

CONFERENCE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

VERBATIM RECORDS

1978

Meetings 767 to 783

(31 January - 30 March)

GENEVA

CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CCD/PV.767
31 January 1978
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY SEVENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 31 January 1978, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mrs. I. Thorsson

(Sweden)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

<u>Argentina:</u>	Mr. F. JIMENEZ DAVILA
<u>Brazil:</u>	Mr. G. MACIEL Mr. I. MASTROGIOVANNI
<u>Bulgaria:</u>	Mr. P. VOUTOV Mr. G. GAVRILOV Mr. I. PETROV Mr. I. SOTIROV
<u>Burma:</u>	U THA TUN U THAUNG HTUN
<u>Canada:</u>	Mr. J.T. SIMARD
<u>Czechoslovakia:</u>	Mr. M. ^{OV} RUZEK Mr. E. ZAPOTOCKY Mr. J. JIRUSEK Mr. V. ROHAL-ILKIV
<u>Egypt:</u>	Mr. O. EL-SHATEI Mr. F. EL IBRASHI Mr. A. ABOUL KHEIR Mr. M. OMAR Mr. T. DINANA
<u>Ethiopia:</u>	Mr. T. TERREFE Mr. G. ALULA
<u>German Democratic Republic:</u>	Mr. G. HERDER Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI Mr. M. RAKAU
<u>Germany, Federal Republic of:</u>	Mr. G. PFEIFFER Mr. J. POHLMANN Mr. K. HANNESSCHLÄGER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS
Mr. I. KORMENDY
Mr. A. LAKATOS

India:

Mr. C.R. GHAREKHAN
Mr. S.T. DEVARE
Mr. B. BALAKRISHNAN

Iran:

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

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO
Mr. G. VALDEVIT
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan:

Mr. T. SAWAI
Mr. Y. NAKAMURA

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES
Mr. M. MARÍN

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco:

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

Netherlands:

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

Nigeria:

Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. G.A. FALASE
Mr. S.T. ADAMU

Pakistan:

Mr. M. YUNUS
Mr. K. SALEEM

Peru:

Mr. G. CHAUNY
Mr. J. AURICH-MONTERO

Poland:

Mr. E. WYZNER
Mr. H. PAC

Romania:

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

Sweden:

Mrs. I. THORSSON
Mr. G. HAMILTON
Mr. L. NORBERG
Mr. J. LUNDIN
Mr. J. PRAWITZ
Mrs. D. EDMAR

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.I. LIKHATCHEV
Mr. B.P. KRASSULIN
Mr. N.V. PESTEREV
Mr. P.F. SHAKHOV
Mr. I.P. GLAZKOV
Mr. L.A. NAOUMOV
Mr. E.D. ZAITSEV
Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO
Mr. A.I. TIOURENKOV
Mr. G.A. SHEVCHENKO

United Kingdom:

Mr. J.G. TAYLOR
Mr. C.K. CURWEN

United States of America:

Mr. A.S. FISHER
Mr. A. AKALOVSKY
Mr. R.N. FRITZEL
Mrs. B. KILLION
Miss B. MURRAY
Mr. R. MIKULAK

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. LALOVIĆ
Mr. D. DJOKIĆ

Zaire:

Mr. BINTU'A-TSHIABOLA
Mr. LUKABU K'HABOUJI
Mr. M. ESUK

Special Representative of
the Secretary-General:

Mr. Risto HYVÄRINEN

Alternate Representative of
the Secretary-General:

Miss A. SEGARRA

Communiqué of the meeting

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 767th meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Inga Thorsson M.P., Under-Secretary of State, representative of Sweden.

The Chairman made a statement.

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Risto Hyvärinen, read out a message from the Secretary-General.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (H.E. Ambassador V.I. Likhatchev) made a statement in which he expounded the contents and importance of the proposals put forward on behalf of the Soviet Union by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, L.I. Brezhnev, in November and December 1977, in particular in connexion with the celebrations of the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Those initiatives concern the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and mutual renunciation by States of the production of neutron bombs.

The Soviet Union proposes a radical step -- that agreement be reached on a simultaneous halt in the production of nuclear weapons by all States, and also on the assumption of an obligation by all States to proceed to a gradual reduction of the already accumulated stocks of those weapons down to their complete elimination.

In order that the negotiations make headway and that the cause of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests is brought to its conclusion, the Soviet Union states its readiness to reach agreement on a moratorium covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, together with a ban on all nuclear-weapon tests for a definite period. Having provided information on the negotiations between the USSR, the United States of America and the United Kingdom which resumed on 23 January in Geneva with a view to elaborating a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the USSR representative expressed the hope that the important step by the USSR in this field would be assessed at its true worth by its partners in the negotiations and thus the road would be cleared for concluding the treaty.

The third new initiative of the Soviet Union is the proposal to the Western Powers to come to agreement on the mutual renunciation of the production of the neutron bomb, in order to save the world from the emergence of this new weapon of mass destruction. The USSR representative expressed the view that the Committee on Disarmament could not disassociate itself from that important and topical question of disarmament.

The USSR representative stressed that implementation of all the new proposals of the Soviet Union would be a most important stage along the road towards limiting the nuclear arms race and removing the threat of nuclear war.

Having dwelt on the primary practical tasks facing the Committee on Disarmament, the USSR representative emphasized that, parallel with the solution of problems in the field of nuclear disarmament, it was necessary to elaborate a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons, as well as an agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. He gave the Committee information on progress in the bilateral negotiations between the USSR and the United States of America on the last two questions.

The USSR representative also pronounced himself in favour of making the work in the Committee more active in the field of the demilitarization of the sea-bed and the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Ambassador Adrian S. Fisher, representative of the United States of America, in his opening remarks, stated that the many long-sought-after goals of a comprehensive test ban, a chemical weapons prohibition and a new SALT agreement were closer to being realized. A comprehensive test ban, which had eluded us for many years, he said, appeared now to be within our grasp. Negotiations to reach agreement on a United States-USSR joint initiative for the CCD on a prohibition of chemical weapons continued and, although several important questions remained to be resolved, he said, particularly in the area of verification, progress was being made and finally, a SALT II agreement was now taking shape which, if concluded at an early date as the United States hoped, would lower the level of United States and USSR strategic arms, impose certain qualitative constraints on potentially destabilizing weapons development, and set the stage for even more substantial limitations in SALT III.

Ambassador Fisher noted another arms control and disarmament measure which might be considered by the CCD during 1978 -- the prohibition of radiological weapons, weapons which could use radiation from natural radioactive decay to cause damage, death or injury. He said that a prohibition on radiological weapons and their use would serve to avert possible development of hitherto untried weapons of mass destruction. He added that he believed the CCD could consider such a prohibition without interfering with higher priority issues before the CCD.

Ambassador Fisher also stated that the United States delegation believed the CCD should consider more actively arms control approaches related to conventional weapons. He said the United States, as a major supplier, had a strong interest in that problem and an obligation to exhibit responsibility, and asked for the views of other delegations on how the CCD might focus greater attention on this issue.

Regarding the CCD's work on a comprehensive negotiating programme, Ambassador Fisher stated that a programme for negotiation should be designed to facilitate the CCD's progress in disarmament, and that he hoped the ad hoc working group on a comprehensive negotiating programme would consider both proposals already before the CCD and those which might be submitted in the future.

In closing, Ambassador Fisher stated that the CCD must be recognized as what it was and had to be, to be effective -- a negotiating body. He said that the United States was prepared to consider organizational changes as long as all delegations were satisfied that such changes would contribute to the CCD's effectiveness. He called attention to the CCD's important task of promoting responsible arms control and disarmament measures and stated that we must all continue to work to achieve a world in which peace, freedom and justice prevail.

The representative of Mexico (H.E. Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles) recalled that the General Assembly had called upon the CCD to submit a "special report" on its work to the forthcoming first special session of the Assembly devoted to disarmament, and suggested that the Committee consider the contents of that report at an early date. In this regard, he noted that the General Assembly had declared in resolution 32/78 that the conclusion of a draft treaty banning all nuclear-weapon tests "would be the best possible augury for the success of the special session". However, since the

three nuclear-weapon States members of the CCD had yet to conclude their negotiations on a CTB agreement, the Committee would be unable for the time being to consider that most urgent matter. Ambassador García Robles suggested that, while it awaited the tripartite CTB text, the CCD should consider anew the question of the establishment of a standing sub-committee of the whole and the question of the abolition of the system of co-chairmanship.

The representative of Italy (H.E. Ambassador Nicolò di Bernardo) devoted his statement to the question of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. He referred to General Assembly resolution 31/63 (XXXII) and to the deliberations of the CCD as regards the convening of an ad hoc working group on the matter.

He formally introduced a working document devoted to the question of the drafting of a disarmament programme (CCD/540).

Ambassador di Bernardo stated that the drafting of a disarmament programme constituted a preliminary undertaking on the way towards concrete action in the field of disarmament. He pointed out that the Italian working paper aimed at offering a realistic and thorough contribution to the framing of an organic set of guidelines for future negotiations on disarmament to take place in the appropriate fora.

Ambassador di Bernardo also stated that the Italian document could offer a substantive contribution to the elaboration of a programme of action based on priorities and short-term measures by the United Nations special session devoted to disarmament.

