

CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CCD/PV.639
2 July 1974
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Tuesday, 2 July 1974, at 3.00 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. Brajesh C. Mishra

(India)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Argentina:

Mr. V.E. BERASATEGUI

Brazil:

Mr. G.A. MACIEL

Mr. A. BIER

Mr. M.T. DA SILVA

Bulgaria:

Mr. R. NIKOLOV

Mr. B. GRINBERG

Burma:

U WIN PE

U THAUNG LWIN

U NYUNT MAUNG SHEIN

Canada:

Mr. A.D. ROWE

Mr. D.R. MACPHEE

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. J. STRUCKA

Egypt:

Mr. A.A. EL-ERIAN

Mr. M. ABOUL-NASR

Mr. A.E. KHAIRAT

Mr. N. ELARABY

Mr. S.A. ABOU-ALI

Ethiopia:

Hungary:

Mr. I. KÖMIVES

Mr. D. MEISZTER

Mr. I. KÖRMENDY

India:

Mr. B.C. MISHRA

Mr. M.K. MANGALMURTI

Mr. H.N. SUKHDEV

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO

Mr. P. BRUNI

Mr. A. BIZZARINI

Japan:

Mr. M. NISIBORI

Mr. A. YATABE

Mr. H. OKA

Mr. T. INOUE

Mr. H. TSUJIMOTO

Mexico:

Mr. M. MARIN

Mongolia:

Mr. M. DUGERSUREN

Mr. J. CHOINKHOR

Morocco:

Mr. S.M. RAHHALI

Netherlands:

Mr. M.J. ROSENBERG POLAK

Mr. E. BOS

Nigeria:

Mr. B. AKPORODE CLARK

Mr. OLAJIDE ALO

Mr. F.J. OSEMEKEHH

Mr. M.G.S. SAMAKI

Pakistan:

Mr. N.A. NAIK

Mr. M.J. KHAN

Mr. A. MAHMOOD

Poland:

Mr. S. TOPA

Mr. A. CZERKAWSKI

Romania:

Mr. C. ENE

Mr. V. TUDOR

Mr. A. SASU

Sweden:

Mr. L. ECKERBERG
 Mr. U. REINIUS
 Mr. J. PRAWITZ

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCIN
 Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
 Mr. N.V. PESTEREV
 Mr. Y.P. KLUKIN
 Mr. Y.D. USPENSKY

United Kingdom:

Mr. H.C. HAINWORTH
 Mr. J.G. TAYLOR
 Mr. A. WHITE
 Mr. I.C. SLOANE

United States of America:

Mr. J. MARTIN
 Mr. W. BROCK
 Mr. R.W. DREXLER
 Mr. R.J. EINHORN
 Mr. J.H. McNALLY

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. LALOVIC
 Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Special Representative of the Secretary-General:

Mr. ILKKA PASTINEN

Alternate Representative of the Secretary-General:

Mr. A. CORRADINI

CONFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 639th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of H.E. Ambassador Brajesh C. Mishra, representative of India.

Members of the Committee observed a minute of silence in honour of the memory of the late President of the Republic of Argentina, Juan Peron.

Statements were made by the Chairman and by the representatives of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Sweden, Argentina, Yugoslavia and Brazil.

Note was taken that on 23 May 1974 the following documents had been submitted by the delegation of India:

"Text of the official announcement made by the Department of Atomic Energy, Government of India, regarding the underground peaceful nuclear explosion experiment conducted on 18 May 1974" (CCD/424).

"Statement made by the Minister of External Affairs of India on 21 May 1974 on the peaceful underground nuclear explosion conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission of India on 18 May 1974" (CCD/425); and by the delegation of Canada:

"Text of a statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, The Honourable Mitchell Sharp, 22 May 1974" (CCD/426).

The delegation of Sweden submitted the following document:

"Some observations on the Draft Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction presented by the delegation of Japan on 30 April 1974 (CCD/420)" (CCD/427).

The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 4 July 1974, at 10.30 a.m.

