CCD/PV.713 20 July 1976 ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, on Tuesday, 20 July 1976, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Joseph Martin, Jr. (United States of America)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Mr. V.E. BERASATEGUI Argentina:

Mr. J.M. OTEGUI

Brazil: Mr. I.M.A. MASTROGIOVANNI

Bulgaria: Mr. R. NIKOLOV

 $\mathcal{Z}^{(n)} : \mathcal{Z}^{(n)} \to \mathcal{Z}^{(n)} : \mathcal{Z$

网络 深海源

Mr. B. GRINBERG

Mr. M. SREBREV

Burma: U THA TUN

Canada: Mr. J.T. SIMARD

Czechoslovakia: Mr. M. RÖZEK

Mr. V. SOJÁK

Egypt: Mr. F. EL IBRASHI

Mr. S.A. ABOU-ALI

and the first of the second control of the s

Ethiopia: Mr. W. BERHANU

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER

Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI

Mr. H. THIELICKE

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G.J. SCHLAICH

Mr. J. BAUCH

Mr. K. HANNESSCHLÄGER

Mr. F. GYARMATI Hungary:

Mr. I. KÖRMENDY

India: Mr. B.C. MISHRA

Mr. P.R. SOOD

Mr. P.K. GUPTA

Iran: Mr. M. FARTASH Mr. H. AMERI Miss C. TAHMASSEB Italy: Mr. N. DI BERNARDO Mr. M. MORENO Mr. G. VALDEVIT Mr. A. BIZZARINI Mr. M. OGISO Japan: Mr. T. SAWAI Mr. H. OKA Mr. S. CAMPOS-ICARDO Mexico: Mr. M.A. CÁCERES Mr. M. DUGERSUREN Mongolia: Mr. P. KHALIOUNE Mr. S.M. RAHHALI Morocco: Mr. A.J. MEERBURG Netherlands: Mr. B. AKPORODE CLARK Nigeria: Mr. G.S. AKUNWAFOR Mr. S.T. ADAMU Pakistan: Mr. K. SALEEM <u>, (2.88), 1.165, 166</u>, 162 - <u>6</u>.11 (1.76), 12.17 (198.12 Mr. G. CHAUNY Peru: Mr. A. OLSZOWKA Poland: Mr. H. PAC Mr. A. CZERKAWSKI Romania: Mr. C. ENE Mr. V. TUDOR

> Mr. M. ROSIANU Mr. C. IVASCU

Sweden:	Mrs. I. THORSSON	
1.01b().3	Mr. G. HAMILTON	e an experience of
(Western and	·Mr. L. JONSSON	
G.Aaburi .	Mr. U. REINIUS	
	Mr. A. HERNELIUS	
	Mr. J. PRAWITZ	Constitution for the second
NEX	• •	
Republics:	Mr. V.I. LIKHATCHEV	
tte publics:	Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN	
	Mr. N.V. PESTEREV	
e standard	Mr. L.A. NAOUMOV	e y e un ¹ no nocul, e
	Mr. I.P. GLAZKOV	
United Kingdom:	Mr. M.E. ALLEN	
	Mr. J.G. TAYLOR	e de la companya de l
	Mr. I.R. KENYON	
to the second of		Sept 1 man
United States of America:	Mr. J. MARTIN	Parific reliance of the second
	Mr. W. STEARMAN	
	Mr. D. THOMPSON	ر معتشق و مداسد المدا
	Mr. N. WALDROP	
	Mr. C. WILMOT	The same distance of the second
Yugoslavia:	hr. M. LALOVIĆ	1. 44.2 <i>14</i> .22
The state of the s	Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIĆ	
Zaire:	Mr. LUKABU-K'HABOUJI	
Special Representative of the	. '	distance of the second second
Secretary-General:	Mr. RISTO HYVÄRINEN	14 <u>14</u>
Alternate Representative of the	Mr. A. CORRADINI	
Secretary-General:		The state of the s

Communiqué of the meeting

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament today held its 713th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of

H.E. Ambassador Joseph Martin, Jr., representative of the United States of America.

A statement was made by the representative of Nigeria

(H.E. Ambassador B. Akporode Clark) on the mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade.

The representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (H.E. Ambassador Mark Allen) supported a suggestion, relating to documents on chemical weapons, which had been made by the representative of Sweden

(H.E. Ambassador Gustaf Hamilton) at the 712th meeting of the CCD.

A statement was made by the Chairman on the establishment of an Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider international co-operative measures to detect and identify seismic events.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 22 July 1976, at 10.30 a.m.