The representative of Sweden, Under-Secretary of State Mrs. Inga Thorsson M.P., made a statement in which she outlined her Government's views with regard to recent developments in the comprehensive test ban issue and on questions related to the institutional mechanisms needed to promote disarmament efforts at the multilateral level. Mrs. Thorsson emphasized that nuclear disarmament was of truly international concern because every nation of the world was affected by the nuclear arms race. Nuclear disarmament was furthermore one important key to real progress in other areas of disarmament such as conventional arms. Mrs. Thorsson said that the CTB therefore was a matter for the international community as a whole and she emphasized that all parties to a CTBT must be given equal rights and responsibilities as regards the control of the treaty. In view of Sweden's commitment to this objective, Mrs. Thorsson declared that her

Government would be prepared to take measures to establish, to operate and to finance an international seismological data centre to be embodied in an international monitoring system of a CTBT. Mrs. Thorsson underlined that nuclear disarmament would be in the focus of attention during the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The immediate task of the CCD was to negotiate an agreement on a comprehensive test ban to be submitted to the special session. With reference to the resolution to that effect adopted by the thirty-second General Assembly, she expressed her Government's deep concern that such multilateral negotiations were further delayed. In order to make full use of the time available up to the beginning of the special session, she formally proposed that the CCD should be in permanent session as long as was required to fulfil the request made to it by the thirty-second General Assembly. As regards institutional mechanism for disarmament negotiations, Mrs. Thorsson suggested the abolishment of the present institution of co-chairmanship and more openness with regard to the meetings of the CCD.

The following document was submitted to the Conference: "Letter dated 16 January 1978 from the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament transmitting the resolutions on disarmament adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session" (CCD/547).

The delegation of Italy submitted a "Working paper on the question of the drafting of a comprehensive programme of disarmament" (CCD/548).

The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 2 February 1978, at 10.30 a.m.

*

*

*

The CHAIRMAN: The 767th plenary meeting of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is called to order. In accordance with the custom for the opening of the sessions of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, the first part of this meeting, over which I have the great honour and privilege to preside, will be open. Allow me first to tell you what a pleasure it is for me to greet you all gathered together once again in this room in order to continue our important work. Considering the fact that the United Nations General Assembly will meet, at an historic moment, for a special session on disarmament this coming spring, it is imperative that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament gives its contribution to halting the arms race and bringing about real international disarmament measures, thereby laying a solid ground for international peace and security.

At this moment I have the particular pleasure and duty to greet representatives of five countries who are participating for the first time in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament -- Ambassador Petar Voutov of Bulgaria, Ambassador Tadesse Terrefe of Ethiopia, Ambassador Gerhard Pfeiffer of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador Richard H. Fein of the Netherlands and Ambassador Olu Adeniji of Nigeria. The new representative of Argentina, Ambassador Carlos Ortiz de Rozas, is not with us today due to his other important duties in New York but we hope soon to be able to greet him here in person. We shall enjoy working together with our new colleagues as we did with their predecessors. At the same time I would like to express our appreciation of distinguished colleagues and friends who have left the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in order to take up other important assignments in the service of their respective countries. Among them I wish to mention Mr. C. A. van der Klaauw who represented his country in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for a number of years before assuming his higher governmental responsibilities. We wish him and other colleagues who have left the Conference every success in the exercise of their new functions.

I avail myself of this opportunity to express our appreciation of the continued presence of Mr. Risto Hyvärinen, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

I should also like to say how much we are gratified by the presence among us of Ambassador Likhatchev of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and Ambassador Fisher of the United States, the two Co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

(The Chairman)

Before concluding these introductory remarks, I should like to stress that we must effectively make use of the time we have at our disposal till the beginning of the special session and spare no efforts for achieving substantive progress in our two priority items, the CTB and the prohibition of chemical weapons. This spring session of the Conference is no doubt of utmost importance. The United Nations General Assembly will hold its special session devoted to disarmament in less than four months. Let us not for a moment forget that the world is eagerly expecting results from the CCD which should contribute to the success of the special session. So let us immediately start our work and accomplish the task we have before us.

I now have the pleasure to call upon the Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Hyvärinen.

Mr. HYVÄRINEN (Special Representative of the Secretary-General): I have been instructed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to convey to this Committee a message which reads as follows:

"As the CCD reconvenes in Geneva, I wish to review the current state of affairs in the field of disarmament and look at the tasks that lie ahead.

"Your decision to resume deliberations earlier than usual this year is a recognition of the urgent agenda that is before you. At its last session, the General Assembly entrusted specific responsibilities to the Committee on such vital matters as the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests and the prohibition of chemical weapons. It also requested the CCD to submit a special report on the results of its work to the Assembly's special session on disarmament, which will be convened at United Nations Headquarters in May. The decision to hold the special session is a unique development in the history of the United Nations efforts to deal with disarmament problems and is a reflection of the deep feelings of concern that we all share about the need to achieve progress in alleviating the serious dangers inherent in the continuation of the global arms race.

"During the past decade and a half there have been some notable achievements, but they have been directed towards arms limitation rather than disarmament. They have been aimed at prescribing certain particularly undesirable developments but have not resulted in a substantial reduction of important weapons systems, nor have they restrained the pace of the arms race.

(Mr. Hyvärinen, Special Representative of the Secretary-General)

"The continuous and rapid collective change in the weapons being produced and deployed is an increasingly dominant and ominous characteristic of the arms race. In recent years, we have witnessed a steady stream of military technological developments in different fields and in environments, each new generation of weapons being more complex and destructive than the one it has replaced.

"While it is evident that an increase in international tension will further speed up the arms race, it is quite clear that an improvement in the international climate is not, in itself, sufficient to slow it down. Thus, we have seen a continuation, and indeed an acceleration of the arms race in the midst of political détente. Disarmament considerations must become an integral part of international efforts towards détente.

"It is dangerous to assume that new military developments can always be contracted and a stable balance of deterrence maintained. It must be generally realized that the continued competition among nations to produce ever more sophisticated weapons is a threat to all of them and that the adoption of effective disarmament measures is in their common interest.

"There is now general agreement that the threat of nuclear war is the greatest single peril to the survival of mankind. Consequently, nuclear disarmament remains the over-riding priority, and responsibility for progress here falls predominantly on the nuclear Powers, and on the two largest in particular. In this regard, the success of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks is of crucial importance in helping to build an atmosphere of international confidence.

"In order to control the development of nuclear weapons, an end to nuclear tests would be an essential first step. I therefore welcome the negotiations entered into last year by the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States with a view to reaching an agreement on this subject. As the General Assembly has declared, the conclusion of such an agreement would be the best possible augury for the success of the special session devoted to disarmament. I therefore hope that the CCD will soon be in a position to consider the results of these negotiations and that an agreed-upon text of a draft treaty will be submitted to the special session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Ilyvärinen, Special Representative of the Secretary-General)

"At its last session, the General Assembly stressed the continuing importance of prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons, and requested your Committee to elaborate an agreement that would be reported to both the special session and the next regular session of the General Assembly. Although important questions remain to be solved, I believe the situation here is more encouraging than in previous years. It is my hope, therefore, that the Committee will now make decisive progress towards a ban on chemical weapons.

"The Committee also has before it two resolutions adopted by the General Assembly with regard to the need for barriers to prevent scientific and technological progress from being applied to the development of new weapons of mass destruction. This is a very complex and broad question, but the Committee's discussions should lead to a clarification of what measures are possible to halt the development of new weapons systems.

"This Committee is well aware that one of the more noteworthy events in the overall disarmament efforts in the past year was the Review Conference of the Parties to the Sea-Bed Treaty. The Treaty represents a significant step towards the exclusion of the arms race from this vast area of the globe, and the constructive way in which the Review Conference worked was in keeping with this ultimate goal. It is now important that the Committee pursue this same objective and undertake the consideration of additional measures towards the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed and ocean floor.

"As conventional weapons increase their accuracy and destructiveness, there is growing awareness in the international community both of their destabilizing effects, mainly at the regional level, and of the economic and social burdens they impose on all of society. Thus, disarmament needs to be pursued at every level and every opportunity leading towards it should be seized.

"As I have previously stated, I believe that partial and collateral disarmament measures can play a role in halting and reversing the arms race only if they are conceived as part of a broader programme. Last year the Committee agreed that at the beginning of the 1978 session, an

(Mr. Hyvärinen, Special Representative of the Secretary-General)

ad hoc working group would be established to draft a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Such a programme can make a valuable contribution to the international community's overall disarmament efforts. The successful discharge of your responsibilities would constitute significant progress in disarmament negotiations.

"The thirty-second session of the General Assembly was, fortunately, characterized by a spirit of goodwill and co-operation. Member States were able to agree on a number of widely acceptable resolutions on some priority disarmament issues. The Preparatory Committee for the special session, which is currently meeting in New York, has conducted its work in this same spirit. It is against this background that I hope that the report of the CCD to the special session will make a timely and decisive contribution to the cause of disarmament in areas of major importance to international peace and security. I wish the Committee every success in its endeavours."

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Hyvärinen, for delivering this challenging message from the Secretary-General to this important session of the CCD.

The opening part of this meeting is now concluded. After a brief interval of five minutes the CCD will resume its work in closed session.

* * *

I now declare open the closed part of the 767th plenary meeting of the CCD.

I give the floor to the first speaker on my list today, the distinguished representative of the USSR, Ambassador Likhatchev.

Mr. LIKHATCHEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Madam Chairman, Mrs. Thorsson, I would like to avail myself of the privilege of being among the first speakers at the session opening today, which initiates the work of the Committee on Disarmament in 1978, in order to welcome sincerely all the distinguished representatives present here and also to express the hope that our constructive efforts will be continued and developed this year which, it seems, promises to be a very busy year as regards work on disarmament problems.