*

*

*

The CHAIRMAN: As we meet today, a pall of gloom has been cast over the international community by the demise of one of the most extraordinary and distinguished figures of Latin America. I am sure I am speaking for all the distinguished delegates here when I extend our deepest condolences to the delegation of Argentina on the passing away of their Head of State, President Peron. May I invite distinguished delegates to observe a minute's silence to honour the memory of the late President Peron?

The members observed one minute's silence.

The CHAIRMAN: It is my pleasure and privilege, as Chairman of the day, to welcome back all the distinguished delegates to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. On behalf of all of us, I should also like to extend a warm welcome to our two new colleagues, Ambassador Lalovic of Yugoslavia and Ambassador Alvares Maciel of Brazil. I wish them all success. We are happy to have among us again Ambassador Pastinen, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and hope to enjoy the same efficient support and co-operation from his colleagues in the Secretariat as in the past.

Before I conclude, it would not be out of place to remember the great hopes placed by the world community on this Conference to work out disarmament measures. Let us hope we can live up to this expectation.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): Like you, Mr. Chairman, we were saddened to learn of the death of the very distinguished President of Argentina, General Peron, who for so many years played a major role not only in the affairs of his country but in those of the world at large. On behalf of my delegation I should like to extend our very sincere and heartfelt condolences to our Argentine colleagues.

On a happier note I should like to take this opportunity to extend a personal welcome to two leaders of delegation who are with us today for the first time: Ambassador Maciel, Permanent Representative of Brazil, and Ambassador Lalovic, Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia. These two diplomats have both had long and

(Mr. Martin, United States)

distinguished careers and are well known to many of you. I know that they will make valuable contributions to our efforts, and I am looking forward to working closely with them during the summer session.

It is once again my very pleasant task to extend our greetings to Ambassador Pastinen, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, and to Mr. Corradini, Alternate Representative of the Secretary-General, to Mrs. Gill and to the other members of the Secretariat, whose expert assistance and services are such an invaluable aid to us all.

Today as we resume our work the leaders of my country and those of the Soviet Union are completing the third of a series of historic meetings. In our view these meetings at the summit provide an important opportunity for the leaders of our two countries to exchange ideas and perceptions about international affairs. They also offer an opportunity to deal with bilateral issues in the field of arms control, more particularly by attempting to limit the arms race through effective arms-control agreements. Thirdly, the two sides seek to work out co-operative arrangements in various fields designed to give each side a stake in a moderate course and in a constructive foreign policy. The work in the field of arms control is, of course, of the greatest interest to this Committee. I hope to be able to report to you on the course of the Moscow discussions on this subject at an early date.

I should now like to turn to two subjects raised by members of the Committee in the spring session. At our 635th plenary meeting the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Thorsson, stated her Government's belief that confidence between States could be promoted by more openness as regards defence expenditures, and that this increased confidence could then lead to measures of disarmament. She suggested that the Committee examine the possibilities of bringing about an inquiry among States about their willingness to account in comparable terms for their defence expenditures and explain how these expenditures have been assigned to different purposes. The Swedish delegation also submitted a useful working paper (CCD/421) analysing data on defence expenditures that could be made generally available in order to increase mutual confidence.

(Mr. Martin, United States)

There is, of course, as Mrs. Thorsson noted, a problem in establishing the comparability of budget information which might be provided. This problem is currently under study by an expert group convened by the Secretary-General pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3093B (XXVIII). With respect to this group's work, we agree entirely with the remarks made to the General Assembly by the representative of Mexico. Mr. Garcia Robles said that

"Among the various points that the report should endeavour to elucidate, it would be desirable to give prominence to the criteria that should be applied in order to arrive at a generally-accepted definition of what is to be understood by military budgets" (A/PV.2179).

We sincerely hope that the Secretary-General's study will arrive at such a definition, as we believe that it is only by such an approach that we can hope to make possible the serious and thorough consideration of this important aspect of work in the disarmament field.