At the same time I would also like to address some words of welcome to the new representatives on the Committee whom we see with us here -- those of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Nigeria, the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma, Ethiopia, the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany.

I would like to welcome cordially the representative of fraternal Bulgaria, Ambassador Voutov, who, as we know, has extensive experience of work in the international sphere, including work on disarmament problems. Many people probably know that in the early 1970s he represented Bulgaria in the Committee on Disarmament; and his competence will undoubtedly be a contribution to our common work. I am confident that our co-operation with Petar Voutov will be as close and fruitful as it was with his predecessor Raiko Nikolov, to whom we request Ambassador Voutov to convey our good wishes for success in his work in his new post, and also our wishes for good health for him personally and for his wife.

It gives me pleasure to welcome the new representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Adeniji, and we would like to express our hope for active work jointly with him, as with his compatriot, Ambassador Clark. I think I am expressing the view of many of my colleagues on the Committee when I say that we think highly of Ambassador Clark for his profound interest in the problems on which the Committee on Disarmament is working, and for his active participation in the activities of this body. I would like to request you, Mr. Ambassador, to convey our sincere wishes for success in his work and wishes for good health to Ambassador Clark and his wife.

In welcoming the representatives of Ethiopia, Ambassador Tadesse Terrefe, and of the Socialist Republic of the Union of Burma, U Tha Tun, we count on the traditional good and friendly co-operation with them, and we request them to convey our feelings of respect to Ambassador Berhanu and to Ambassador U Thet Tun.

(Mr. Likhatchev, USSR)

With the representative of the Netherlands, Ambassador van der Klaauw, we maintained business-like co-operation on practically all the questions under the discussion in the Committee. This co-operation was, as we see it, particularly active in the period of our joint work on the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques, when the experience and knowledge of Ambassador van der Klaauw were helpful for the successful elaboration of this Convention. In welcoming the new representative of the Netherlands, Ambassador Richard Fein, I would like to express the hope for a continuation of business-like contacts with the delegation of the Netherlands and also with him personally. We request him to convey to Mr. van der Klaauw our good feelings and wishes for success in his high office of Minister of Foreign Affairs as well as our best wishes to his wife. I would like to remark incidentally that our Committee is a kind of school from which foreign ministers graduate.

We welcome the new representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador G. Pfeiffer, and we look forward to fruitful co-operation with him. I would also request him to convey our best wishes to Ambassador Schlaich with whom we worked jointly for a certain period of time in this Committee.

I would like to take this opportunity to express our respect to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Hyvärinen, with whom we maintain fruitful co-operation, and also to welcome Ms Segarra as Alternate Representative of the Secretary-General. Of course, it will give us pleasure to work with them and with all members of the Secretariat and we count, in particular, on a faultless performance by the interpreters and translators who, with their sincere efforts, assist in the work of the Committee.

The Committee on Disarmament is beginning its work in 1978 in conditions in which international relations are, as it were, at a crossroads, which lead either to the growth of trust and co-operation or to an increase in mutual suspicions, disputes and the stockpiling of weapons -- a crossroads leading, ultimately, either to lasting peace or, at best, to balancing on the brink of war. International détente offers the opportunity of choosing the road of peace.

The Soviet Union highly values those changes for the better in international relations which have taken place in recent years and it deems it to be its duty to cherish and multiply those achievements. We must all do everything possible

(Mr. Likhatchev, USSR)

to deepen and consolidate the relaxation of international tension, to make this process universal and irreversible, and to supplement political détente with military détente. All countries are called upon to make their contribution to the prevention of war and to the development of international co-operation in the name of the existence and the future of mankind.

In our view, under present-day conditions the main place in the work of the Committee on Disarmament should be given to questions aimed at the consolidation and development of the positive processes which are taking place in modern world and at achieving new successes in limiting the arms race and in disarmament.

One distinctive feature of this session of the Committee on Disarmament is that it will take place on the threshold of the forthcoming special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. This places on all of us a special responsibility and obliges us to exert the maximum efforts to achieve positive results in our work. However, it would be wrong to link the solution of major and complicated problems of disarmament to the holding of any international conferences, or to set rigid time-limits. The essential thing, in our view, is to achieve agreement and to find a solution of a problem that will be viable and acceptable for all.

The Soviet Union, as previously, stands ready to come to agreement on the most radical disarmament measures. After the Second World War the USSR, as is known, has put forward over 100 proposals aimed at curbing the arms race and at disarmament. In the last three months alone it has come out with a number of important concrete initiatives on questions of disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. Those proposals seem to be known to the members of the Committee. We are referring to the three important initiatives which were put forward on behalf of the Soviet Union by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, L.I. Brezhnev, at a jubilee meeting held in Moscow on 2 November 1977 on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and in his replies to questions by a Pravda correspondent in late December 1977. These initiatives relate to the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and the mutual renunciation by States of the production of neutron bombs.

(Mr. Likhatchev, USSR)

Concerning the first of these initiatives, L.I. Brezhnev stated that:

"To-day we are proposing a radical step: that agreement be reached on a simultaneous halt in the production of nuclear weapons by all States. This would apply to all such weapons -- whether atomic, hydrogen or neutron bombs or missiles. At the same time, the nuclear Powers could undertake to start the gradual reduction of existing stockpiles of such weapons and move towards their complete, total destruction".

The cessation of the production of nuclear weapons would be a decisive step on the road towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race, and it would put an end to the quantitative accumulation of those weapons. It goes without saying, however, that the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons alone does not yet eliminate the threat of nuclear war, because large quantities of such weapons are already now accumulated in the arsenals of States. The Soviet Union's proposal is therefore not to stop there but to take also a further step -- to start the gradual reduction of accumulated stockpiles of nuclear weapons, right down to their complete elimination.

Of course, the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and their complete elimination are not easy matters, and great efforts will be required to achieve this goal. But this task must be solved if our objective is to eliminate the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet Union has stated its readiness to find a concrete solution to this problem. It is ready at any time to sit down at the negotiating table together with all other nuclear Powers in order to examine comprehensively the problem of nuclear disarmament in all its scope and to elaborate, jointly with others, specific ways for its practical solution. In so doing, the Soviet Union has no objections to non-nuclear States taking part in such negotiations, because all countries -- large and small, developed and developing -- are interested in nuclear disarmament.

One of the major measures for the cessation of the arms race is the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests, because such tests are conducted for the purpose of perfecting existing nuclear warheads or for developing new types of such warheads. The Soviet Union has taken a radical step forward in this direction as well. In his speech which I have already quoted, L.I. Brezhnev states that:

"There is another important problem which has a direct bearing on the task of reducing the threat of nuclear war, namely, the problem of bringing

(Mr. Likhatchev, USSR)

to completion the work of banning nuclear-weapon tests, so that such tests are banned entirely -- not only in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, but underground as well. We want to move forward the negotiations on this matter and bring them to a successful conclusion. Therefore, we state that we are prepared to agree that, together with a ban on all nuclear-weapon tests for a definite period, a moratorium be declared on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. We trust that this important step by the USSR will be assessed at its true worth by our partners in the negotiations, and that the road will thus be cleared for concluding the treaty that has been long awaited by the peoples".

The negotiations between delegations of the USSR, the United States of America and the United Kingdom with a view to elaborating a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests were resumed at Geneva on 23 January. In these negotiations, the USSR delegation is proceeding from the premise that the important initiative by L.I. Brezhnev on 2 November 1977 ensures favourable conditions for the successful conduct and completion of the negotiations. The proposal for a moratorium covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes together with the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests is a major step to meet our partners in the negotiations half-way, and makes it possible to elaborate quickly and effectively specific provisions of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. The Soviet Union expects that the United States of America and the United Kingdom, for their part, will also display a constructive approach towards a speedy solution of the problem, which is of great importance for reducing the threat of nuclear war.

Great interest was aroused in the world by yet another initiative of the Soviet Union -- namely, the proposal for the mutual renunciation of the production of the neutron bomb.

The cause of peace is greatly threatened by the emergence of the neutron bomb and by the fact that persistent efforts are being made to thrust on the world this inhuman weapon which is particularly dangerous because it is being passed off as a "tactical" and almost "harmless" weapon, and attempts are thus being made to efface the dividing line between conventional and nuclear weapons and to make the transition to nuclear war outwardly imperceptible, as it were, to the peoples.

(Mr. Likhatchev, USSR)

The position of the Soviet Union has been clearly expressed by L.I. Brezhnev as follows:

"The Soviet Union is decisively against the development of a neutron bomb ... but if this bomb is developed in the West -- developed against us, which no one even attempts to conceal -- then it should be clearly understood that the USSR will not stand by as a passive observer. We shall be faced with the necessity of meeting this challenge in order to ensure the security of the Soviet people and its allies and friends. In the last analysis all this will raise the arms race to an even more dangerous level.

"We do not wish this to happen and therefore we propose that agreement be reached on the mutual renunciation of the production of the neutron bomb so as to save the world from the emergence of this new weapon of mass destruction of human beings. Such is our sincere desire, such is our proposal to the Western Powers".

I would like to voice the hope that Western countries will treat this Soviet proposal with all seriousness and responsibility.

In our view, the Committee on Disarmament cannot stand aside from this important and topical question of disarmament.

One of the most important international agreements in the nuclear field is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It is necessary to make energetic efforts to increase the effectiveness of this Treaty and to make it truly universal. It is necessary to provide for conditions of international co-operation in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, which would exclude any possibility of using it for the development of nuclear weapons. The Committee on Disarmament can have its say on this question as well.

The Soviet Union, which has consistently and firmly advocated the prevention of the threat of nuclear war, is ready, together with other States, to promote in every way the achievement of the above-mentioned objectives.

Among the questions which are of primary importance in the work of the Committee, there is also, as is known, the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons.

For many years the Soviet Union has been striving for a complete and radical solution to this question. The USSR advocates that an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons should provide simultaneously for the renunciation

(Mr. Likhatchev, USSR)

of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons as well as for the destruction of all stockpiles of such weapons. Only such a fundamental solution of this problem can finally and entirely eliminate the threat of the use of chemical means of warfare and place on an equal footing all countries, whether or not they possess this type of weapon.

As is known, the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons is a subject which is being discussed not only in the Committee on Disarmament but also in bilateral negotiations between the USSR and the United States of America with a view to the elaboration of a joint initiative on this question. Several rounds of bilateral meetings were held in 1977, and on 10 January last another round of negotiations was started in Geneva and is continuing now. It should be stated that these negotiations are being conducted very intensively and certain progress has been achieved in them. On a whole number of questions -- in particular, on the scope of the prohibition, on the elimination of declared stocks of chemical weapons, on the dismantling of capacities at which such weapons have been produced, and also on some aspects of the system of verification -- there has emerged a large measure of agreement and mutually acceptable formulations have even been found. However, on some questions, including individual questions connected with verification of the destruction of stockpiles of chemical agents, agreement has not yet been reached.

It should be also noted that the problem of the prohibition of chemical weapons is a multifaceted and complex problem, since it has many political and also technical aspects; and, of course, time is needed for its solution. The essential thing here is to elaborate a draft of an agreement which would viably and effectively ensure the solution of the problem of the prohibition of chemical weapons and elimination of all accumulated means of chemical warfare.

Among the problems of limiting the arms race and of disarmament, an important place is occupied by the question of concluding an international agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction. The need for concluding such an agreement as soon as possible is becoming increasingly obvious in view of the emergence of new means of warfare, such as the neutron bomb. In view of the rapid development of science and technology, the new scientific discoveries in all fields of human activity, and the creation of the material and technical basis for giving practical application

(Mr. Likhatchev, USSR)

to scientific discoveries in fields including the development of new means of warfare, it is urgently necessary to take effective measures to exclude the possibility of the emergence in the future of new types of weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet Government was guided precisely by those considerations when it put forward the proposal for the conclusion of an agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

During the fairly thorough examination of this proposal in the Committee on Disarmament, with the participation of competent governmental experts, certain useful work was accomplished in studying the substance of the problem and possible approaches to its solution.

As is known, the Soviet Union favours the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement on this question, because it is precisely this approach which excludes the possibility of using scientific discoveries, to the detriment of mankind, for developing new types of weapons of mass destruction. We note with satisfaction that such an approach met with wide support in the Committee on Disarmament. At the same time, opinions were also expressed to the effect that agreements on the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction should be elaborated and concluded as and when potential dangers of the development of specific new types of such weapons became evident.

Taking into account the exchange of views which took place, the Soviet Union introduced in the Committee on Disarmament in August 1977 a supplemented draft of an agreement on this question (CCD/511/Rev.1). As is known, the draft took into account the wishes expressed by a number of participants in the negotiations. In particular, a new wording was proposed for the general definition of the subject of the prohibition in the agreement, and a specific approximate list of types of weapons to be prohibited was annexed, with a provision to the effect that the list could be supplemented in future as necessary. A special clause was included providing that, in addition to the general agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, special agreements can be concluded on the prohibition of specific types of such weapons.

(Mr. Likhatchev, USSR)

The problem of the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction is being examined simultaneously not only in the Committee but also in Soviet-United States bilateral talks. At these talks, in particular, the question of the elaboration of a special agreement on the prohibition of radiological weapons has also been discussed in detail. Certain progress has been achieved in this respect.

We express our profound satisfaction with the fact that 90 States Members of the United Nations pronounced themselves, at the thirty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly, in favour of a comprehensive approach to the solution of this problem, stating that it is necessary to discuss without delay in the Committee on Disarmament a draft agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction. We should not confine ourselves merely to watching developments in this field and to studying the possibilities of the emergence of new types of weapons, starting the elaboration of appropriate agreements only when such a danger has already become evident. Such an approach may turn to be a belated one, with all the ensuing fatal consequences.

We hope that the Committee will continue work on such a draft and will make headway in this very important question.

There is another problem to which we would like to draw the Committee's attention at the very outset of its work.

As is known, in June last the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof was held at Geneva. The Conference reaffirmed the commitment undertaken by the Parties to the Treaty in article V to continue negotiations in good faith concerning the demilitarization of the sea-bed, and it requested the Committee on Disarmament, in consultation with the States Parties to the Treaty, to proceed without delay to the examination of further measures aimed at preventing the arms race on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof. The thirty-second session of the United Nations General Assembly adopted an appropriate resolution on this subject.

(Mr. Likhatchev, USSR)

The Soviet Union, as is known, is an advocate of the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed. Proceeding from this, we support the above-mentioned decision and are ready to begin consultations with other States members of the Committee on Disarmament concerning the procedure for starting, in the Committee, the discussion of the problem of the demilitarization of the sea-bed.

The Soviet Union also supports the proposal for the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, a programme which would cover a broad spectrum of problems aimed at the implementation both of partial measures in the field of disarmament and of general and complete disarmament. This is precisely the purpose of the memorandum of the Soviet Union on questions of ending the arms race and on disarmament, of the working papers entitled "Basic provisions of the declaration on disarmament" and "Basic provisions of the programme of action on disarmament" which were introduced on 7 September 1977 by the Soviet delegation and by the delegations of a number of other socialist countries in the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, and also of a number of other proposals aimed at the deepening and consolidation of international détente, the prevention of the threat of nuclear war, and the non-use of force in international relations.

The Committee is to take a decision on the establishment of a working group on the question of the comprehensive programme of disarmament and also on the mandate for its work.

The Soviet delegation would like to stress once again the important significance of the Committee on Disarmament as an authoritative and effective international body for negotiations on disarmament, which is capable in its present form of elaborating and reaching agreement on multilateral agreements in this field.

For its part the Soviet Union will continue to make persistent and consistent efforts and display flexibility and good will, so that the Committee can achieve practical successes in limiting the arms race and in disarmament. I would like to express the hope that other countries members of the Committee will also make a constructive contribution to the solution of the problems which face all of us here, and that the Committee on Disarmament will be able to achieve new concrete results, including results on the most important problems of disarmament which have been mentioned above.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): Madam Chairman, it is always a pleasure to see many friends from earlier sessions around this table. You represent a reservoir of experience which constitutes one of the main strengths of the CCD. Also, there are several new colleagues with us and I would like to extend a very special welcome to each of them. I would like to welcome Ambassador Voutov from Bulgaria, Ambassador Terrefe from Ethiopia, Ambassador Pfeiffer from the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador Fein from the Netherlands and Ambassador Adeniji of Nigeria with whom many of us had the pleasure of working in the First Committee of the United Nations. You are able to offer new perspectives on old problems and provide the type of fresh thinking that helps to keep the CCD vital. The continuing infusion of new blood is another one of the strengths of the CCD.

I would also like to avail myself of the opportunity to work with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Alternate Representative of the Secretary-General and I would be churlish indeed if I did not welcome -- although this may not be wholly mutual -- the opportunity to work with the various members of the Secretariat, particularly the interpreters and translators, who, by their sincere efforts have translated sometimes imperfect and often excessively hasty English correctly into other languages.

As I look around this table, I also see that some old friends have moved on; some, happily, to positions of considerable responsibility. I understand that Ambassador Nikolov is preparing himself for an important new diplomatic assignment. Please convey my best wishes to him. Ambassador Schlaich has been assigned as Ambassador to the Western European Union in London. I wish him well as he undertakes these new duties. Ambassador van der Klaauw has returned to the Hague to serve as Foreign Minister. Please relay to him my very best regards. All of us will miss those who have departed from our ranks. However, they too represent one of the strengths of our Committee, since they take with them an appreciation of the problems we have before us.

As we look to the year ahead, we see a very active period in the area of disarmament. We are getting closer to the realization of many of our long-sought-after goals -- a comprehensive test ban, a chemical weapons prohibition, a new SALT agreement -- at the same time that we are considering new steps, like conventional arms limitations, which will lead us further down the road to genuine disarmament. I believe we all share the responsibility for achieving lasting peace and making a disarmed world a reality.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

I am happy to report that, since we last met, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union have made progress with respect to a comprehensive nuclear test ban. Trilateral talks on this important arms control measure are continuing at this time.

A comprehensive test ban has proven to be an elusive goal for many years. However, this year it appears within our grasp. We may at last be in sight of the goal which Prime Minister Nehru addressed 24 years ago when he made the first call for a cessation of nuclear testing, and which President Carter reiterated in his recent speech to the United Nations when he said "... the time has come to end all explosions of nuclear devices, no matter what their claimed justification -- peaceful or military."

In this group, I know I need not dwell at any length on the significance of a CTB. We all believe that it will help to bring a halt to the qualitative nuclear arms race. It will be applicable to nuclear- and non-nuclear-weapon States alike. For the nuclear-weapon States, it will inevitably lead to reduced dependence on nuclear weapons. For the non-nuclear-weapon States, it will substantially reduce the incentives to develop a technology leading to a nuclear explosive capability. For both, it will serve as an important measure to support our collective non-proliferation efforts.