Meanwhile my delegation welcomes the suggestion for more openness in defence expenditures. We agree that greater knowledge about the defence expenditures of various countries could promote confidence among States by allaying concerns that arise out of suspicion and misunderstandings. Such information could also be very useful in approaching the important question of effective restraints on conventional weapons.

My delegation was also interested to hear the representative of Nigeria, Mr. Clark, say in his intervention of 23 May that his Government intends to look again at the 1964 Declaration of the OAU regarding a nuclear-free zone for Africa. Committee members may recall that the proposal about which Mr. Clark spoke was endorsed in resolution 2033 of the twentieth session of the General Assembly. In indicating support for that resolution the United States representative to the First Committee said that the United States welcomed the initiative of the States of Africa, and a concurrent initiative of the States of Latin America, in undertaking studies with a view to achieving and maintaining a nuclear-free status for those regions.

Since that time the Latin-American Nuclear-Free Zone has become a reality with the negotiation of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, to which a majority of the States of Latin America have adhered and which a majority of nuclear Powers have agreed to respect through their adherence to its additional Protocol II. If African nations should decide to re-examine this question, my delegation believes that that could be a constructive development.

In 1965 the United States delegation suggested four criteria for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone, whether in Africa or elsewhere. The proposed criteria, which were further refined in the following year, were that the initiative should be taken by the States in the region concerned; the zone should preferably include all States in

(Mr. Martin, United States)

the area whose participation is deemed important; the creation of a zone should not disturb necessary security arrangements; and provision should be made for adequate verification, which would include procedures for follow-up of alleged violations to give reasonable assurance of compliance. My Government would be interested in further expressions of views on this subject.

I should now like to turn to one of the priority interests of this Committee -- our work toward the objective of effective restraints on chemical weapons (CW). During our recess my Government continued its studies of CW, and we will participate with experts in the informal meeting beginning on 17 July. We plan to submit at that time working papers based on our studies which I believe will be of interest to the Committee. We hope that the work of this session will bring us closer to solution of the difficult problems inherent in CW, particularly those of verification.

My colleagues will recall that in our spring session I commented briefly on non-proliferation in the light of the Indian test of a nuclear-explosive device. I should now like to reaffirm to the Committee that there has been no change whatsoever in the long-standing policy of the United States against the proliferation of nuclear-explosive devices. We continue to support the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) as one of the most significant contributions to disarmament and world peace. We therefore continue to urge those states which have not adhered to the Treaty to do so.

I should also like to make it clear that there has been no change in the view of the United States regarding the relationship between nuclear-explosive devices for peaceful purposes and nuclear weapons. My Government stated this view on many occasions during the negotiation of the NPT, and also in connexion with the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Thus our instrument of ratification of additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco states that the United States Government "Considers that the technology of making nuclear-explosive devices for peaceful purposes is indistinguishable from the technology of making nuclear weapons."

We have placed on record in the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) the understanding inherent in all our bilateral agreements for co-operation in the nuclear field that the use of any material or equipment supplied by the United States under such agreements for any nuclear-explosive device is precluded; and the understanding, inherent in the safeguards agreements related to such co-operation agreements, that the IAEA would verify inter alia that the safeguarded material was not used for any nuclear-explosive device. The continued co-operation of the United States with other countries in the nuclear field is dependent on the assurance that these understandings will continue to be respected in the future.

Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): Mr. Chairman, the Soviet delegation adds its condolences to yours on the death of the President of the Argentine Republic, Juan Peron. We offer our deep sympathy to the Argentine delegation in this Committee.

We should like to welcome our new colleagues: Ambassador Jorge Maciel, representative of Brazil, and Ambassador Milos Lalovic, representative of Yugoslavia, to whom we wish all success in their work on this Committee. We also greet Ambassador Ilka Pastinen, representing the Secretary-General, and his staff, and all our fellow members of the Committee on Disarmament.