The issues involved in our talks on a comprehensive test ban these many months are complex and difficult. They have repeatedly thwarted earlier efforts to negotiate such a ban. But we hope to present to the CCD at an early date the results of the trilateral discussions now going on so that we here can complete the work on a comprehensive nuclear test ban which will have the broadest possible adherence.

We at the CCD will soon be dealing with one aspect of this problem when we receive the report of the seismic experts on 7 March. This is, of course, the problem of a seismic data information exchange. The extensive study which has been made in this area, in our view, can make a significant contribution to further work on a CTB, which we hope soon to be considering.

Another important disarmament measure on which we hope to begin negotiations in the CCD this year concerns chemical weapons. Of course, we already have the Geneva Protocol of 1925 dealing with poison gas. But, substantial though this agreement is, the prohibition is limited to use. It does not deal with substantial stockpiles of poisonous gases which are now in existence and which could easily be poised for employment, or even employed in the event of a future

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

Since the end of the last session of the CCD in August, the United States and the Soviet Union have held three more rounds of their bilateral negotiations to continue work on a joint initiative banning chemical weapons for presentation to the CCD. What we have been working on is a joint initiative that might serve as the basis for negotiating a convention which would require the destruction of all stocks of chemical weapons and the effective prohibition of any further development, production, or stockpiling of these dangerous weapons. While there has been progress on the joint initiative, several important questions remain to be resolved, particularly in the area of verification. I cannot predict with certainty when the joint initiative will be completed. However, I can assure you that the United States is continuing to make every effort to reach agreement promptly on a joint initiative that will lead to CCD elaboration of a convention which effectively eliminates chemical weapons from the arsenals of States parties.

The United States believes that it is particularly important that our efforts to ban chemical weapons be brought promptly before the CCD, the multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations.

As we have stated previously, we believe that a chemical weapons convention will directly engage any country with a modern chemical industry and pose new challenges in the area of verification. These challenges create an opportunity to work out innovative forms of international co-operation which, in turn, can build the experience and the confidence for broader disarmament efforts in the years ahead.

We also believe, in dealing with the means of chemical warfare, that we are operating at the forefront of a technology which has the potential for creating weapons even more dangerous than existing ones. This potential is not confined to a few technologically more advanced States but is a force with which all societies with a chemical industry have to cope. If we can safeguard this technology through effective arms control, we will be contributing to the kind of world order which all of us surely seek, not only for ourselves, but for coming generations.

Another measure which may be considered by the CCD this year is the prohibition of radiological weapons, weapons which could use radiation from natural radioactive decay to cause damage, death or injury.

Let me explain briefly why a convention on RW would be a valuable step. This convention would prohibit the use in warfare of the radioactive material which is becoming increasingly plentiful as the use of research and power reactors grows

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

a comprehensive test ban or a chemical weapons convention, a prohibition on radiological weapons and their use would fill a logical gap in the panoply of arms control measures, and would serve to head off the possible development of hitherto untried weapons of mass destruction specifically mentioned in the 1948 United Nations definition. The relatively wide availability of radioactive material creates a potential threat which we should not ignore -- one which we can effectively guard against through arms control, i.e. providing we act promptly and deal with such weapons before rather than after they are in the arsenals of States. I believe it should be possible for us to consider a comprehensive prohibition on radiological weapons without interfering with the CCD's higher priority issues.

The activities which we can expect to be going on at the CCD must be viewed in the context of activities that are being carried on elsewhere which, together with the results we look to achieve here, will make a coherent whole. I am referring particularly to the United States-Soviet talks on the limitation of strategic arms.

Recently, in connexion with the five-year review of the ABM Treaty which bans nation-wide missile defense systems, the United States and the Soviet Union jointly reaffirmed their vigorous support of the Treaty. Both sides have indicated that, pending further agreement on a SALT II accord, their conduct will continue to be guided by the limitations contained in the SALT I Interim Agreement. This Agreement, signed in 1972, served the essential purpose of limiting the strategic competition while both sides sought a more meaningful and durable agreement limiting offensive nuclear forces.

We now see a SALT II agreement taking shape. If such an agreement is concluded at an early date, as we hope it will be, it would lower the level of strategic arms on both sides, impose certain qualitative constraints on potentially destabilizing weapons development, and set the stage for even more substantial limitations in SALT III. The SALT II agreement would not only increase the security of the United States and the Soviet Union, it would contribute to world security, and it would provide further stimulus for rapid progress in other areas of arms control.

Let me stress that what we are seeking are not agreements which merely channel competition in convenient directions. This has sometimes been alleged, but nothing could be further from the truth. We seek significant disarmament. As President Carter has said with respect to nuclear weapons, "On a reciprocal basis, we are willing now to reduce them by 10 per cent, by 20 per cent, even by

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

For this reason, as soon as SALT II is in hand, we shall proceed immediately with work on SALT III which we hope will lead to significant reductions in the strategic arsenals of both sides.

My delegation believes that the CCD should play a more vigorous role in coming to grips with arms control approaches related to conventional weapons. Our main efforts have been directed toward nuclear issues -- non-proliferation and a comprehensive test ban. While we agree that these are the most urgent issues, we also believe that efforts to deal with conventional weapons cannot wait until all important nuclear issues have been resolved.

All nations have a fundamental interest in maintaining an adequate level of conventional weapons to meet their basic security needs. All nations also have a fundamental interest in finding ways to reduce the requirements for military expenditures in order to free limited resources for economic and social needs. In our view, adequate attention has not been paid to the possibilities for arms control approaches to reduce the requirements for conventional arms both in quantitative and qualitative terms.

One aspect of this wider problem of conventional arms control is that of arms transfers. Since the United States is a major supplier, we have a strong interest in this problem and an obligation to exhibit responsibility. The United States has enunciated a policy which will guide our own actions. It is a policy of restraining the flow of unnecessary, expensive and destabilizing weapons while recognizing the legitimate defence needs of others.

These are the views of the United States. Other nations, both suppliers and recipients, may have other views. This is a complex problem and the answers are likely to be complex as well. However, it is also clear that there must be some broad international co-operative effort if this problem is to be brought under control. We believe that, in seeking a solution, our collective efforts must be guided by two broad principles:

- All States have legitimate security requirements, and these must be met.
- Both producer and consumer nations are concerned, and a solution must reflect the interests and ideas of both.

For its part the United States delegation would welcome the views of others on how the CCD might focus greater attention on conventional arms questions, in general, and arms transfer issues, in particular. As we begin our work on a comprehensive negotiating programme, the United States delegation believes that conventional arms issues should be given full consideration.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

We are all aware, of course, that we are working with the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament just over the horizon. It will be held from 23 May to 28 June 1978. The penultimate session of the Preparatory Committee for this special session is now underway; indeed many of our colleagues are attending it. I would like to express my personal gratitude as a member of the Committee that one of our colleagues who was attending it has flown many thousands of kilometres and is going to do it again, for the purpose of letting us have the benefit of his views. The final session of the Preparatory Committee is scheduled to be held in April, and many of us may be there also.

The imminence of the special session devoted to disarmament presents us with a challenge but it presents us with an opportunity as well -- an opportunity to broaden our vision, free ourselves from preoccupation with the immediate issues and try to build for the future by stimulating, broadening, and accelerating our negotiations on disarmament. This is one of the reasons why the United States delegation supported the decision of this body of 29 August 1977, by which we agreed to establish at the beginning of this session an ad hoc working group to discuss and elaborate a draft comprehensive programme of disarmament to be submitted to the CCD for consideration.

We recognize that there are limitations as to what can be accomplished by a comprehensive negotiating programme. Since negotiations in the field of arms control and disarmament are, by their very nature, consensual transactions, it is not possible to set a binding deadline for agreement. It is also a fact, however, that there is a logical sequential order in measures of arms control and disarmament, both in the nuclear and in the conventional field. Our work would be expedited if we come up with a programme for negotiation which facilitates, rather than hinders, the progress made here.

We already have some interesting proposals before the CCD for consideration by the working group. I would hope that the terms of reference for the working group would be designed to permit consideration not only of proposals which are now before the CCD, but also those which may be submitted in the future.

In closing, I would like to note that the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament plans to consider "machinery for disarmament negotiations". This means that the special session could make

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

recommendations which could affect our work here in the CCD. It goes without saying that what we accomplish this session at the CCD, and how we accomplish it, will have a substantial effect upon what those recommendations will be.

The United States is not yet prepared to express its final views as they relate to the "machinery for disarmament negotiations"; however, I do believe that a few preliminary remarks might be appropriate.

The CCD must be recognized as what it is and has to be, to be effective -- a negotiating body. This means that it has to operate by consensus, because effective disarmament measures cannot be mandated by majority decisions, particularly when important security interests are at stake. This also means that it has to be a body of limited, but representative, membership. A body much larger than the CCD would lose the flexibility and facility of communication which are prerequisites for an effective negotiating body.

These are not merely opinions; they are facts which are inherent in the disarmament process and facts which we believe the CCD should bear in mind so that it continues as the major multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations.

The statement of these facts does not mean there should be no change in the organization or functioning of the CCD. There are, for example, important States that are not represented at this table. For its part, the United States would welcome participation by such States. Additionally, the United States is prepared to consider organizational changes. However, before discarding proven methods, we should all be satisfied that any such changes would make the CCD a more effective negotiating body. Our primary consideration should be the important task which lies ahead -- the task of promoting responsible arms control and disarmament measures which reduce the competition in arms and strengthen the security of all nations. This is a task at which we must all continue to work in an effort to achieve a world in which peace, freedom and justice prevails.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Fisher for his statement. The next speaker on my list is the distinguished Ambassador of Mexico. I would like to give voice to the appreciation of the Committee, as well as my own, at the fact that Ambassador García Robles, as Ambassador Fisher underlined a few minutes ago, arrived this very morning from the important fourth meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the special session in New York and I have very great pleasure in giving him the floor.

Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Madam Chairman, I should like first of all to associate myself with the words of welcome which you addressed, at the beginning of this meeting, to those distinguished representatives who are today for the first time occupying their place at the head of their respective delegations, and also to endorse what has been said in this Committee about their distinguished predecessors. I should also like to take this opportunity to extend greetings once again to Ambassador Hyvärinen, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and to express our pleasure at the return of Ms. Amada Segarra, who is now Alternate Representative of the Secretary-General.

The work of the 1978 session of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament which is beginning today should have as its guideline the fact that before four months have passed, on 23 May, the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament will be opening in New York.

The special session is a meeting at which, in accordance with the recommendations of its Preparatory Committee, it is certain that Member States will be represented "at the highest possible level", and that, in the light of the debates which took place in that Committee during the year just ended, a serious effort will be made to lay the foundations of what might be called a new "disarmament strategy" and to give a decisive impetus to disarmament negotiations which for so long have been at a standstill.

Hence it would appear to be no exaggeration to affirm that the fate of the CCD may largely depend on the content of this "special report" which -- in accordance with General Assembly resolution 32/88 B of 12 December 1977, which "endorsed" the corresponding recommendation of the Preparatory Committee -- we shall have to submit to the General Assembly, informing it of the "state of the various questions under consideration" by this Conference.

We believe therefore that the CCD should begin at an early date to consider what the content of this "special report" should be, and what steps should be taken in order to ensure that it can be described as positive.

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

My delegation feels that there is nothing better that could be done in this respect than to obtain in the CCD the agreement of all its members to a draft treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. It was not for nothing that the General Assembly, in its resolution 32/78 of 12 December last -- which was adopted, incidentally, with the affirmative vote of the three nuclear Powers represented in this forum, to whose repeated abstentions we had grown accustomed -- declared that the conclusion of such an international instrument and its opening for signature "would be the best possible augury for the success of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

It was assuredly for that reason that the Assembly, in the same resolution, after noting with satisfaction that negotiations had begun "among three nuclear-weapon States", urged them "to expedite their negotiations with a view to bringing them to a positive conclusion as soon as possible and to use their best endeavours to transmit the results for full consideration by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament by the beginning of its spring session".

Unfortunately, as we all know, the "positive conclusion" to which the Assembly referred has not yet materialized. For the time being, therefore, we are unable to comply with the request in the above-mentioned resolution that the CCD take up "with the utmost urgency" the text transmitted to it as a result of the trilateral negotiations "with a view to the submission of a draft treaty to the General Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament".

The enforced inactivity to which the CCD is thus condemned with regard to this most important issue is, we believe, very regrettable. We hope that this is a temporary situation and that the desired text will be received by the Committee during February or the first fortnight of March, at the latest. Otherwise, I do not see how we could give it our "full consideration" as requested by the Assembly, "with a view" -- as I have just recalled -- "to the submission of a draft treaty" for this special session which, it must not be forgotten, will start on 23 May. We trust that the three nuclear-weapon States are fully aware of the responsibility involved in the negotiations which they have been conducting, and of the pressing urgency to bring them to a happy conclusion.

A second topic on which we think it would be extremely desirable for the CCD to adopt urgent measures in the next three months, in order to enable it to include in its "special report" a statement indicative of real progress in this connexion, is the topic which, in our deliberations, has been given the title "Organization and procedures of the CCD".

In the closing stages of our session last year I already had occasion, in my statement at the 762nd meeting on 16 August 1977, to set forth at length the

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

severe criticisms levelled at the CCD in the opinions of Governments examined by the Preparatory Committee for the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly. I will merely emphasize that, as is clear from the many quotations I read out on that occasion, there is a fairly widespread feeling that "the need for an effective multilateral organ for the negotiation of disarmament measures is becoming more and more evident", and that there is a need for "improving the structure and methods of work of the CCD" and "to change without delay the present system of co-chairmen".

Consequently, in our view, the Committee should use the time which, inevitably but involuntarily, it will have at its disposal before it receives the tripartite text of the preliminary draft treaty on nuclear-weapon tests, to reconsider two proposals: the setting up of a standing sub-committee of the whole and the abolition of the co-chairmanship system.

With regard to the first of these proposals which, to our way of thinking, would double the working capacity and thus the efficiency of the CCD, working paper CCD/530 submitted last year by twelve delegations -- those of Argentina, Brazil, Burma, Egypt, Iran, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Peru, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Zaïre -- retains all its validity. What was suggested there, in March 1977, might well be taken, in February 1978, as a point of departure for resuming a conscientious examination of this subject.

As will be recalled, the proposal on this subject, which is fairly brief, was worded as follows:

"A standing sub-committee should be set up to negotiate specific texts of draft conventions, treaties, agreements and other documents on those questions in the agenda of the CCD which the Committee may refer for that purpose to the sub-committee.

"The organization of work and its procedures should be determined by the CCD and should not impair in any manner the right of the Committee to adopt any other procedural measures it may deem advisable. The chairmanship should be by monthly rotation according to the alphabetical order in English of member States.

"The sub-committee should have its records, as appropriate, and should submit its report(s) to the CCD.

"The level of representation in the sub-committee should be determined by each delegation.

"Its meetings should be held without hampering the regular or informal meetings of the CCD".

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

With regard to the adoption of a procedure to replace the unusual institution of the co-chairmanship, the many suggestions that have been submitted by the delegation of Mexico since nearly ten years ago might perhaps serve as a basis for the resumption of discussions on the matter. I will merely recall, as the most recent among them, the following ideas which it fell to me to place before the First Committee of the General Assembly exactly three months ago today, on 31 October 1977:

"My delegation has in the past suggested various options that might be resorted to in order to achieve the end we have in view. We believe the one to be chosen from among them should be that which has the most chance of being acceptable to each and every one of the five nuclear Powers.

"According to the reactions that I have heard this year, it seems to me that the procedure that would best answer this purpose would perhaps be the monthly rotation of the chairmanship among all non-nuclear-weapon States members of the CCD. Indeed, such a system would be closest to that applied in the case of the Security Council, a system which from the very beginning has won the consent of its permanent members, that is, the five nuclear-weapon States.

"We are convinced that the relinquishment of the co-chairmanship in a gracious and co-operative gesture -- which, I am sure, is how the relinquishment of the office by the two Co-Chairmen would be interpreted -- would not in the very least prejudice either the prerogatives or the legitimate interests of the United States or the Soviet Union, especially in a body like the CCD, in which decisions must necessarily be taken on the basis of consensus. Quite the contrary; the moral stature of the super-Powers would increase considerably in the eyes of all the Members of the United Nations, and even from the purely practical point of view their representatives would benefit quite considerably because they would be freed from the many and arduous duties entailed in the office they have been occupying jointly, and they could use their time to much greater advantage by stepping up the pace of their bilateral negotiations, the slowness of which is, we must confess, frequently discouraging."

We have also explained many times in various forums, both in the CCD and in the United Nations, the obvious advantages that would derive from the new system which, in the words used in the same statement to which I have just referred, might be summed up as follows:

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

"Of course, this would have the merit of being a reflection of the fundamental principle of the sovereign equality of States. But the element which should be decisive for the modification we have been suggesting for years now is the unquestionable need for the other two nuclear Powers, France and the People's Republic of China, which have so far been absent from the CCD, to participate in its work. This appears obvious to us just as it is likewise axiomatic that, as long as the system of co-chairmanship of the two super-Powers is maintained, there is not the slightest possibility of achieving that participation -- which is not surprising, since the situation would certainly be the same if France and China were the Co-Chairmen and the United States and the Soviet Union were outside the CCD."

In reply to some questions as to why we have proposed that the nuclear-weapon States should not be included among those which, in accordance with our formula, would each month in turn act as Chairman of the CCD, I should like to state that the reasons for their exclusion are identical with the reasons for which the permanent members of the Security Council, which are the same nuclear-weapon States, have from the outset been excluded from the Presidency of the General Assembly.

My delegation is fully aware of the difficulties which will have to be overcome if, within an inexorable time-limit of less than four months, we are to implement measures such as those which I have outlined and which must be regarded merely as examples of the many measures which should figure, in the "special report" of the CCD to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, not as projects but as actual achievements.

The three measures to which I have referred -- one substantive and two procedural -- were of a priority nature last year; but it was, nevertheless, impossible to make progress on any of them. However, we hold a guardedly optimistic view that the results in 1978 will be different from what they were in 1977.

Firstly, because the special session devoted to disarmament -- which for some, it seems, was in 1977 lost to sight in the distant future -- is now an imminent reality which cannot be ignored. Secondly, because there have been a number of encouraging changes whose importance should not be underestimated.

We have already mentioned the fact that the three nuclear Powers which are participating in the work of the CCD voted in the General Assembly for the

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

resolution on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, instead of abstaining as they had always done in the past and in spite of the fact that the resolution, in the form in which it is drafted, demands -- it might be said -- more than requests that such tests should be halted within a peremptory time-limit.