Today the Committee on Disarmament is resuming its deliberations after a brief recess. It will continue its work in the atmosphere of further international détente. During the period between the spring and summer sessions of the Committee, events took place which attest the steady improvement of the international climate and the normalization of the world situation. These events include the cessation of hostilities between Syria and Israel and the conclusion of the agreement on military disengagement. The conflict in the Middle East is now reaching the stage of political settlement. The favourable process in present-day international affairs is facilitated by the further positive development of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, which is reflected by the meeting and talks now being concluded between Mr. L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President Richard Nixon of the United States.

The détente must become irreversible and its political character must be supplemented by a military détente. In order to consolidate this process in Europe, the site of two world wars and of the largest concentration of arms and armed forces, the Conference on European Security and Co-operation is continuing its deliberations, and the talks on the reduction of arms and armed forces in Central Europe are being carried on in Vienna.

These important developments in international affairs create better prerequisites for talks on disarmament problems, including those held within the Committee on Disarmament, whose session is opening today.

At its present session the Committee is to continue negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons. This question invariably attracts the attention of a large number of States. The Soviet Union, of course, advocates the complete prohibition of chemical means of warfare. This USSR position is reflected in the draft convention of the socialist countries submitted to the Committee by seven of its members on 28 March 1972 (CCD/361).

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

We note with satisfaction that the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons introduced by Japan in April (CCD/420) contains provisions similar to those already included in the draft of the socialist countries already mentioned. The Japanese draft provides for an undertaking by all States never in any circumstances to develop, produce, stockpile or otherwise acquire or retain chemical weapons, equipment or means of delivery designed to use such weapons for military purposes. But, unlike the draft convention of the socialist countries, the Japanese draft contains an article IV which stipulates that the parties may take provisional measures providing for exemptions from the prohibition of chemical weapons. What will those exemptions be? The Japanese draft convention does not answer this question. The States whose approach is taken into consideration by article IV, permitting limitations and exemptions from the prohibition of chemical weapons, have not yet defined their attitude on the exact scope of the prohibition of such weapons. It is therefore not clear to what extent and in what direction those States intend to make use of the provisions of the article.

We are awaiting an answer to this question from the United States and other Western countries to enable us to state our attitude towards the basic provision of the Japanese draft convention regarding the scope of the prohibition of chemical weapons. When the position of the United States and other Western countries on the scope of the prohibition of chemical weapons has been defined, it will be possible to judge if there exist favourable prospects for progress in the negotiations on the problem of prohibiting chemical means of warfare. At the summer session of the Committee, efforts should be made to advance the negotiations for reaching agreement on the draft convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

Closely connected with the problem of such prohibition is the task of bringing the international Convention on the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) weapons into operation as rapidly as possible. Historically the prohibition of chemical weapons and the prohibition of bacteriological weapons were discussed as interconnected problems. The conclusion of the Convention on bacteriological weapons was viewed as a step towards the prohibition also of chemical weapons. This step met everywhere a very positive response as a measure of practical disarmament. To put that measure into effect at an early date, the States depositaries of the Convention on bacteriological weapons must speed the process of its ratification. For our part we should like to inform the members of the Committee that the Soviet Union intends to ratify the Convention this year.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

An important task before the Committee is to continue the search for a solution to the problem of the reduction and removal of the danger of a nuclear-missile war. An agreement on the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests would be an important step in this direction. The Soviet side considers that nuclear-weapon tests, including underground tests, should be discontinued everywhere and by all. The Soviet Union is making efforts in this direction both in bilateral negotiations and in multilateral bodies. Referring to the negotiations with the United States on this problem, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, L.I. Brezhnev said in his speech of 14 June: "We are in favour of the United States and the Soviet Union showing, by mutual agreement, maximum restraint in the further development of their armaments and reaching an understanding which would make it possible to prevent the creation of ever new systems of strategic weapons. We are prepared to come to an agreement with the United States immediately on the limitation of underground nuclear weapon tests pending their complete cessation within an agreed time".

The question of control over underground nuclear tests has been discussed for a number of years. The Soviet side cannot agree to the unsubstantiated claim that control over the cessation of such tests should be exercised through international on-site inspection. This claim blocks progress in the negotiations on the problem. As the Soviet side has repeatedly stated, the national means of detection and identification of underground nuclear explosions provide the necessary facilities for revealing violations by States of their obligations to end underground nuclear tests.