Something similar has occurred with regard to the question of the SALT negotiations, since a careful analysis of the text of resolution 32/87 G, adopted on 12 December 1977 by 134 votes in favour and only 2 against (Albania and China), with no abstentions, leads to the undoubted conclusion that this is a resolution which goes much further than any of the seven resolutions which the General Assembly has previously adopted on this question since 16 December 1969. Although this resolution, unlike some of the preceding resolutions, contains no specific reference to "important qualitative limitations and substantial reductions" of the strategic nuclear-weapon systems of the two super-Powers, it nevertheless quotes word for word the following two categorical statements:

First, the statement made by the President of the United States of America to the General Assembly on 4 October 1977, in which he said that:

"The United States is willing to go as far as possible, consistent with our security interests, in limiting and reducing our nuclear weapons. On a reciprocal basis we are willing now to reduce them by 10 per cent, 20 per cent or even 50 per cent. Then we will work for further reduction to a world truly free of nuclear weapons".

Secondly, the statement made by the President of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on 2 November 1977 at the Joint Session of the Supreme Soviet and the Central Committee of the Communist Party, in which he said that:

"Today we are proposing a radical step: that agreement be reached on a simultaneous halt in the production of nuclear weapons by all States. This would apply to all such weapons -- whether atomic, hydrogen or neutron bombs or missiles. At the same time, the nuclear Powers could undertake to start the gradual reduction of existing stockpiles of such weapons and move towards their complete, total destruction".

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

Immediately afterwards, the Assembly resolution stresses the "necessity and urgency" that the United States and the Soviet Union

"strive to implement as soon as possible the foregoing declarations of their respective Heads of State and invites the Governments of both countries to adopt without delay all relevant measures to achieve that objective".

This objective is obviously much broader than that expressed on earlier occasions, since it involves nothing less than "a simultaneous halt in the production of nuclear weapons", progress towards the "complete, total destruction of existing stockpiles of such weapons", and the achievement of "a world truly free of nuclear weapons". In spite of this, the two super-Powers modified the position of abstention which they had persistently adopted in the past and, for the first time, voted for the resolution, as did the United Kingdom and France.

It is to be hoped that the three nuclear-weapon States represented in CCD will be able to give evidence, at the session of CCD which is beginning today, of a spirit of understanding and co-operation similar to that which they displayed when those two resolutions were adopted. And let it be said in passing that, after they have voted in favour of those resolutions, they cannot, we believe, in future deny the fully binding nature of the resolutions.

If they follow the course which we have outlined -- and may I say that the words we have heard today from Ambassador Fisher and Ambassador Likhatchev are somewhat encouraging in this respect -- we are convinced that the Committee will be in a position to transmit to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament a favourable balance-sheet of its work, whose positive results might include the realization of the three specific measures which I have examined in this statement.

Mr. di BERNARDO (Italy): Taking the floor at the opening of the CCD spring session, I would like firstly to join previous speakers in welcoming the Heads of Delegations attending the Conference for the first time.

Among the newcomers I am particularly gratified to congratulate the newly-appointed leaders of the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador Gerhard Pfeiffer, and of the Netherlands, Ambassador Richard H. Fein. I would like also to express a warm welcome to Ambassador Petar Voutov of Bulgaria and Ambassador Adeniji of Nigeria, as well as to Ambassador Tadesse Terrefe of Ethiopia and to Mr. Tha Tun, Chargé d'affaires of Burma. I am looking forward to closely co-operating with them, as was the case with their predecessors with whom I am honoured to have worked during a long period of time.

I wish to greet also Ambassador Risto Hyvärinen and to express the satisfaction of the Italian delegation at knowing that he will continue to perform his important function in this forum. I would also like to express similar feelings of appreciation to Ms. Amada Segarra, Alternate Representative of the Secretary-General.

Permit me, Madam Chairman, at this juncture to mention those eminent personalities who have played an important role in this body and who are no longer among us in this room. In particular, I refer to Ambassador van der Klaauw of the delegation of the Netherlands, Ambassador Schlaich of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany and Ambassador Clark of Nigeria. The Italian delegation had the opportunity to appreciate in full measure their outstanding professional skill as well as their high personal qualities and their human approach. In the name of my delegation I would be grateful to the delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the Netherlands if they could convey to them my warmest congratulations for their appointment to new and important assignments. In this respect I would in particular pay tribute to Ambassador van der Klaauw in his new high capacity as Foreign Minister of his country.

I would like also to express the profound esteem of the Italian Delegation to Ambassador Nikolov of Bulgaria, Ambassador U Thet Tun of Burma and Ambassador Berhanu of Ethiopia. I wish them all professional success and a happy life.

(Mr. di Bernardo, Italy)

Some years ago, in response to United Nations General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) of December 1969, concerning the question of a comprehensive disarmament programme, our delegation summarized the main views of the Italian Government on this important matter in a working paper tabled on 19 August 1970 (CCD/309). Since then relevant proposals and suggestions, related to the same topic, were submitted by a number of delegations which constitute a useful background material for the CCD.

At its thirty-first session, the United Nations General Assembly urged the CCD to "adopt, during its 1977 session, a comprehensive programme dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) proclaiming the Disarmament Decade".

Pursuant to this General Assembly resolution (31/68), two informal sessions of the CCD were convened last year to debate the problem. Although it was not possible for the CCD to concretely engage in the drafting of a formal document, the exchange of views proved challenging and fruitful. Consensus was eventually reached among the States members of the Committee that at the beginning of its spring session 1978 an ad hoc working group would be established, in accordance with its procedural decisions adopted at the 746th meeting of the Conference on 21 April 1977 (CCD/532), to discuss and elaborate a draft comprehensive programme of disarmament to be submitted to the CCD for consideration.

At the 763rd meeting of the Committee on Disarmament, held on 18 August 1977, I had the honour to put forward some preliminary thoughts of my Government on the framework for an organic programme of global negotiations on disarmament, and I am confident members of this Committee will recall the basic ideas of my speech.

Before commenting on the working paper now in front of you (CCD/548), and which in any event we have circulated before the Committee's debate on the spring session agenda, I wish to make a few comments.

The drafting of a disarmament programme constitutes a preliminary undertaking on the way towards concrete action in the field of disarmament.

The working paper now before the Committee aims at offering a realistic and thorough contribution to the framing of an organic set of guidelines for future negotiations on disarmament to take place in the appropriate fora. Furthermore we think that the framework we have proposed could offer also a

(Mr. di Bernardo, Italy)

substantive contribution to the elaboration of a programme of action based on priorities and short term measures by the United Nations special session devoted to disarmament.

Secondly, it is not intended to counter any formal working document previously submitted to this body by other delegations; our aim is to contribute together with them to a more orderly and articulated progress toward the capital goal of general and complete disarmament.

The working paper is divided into three main parts: the first one, while resting upon a widely-shared general approach to disarmament, specifically points to some concepts and principles that, we believe, should constitute the core of any well structured and articulated programme on this matter.

Basically such principles are the following:

- (1) a degree of flexibility as to the schedule and time-table for the consideration and negotiation of specific international instruments;
- (2) a balance between the measures to be taken in the various disarmament sectors, namely between nuclear and conventional armaments;
- (3) an appropriate co-ordination of global and regional initiatives in the field of disarmament;
- (4) a step-by-step approach in order to prevent imbalances and destabilizing effects;
- (5) effective verification measures to ensure that disarmament obligations are being fully complied with by all parties.

In fact, to result in a sound and well-balanced instrument, a global programme on disarmament, we believe, should be based on general principles resulting from the experience of the past and a considered appraisal of today's international reality and of its foreseeable trends in the years to come. We consider it to be the most appropriate way to provide the international community with clear guidelines as to the most suitable and consistent approach towards the attainment of the defined objectives.

Part two, titled "Main elements of the disarmament programme" is intended to offer a set of priority measures which should command the responsible and lasting endeavours of the international community in the near future.

Such measures affect, in the first place, nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

They also contemplate conventional weapons as well as other weaponry systems. They are altogether intended to set in motion bilateral and multilateral initiatives capable of fostering a climate of natural confidence and trust. I

(Mr. di Bernardo, Italy)

will not dwell on them specifically to avoid unnecessary repetitions. I would simply draw the attention of this Committee to my statement of 18 August 1977 and of course to the paper before you.

Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden): Speaking for the first time today in my capacity as representative of Sweden, I intend to discuss mainly two aspects of the current situation in the field of disarmament. Before I do so, however, I want to make a few remarks of a more general character, connected with what I said in my opening remarks as Chairman of today's meeting.

During this session the CCD will face the greatest challenge in its 16-year history. What does the outside world, anxiously and impatiently awaiting decisive results of years of disarmament efforts, think of us as a negotiating body? Is our image that of a group of idle talkers achieving glaringly insufficient concrete progress? Or have we managed to get the world outside this body to see the complexities of the problems that we have been asked to solve, the many serious and varying obstacles that we come upon in our search for solutions? Does this outside world doubt or believe in a sincere and sufficiently strong political will among the Governments participating in the CCD negotiations to reach these solutions at long last?

I do not know the answers to such questions. What I do know is that the efficiency and effectiveness of the CCD will be put under scrutiny in a few months from now by the most authoritative organ of the world community. It is up to us now, representatives of the two military blocs as well as of non-aligned and neutral States, to face this challenge and to work in such a way during this spring session that our special report to the United Nations will reflect lasting progress in the most important areas of our work.

It is in this spirit that I will now turn to the substantive issues that I intend to deal with.