Another important task in curbing the danger of war, and above all of nuclear war, is to achieve agreement on other measures related to disarmament and arms-race limitation. A number of important international agreements have been concluded in this field, without which present-day international affairs would be difficult to imagine. These are the treaties providing for the banning of nuclear tests in three media: in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and for prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor. Efforts should be made to enlarge participation in these treaties. The accession of a large number of States to these international instruments will make them more effective and will ensure that the objectives which the participants set themselves when concluding these important international instruments are fulfilled. The attempts by the

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

representatives of certain States to belittle the significance of the treaties concluded in the nuclear field and to misrepresent their purposes are not compatible with the task of strengthening peace and security, easing international tensions and advancing the disarmament talks.

In speaking about the significance of international disarmament agreements, special mention should be made of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons added in March 1970 to the international documents and agreements in force. This treaty deals with the very critical and pressing problem of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons. Failure to implement it would be fraught with far-reaching adverse consequences. We regret to note that a number of important so-called near-nuclear States have not yet become parties to the Treaty. Next spring a conference of the parties to the treaty is to be convened to review its operation -- how its purposes and provisions are being realized. That conference should consider measures to ensure a greater participation of States in the non-proliferation Treaty.

At the last session of the Disarmament Committee the representatives of Mexico, Sweden and Poland raised the question of the implementation of measures for the further demilitarization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor. As you will recall, as far back as 1969 the Soviet Union submitted to the Committee on Disarmament a draft treaty providing for the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor. The negotiations on that problem resulted in a partial solution and in the conclusion of the Treaty prohibiting the emplacement in the said environment of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. However, the question of the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed is by no means disposed of, and the Soviet proposal of 1969 still stands. The USSR delegation would like to point out that the sea-bed Treaty, which entered into force in 1972, obliges the parties to continue negotiations on further measures for the demilitarization of the sea-bed. It is the opinion of the Soviet side that the negotiations on this question should begin this very year. The time is approaching for convening a conference to review the operation of the treaty. The obligations under that treaty, including obligations to continue negotiations on further demilitarization of the sea-bed, must be strictly observed.

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

In recent years the United Nations General Assembly has discussed and adopted on the initiative of the USSR a number of important recommendations. Thus in 1971 it declared, on behalf of its Member States, that they were renouncing the use of force in international relations and that the use of nuclear weapons was permanently prohibited. For its part, the USSR declares that it is ready to enter into multilateral or bilateral negotiations to conclude an agreement on this question. Such an agreement would do much to reduce the threat of nuclear war and ensure international security.

The USSR proposal to convene a world disarmament conference has gained wide support among States. Such a conference would give a new impetus to the adoption of further measures in the field of disarmament. Nevertheless, some States continue to impede the convening of such a conference and thus create obstacles preventing the development of broad international co-operation in disarmament.

The incessant growth of military expenditure indicates the acceleration of the arms race. To curb this race it would be important to implement the General Assembly recommendation on the reduction of the military budgets of the five permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and the use of a part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. But we have to admit that there are great difficulties in the way of carrying out this vital recommendation of the General Assembly because of the opposition on the part of some permanent members of the Security Council. The States interested in the termination of the arms race and in obtaining additional resources for economic development will have to make major efforts to eliminate the obstacles to a reduction of the armaments of the militarily most important States, which bear a special responsibility for preserving peace and international security.

The Soviet Union is a champion of international détente. It advocates real changes in the field of disarmament. We consider it necessary to develop broad co-operation in the field of disarmament based on the principles of equal security for all States, with no unilateral advantages for some countries to the detriment of the interests of other parties to the agreement. At the same time we note with regret that the arms race continues. Referring to the arms race, L.I. Brezhnev said in his speech of 14 June: "The generally-known facts indicate that the arms race, the rivalry in the creation of the most dangerous types of weapons of mass destruction were imposed on us. It was not we who started to create atomic bombs, submarines with strategic missiles, multiple warheads and many other weapons".