I will first outline Sweden's position with respect to recent developments in the comprehensive test ban issue which, in the view of the Swedish Government -- and I am confident this view is shared by many other Governments -- is the most urgent problem at hand. Secondly, I will deal with the institutional mechanism needed to promote disarmament efforts at the multilateral level and in that context in particular of course the CCD.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

All over the world demands for results of the disarmament efforts, particularly in the nuclear field, are raised with continuously increasing impatience. A vital step in the direction of nuclear disarmament is, as we all know, a comprehensive test ban.

Recognizing that a CTB concerns the security of all States, the international community has at its highest political level -- the United Nations General Assembly -- adopted a resolution that a draft treaty on a CTB be submitted to the special session of the Assembly devoted to disarmament. In resolution 32/70 of 12 December 1977, the thirty-second Assembly urges the three nuclear-weapon States involved in the trilateral talks regarding the comprehensive test ban to expedite their efforts and to use their best endeavours to transmit the results for full consideration by the CCD by the beginning of its spring session. Furthermore, in the same resolution, the Assembly requests the CCD to take up the matter with utmost urgency with a view to the submission of a draft treaty to the special session.

The Swedish Government has noted with appreciation that the resolution referred to was supported by all the participants in the trilateral talks. This is an expression of political will on the part of three States which implies great hope for effective multilateral negotiations at an early stage and consequently a rapid and successful conclusion of the yearlong endeavours of the CCD in this matter of the highest priority. Against this background, distinguished delegates -- and I am looking deliberately to my left -- the Swedish delegation notes with concern that the trilateral talks are not yet successfully terminated.

The special session which lies less than four months ahead is expected by public opinion everywhere to provide a unique opportunity to initiate a new and more fruitful phase in disarmament negotiations. The CCD as the main international negotiating body in this field has a particular responsibility. This is recognized, I hope, by all of us. If the CCD is to be maintained as a credible negotiating body it is imperative that it can register substantial progress in its main issues at the special session. This is one of the reasons why it is of utmost urgency that the trilateral talks on a comprehensive test ban are transformed into multilateral negotiations in the CCD without further delay.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

Nuclear disarmament will be in the focus of attention during the special session. Obviously, any real progress achieved before the session itself will have a favourable impact on its outcome. Together with SALT, the only conceivable result that can be attained in time for the special session seems to be a comprehensive test ban. Against this background, and with reference to the General Assembly resolution referred to, I therefore, formally propose that the CCD this spring shall be in permanent session as long as is required to fulfil the request made to it by the General Assembly.

Nuclear disarmament is of truly international concern because every nation in the world is affected by the nuclear arms race and therefore also by every such disarmament measure or the lack of such measures. This is one justification for a multilateral negotiating body like this Conference, and it is also an incentive for middle-sized and small non-nuclear-weapon States to be active in the disarmament work. Nuclear disarmament is furthermore one important key to real progress in other areas of disarmament such as conventional arms.

It must always be borne in mind that a CTBT, as a vital step towards nuclear disarmament, acquires its full significance only in combination with other measures in this field, particularly by the two leading nuclear-weapon States.

Nuclear disarmament is also crucial in the battle against proliferation of nuclear weapons to additional States. One reason why the NPT is still not universally adhered to is the fact that the major nuclear Powers have not accepted what we, the non-nuclear-weapon States, see as the full consequences of their accession to the treaty.

As regards the verification of a CTBT, all parties must be given equal rights and responsibilities as regards the control of compliance with the treaty. The right of full access to relevant data and information systems is of vital importance. The main part of a verification system under a CTBT is planned to consist of an effective international exchange of seismological data from a global network of seismological stations. It is obvious that the elaboration of such a global system must be a matter of multilateral negotiations. I wish to stress the importance my delegation attaches to this question. The Swedish draft CTBT (CCD/526/Rev.1) contains provisions for an effective international exchange of seismological data and for a procedure involving on-site inspections.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

At this moment, in view of the forthcoming multilateral CTB negotiations, I would like to point out some measures which should be considered now in order to facilitate the adequate verification of a comprehensive test ban treaty. The intention of such measures is to enable also States which have limited resources as regards detection seismology to make an independent assessment of globally collected and pre-analysed data. It will for this purpose be required to establish an international system consisting of a network of selected seismological stations, a communication network and international data centres.

In order to facilitate an early conclusion of a CTBT, it is important in our view already at this stage to take measures to initiate the establishment of an international monitoring system. To create the necessary basis for such an international co-operation, CCD members and also other countries should be prepared to participate in the data exchange by providing data for detection and identification of seismic events. In consequence with our earlier initiatives in promoting international seismological co-operation, we would be ready to take a further step in order to contribute to the establishment of an adequate international monitoring system. Provided that satisfactory arrangements can be made, the Swedish Government would be prepared to take measures to establish, to operate and to finance an international seismological data centre. No doubt the findings of the CCD seismological Ad hoc Group will be a valuable guide in establishing procedures for this international data exchange.

The final report of the Ad hoc Group is expected to be submitted to the CCD in about a month's time. We are pleased to note the progress made in the work of the Group so far. Without anticipating the conclusions and recommendations of the Ad hoc Group, a number of measures can be identified that are required in order to put an international data exchange system into operation. For this purpose, it is obvious that the CCD will also in the future need the assistance of seismological experts. In the Swedish view the CCD should as early as possible take a decision regarding the continuation of the efforts to establish such a system. In this context it should be mentioned that the Japanese delegation on 3 March last year in the CCD suggested an "experimental exercise". The Swedish delegation welcomes this

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

proposal. It is important, however, that such an "experimental exercise" does not delay the establishment of an international data exchange system. It should rather be seen as the initial phase in the operation of such a system. The objective should be to have a data exchange system, which is fundamental for the international control of a CTBT, fully operative when such a treaty enters into force.

While discussing the question of verification I would like to touch upon the problem of on-site inspection and other non-seismological methods of verification, that is reconnaissance from satellites. For similar reasons as in the case of seismological data exchange, such other verification measures must not become the exclusive concern of the major nuclear-weapon Powers. It is essential for the viability of a CTBT that verification is carried out with genuine international participation and that all parties to the treaty have full access to all relevant data and information. The procedures for international participation and exchange of information will of course depend on the outcome of CCD negotiations.

From our previous discussions it appears to be a generally accepted view in the Committee that certain procedures for consultation and co-operation in questions relating to the implementation of a CTBT are desirable. We are pleased that many delegations have endorsed the concept of a consultative committee as proposed in the Swedish draft treaty referred to earlier. We have in mind an advisory body which would be the main instrument of the parties in all matters relating to the functioning and implementation of the treaty.

The main purpose of the committee should be to inspire confidence in the effectiveness of the treaty and to increase its viability. As its name indicates, the committee should have an advisory role. In view of the vital importance of the confidence building aspect, it would seem natural if the committee would meet with some periodicity. Satisfactory arrangements must be worked out for ensuring a close liaison between the work of the committee and the international system for exchange of seismological data and other verification measures. One possibility might be to entrust to the committee the important task of guiding the operation of the monitoring system. Provisions in this respect could be included in a protocol annexed to the treaty in connexion with arrangements for technical supervision of the compliance with the treaty.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

Having discussed in some length the most important item on the agenda of this spring session, I now want to say a few words on our own future, i.e. the future organization of the CCD. Obviously, this will be a major aspect of the consideration by the special session with regard to the institutional mechanism in the field of disarmament. Equally obvious is that the special session's assessment of the CCD as the main international negotiation body will to a considerable extent be influenced by our performance in the course of this spring session.

Last year I said in the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly that two different types of disarmament organs are required, that is, a negotiating body with limited membership and a forum at the highest political level comprising all members of the United Nations. The actual situation today corresponds roughly to this general concept. This does not mean, however, that there is no room for improvements: on the contrary, several measures can be contemplated in this regard. With respect to CCD, the Swedish delegation has on previous occasions advocated a change in the present institution of co-chairmanship established in 1962. We live now in a different world and this institution, which 16 years ago may have appeared natural, must now be replaced with a system in line with the present political situation.

A possible model for discussion could be a bureau consisting of four members, namely one Chairman and three Vice-Chairmen. Two members of the bureau would be selected from the States belonging to the military blocs and the other two from the group of neutral and non-aligned. The chairmanship could rotate among all members of the CCD in alphabetical order on a monthly or on a sessional basis.

Furthermore, my delegation believes that more openness is required with regard to the meetings of the CCD. We see no reason why the formal meetings of the Conference could not be made public -- with a possibility of course to hold closed meetings whenever need arises.

We also believe that all members of the United Nations that submit directly to the CCD proposals on measures of disarmament should be entitled to address the Conference in connexion with its discussions of the subject concerned. On the other hand -- for reasons of efficiency -- informal meetings, meetings in working groups, etc., should in principle remain exclusively restricted to CCD members.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

In my intervention today as representative of Sweden, I have emphasized the indisputable fact that the CCD will have to achieve the results expected of us during this spring session. The responsibility rests very heavily indeed with the three nuclear-weapon States members of this body to fulfil their solemn obligation under a United Nations resolution which all of them have supported and, to provide us with the basis for truly multilateral -- and successful -- negotiations leading up to a CTBT. Our -- the non-nuclear-weapon States' -- obligation is not to let our colleagues from these three member States distract for one moment from their endeavours to finish their part of the job and let us take over, at the earliest possible moment, determined to do our part.

Distinguished delegates, Sweden, as so many other countries, wants to see the year 1978 as the year of a CTBT, the year of the first decisive step towards nuclear disarmament.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.