(Mr. Roshchin, USSR)

At the Disarmament Committee session which is opening today, as at its previous sessions, the Soviet delegation will make every effort to contribute to progress in the disarmament negotiations, mindful, of course, that these negotiations can be successful only if there is good will and readiness on the part of all States to put an end to the arms race and to carry out realistic measures in this field.

Mr. ECKERBERG (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, permit me first to associate myself and the Swedish delegation with your words of condolence to the delegation of Argentine at the sad occasion of the death of President Peron.

We also join you in welcoming to our Committee the new representatives of Brazil, Ambassador Maciel and of Yugoslavia, Ambassador Lalovic. We wish them success in their efforts here and look forward to working with them.

Members of the Committee have found on the table today a Swedish Working Paper entitled "Some observations on the draft Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Chemical weapons and on their Destruction presented by the delegation of Japan on 30 April 1974 (CCD/420)". The Paper has been given the number CCD/427 and I have asked for the floor in order to introduce it briefly.

As you will recall, Mr. Chairman, the leader of the Swedish delegation, Madame Thorsson, proposed in May that the CCD should hold informal meetings this summer together with experts on the question of the prohibition of chemical weapons. The first such informal meeting has been set for 17 July.

The Committee's spring session was not very productive, but one positive feature was the draft convention on chemical weapons which the delegation of Japan presented at the end of April. This proposal was welcomed by all delegations who commented on it. However, the very interesting solution which our Japanese colleagues proposed in regard to the scope of a prohibition has raised a number of questions. In the Swedish delegation we have felt that it would be valuable to have an exchange of views on these questions between members of the Committee and experts. This was the main reason why Madame Thorsson suggested that the informal meetings be held and it is also the reason why the Swedish delegation tables this working paper.

(Mr. Eckerberg, Sweden)

I shall not go into the substance of the paper today -- it will be introduced in detail on 17 July. Suffice it to say that it is a modest attempt to interpret and discuss the different possibilities which the Japanese proposal offers in regard to the scope of a prohibition. In the first part of the paper three somewhat primitive drawings -- or perhaps I should rather call them illustrating figures -- are included, which we hope our colleagues will put up with. There is also a general discussion on the scope, which I hope you will not find equally primitive, even though most of it might be quite elementary. The second part of the paper consists of a number of questions, which we would like to discuss with our colleagues and with the experts during the informal meetings. For some of the questions we think that we know the answers we prefer -- as regards several others the Swedish delegation has not yet taken a position but we hope that the views and contributions of others will clarify the problems.

Mr. BERASATEGUI (Argentina): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my delegation I desire to acknowledge most gratefully your condolences on the sad death of his Excellency the President of the Argentine Nation, Lieutenant-General D. Juan Peron, and also to thank the representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States and Sweden, Ambassadors Roshchin, Martin and Eckerberg, for the condolences that they have addressed to the delegation of Argentina. I will communicate to my government and to the people of Argentina the sentiments of solidarity expressed by this Committee.

Mr. LALOVIC (Yugoslavia): Mr. Chairman, I wish to join previous speakers in expressing my Government's sincere condolences to the delegation of Argentina upon the sad demise of the President of the Republic of Argentina, Juan Peron, a prominent world figure.

I also wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman and the distinguished Ambassadors of the United States, USSR and Sweden for the warm welcome you have extended to me as a new member of the Committee, and to assure you and the other distinguished delegates of my delegation's desire to continue fruitful co-operation with them all. My delegation will do its utmost to contribute to the successful work of the Committee.

Mr. MACIEL (Brazil): I wish to associate myself with the other speakers who have expressed to the delegation of Argentina their condolences on the death of President Juan Peron.

I also wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ambassador Eckerberg the delegate of Sweden, Ambassador Roshchin the delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Ambassador Martin the delegate of the United States of America for their kind words of welcome. I will endeavour to co-operate with all members as my predecessors have done.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.