-

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasant duty for me to be able to pay tribute, on behalf of my delegation, to the outstanding personal qualities of Ambassador A.A. Roshchin of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Ambassador W.H. Barton of Canada, who until recently were most able representatives of their countries at this Conference. Ambassador Roshchin brought a new dimension to the role of Co-Chairman. He was never wanting in the defence of his position, yet it was his human side that appealed to us most. He was an optimist; he cared; and he had faith in the future. We wish him a long life and every happiness in his retirement. Ambassador Barton has not retired. He has only moved to another forum. We look forward to meeting him again and we wish him every success.

My brother, Ambassador C.M. Kasasa of Zaire, has also left for another equally important assignment. I had the privilege of working with him not only in the CCD but in several other organizations in Gereva and elsewhere. We shall miss him because he was a good man who pioneered with redit and ability the role of his country in the CCD.

As we say good-bye to these fur dear friends and colleagues, we are confident that the great countries from where they came have also sent eminent reliefs for them. We gladly therefore extend our rist cordial welcome to Ambassador Likhatchev of the USSR. We also welcome our brother Mr. F. El Ibrashi of Egypt. Their wide experience and the commitment of their Juntries to the goals of disarmament encourage us to hope that their stay with v will be fruitful and friendly.

Ambassador Hami con of Sweden made an interesting point last Thursday. He drew our attention to a informal background paper prepared by the Secretariat which showed that since 1972 r working papers on the subject of a chemical weapons ban (CWB) have been submitted 5 the CCD and that some 230 statements have also been made on it before this forum. Ords are like leaves, as the saying goes. Where they are plentiful, fruits hard exist.

I belive that the same source, which Ambassador Hamilton referred to, also revealed any other disturbing facts. Take the question of CTB, for instance, in the inform background paper prepared by the Secretariat and dated 14 April 1976. We all recor be that CTB is crucial to the effort to realize unequivocally the objectives of the leaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We know that without CTB we

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

cannot be sincere and realistic in our professions to halt the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. At the same time we accept CTB as a disarmament measure, without which we cannot proceed to limit and reduce nuclear armament. Yet serious consideration of CTB has been stalled and stymied over the years by a proliferation of words and wafts. Even the bilateral Treaties between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests and on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes have not led us to expect that the CCD will address itself to a text of a draft comprehensive test ban treaty in the immediate future.

My present statement is not a critique of the various suggested texts or specific proposals on CWB or CTB before the CCD. But I see immense merit in the Swedish idea that some effort should now be made to compile and analyze critically some of the facts and views already before this Conference in recent years, so as to see whether they can provide a guide or outline for a draft comprehensive test ban treaty. And then we should proceed on the basis of our findings and analysis to elaborate a draft on the subject.

I am also tempted to take advantage of this opportunity to invite attention to the constructive aspects and interpretations of article IV of the recent Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes (document CCD/496 of 23 June 1976), and to propose that the United Nations, which has primary responsibility for disarmament, should open a register for all nuclear explosions, peaceful or otherwise, and that all States should accept an obligation to report and record their nuclear explosions in that register. The information to be provided on individual nuclear explosions may not be as detailed as those required in the Protocol to the United States-Soviet Treaty. But notice of the incidence, occurrence and purpose of each explosion is vital and important. That notice should be recorded in the proposed register.

I do not see how such notification as we have proposed can materially undermine the security of any State. If anything, it will attenuate the current controversy over peaceful nuclear explosions, as we become better informed about the motive behind each explosion. If anything, it will serve as a confidence-building measure, a concept so dear to the proponents of the Helsinki Treaty on European Security and Co-operation.

If anything it will translate mutual assurances, given on a bilateral plane and based on presumptions of a dyarchy in international affairs, into plurilateral confidence and safeguards.

If I may return, Sir, to my subject of the mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade, I can only begin by recalling what Ambassador Ene of Romania challenged us to do last Thursday, 15 July 1976. We need the political will to move from words to action. We need a programme of action and agenda to enable us to proceed with our deliberations on a systematic basis. We need a time-table to enable us to focus and concentrate our attention on specific issues at specific times. We need to establish some priorities so that we do not give our preoccupations the character of a moving target.

I am not advocating by this that our emphasis must not change as time and circumstance dictate, or that we cannot move from the negotiation of one text to another if there are obvious difficulties. The practice of seeing difficulties before we really come to difficulties, thereby abdicating the political will to negotiate; the tendency to convert the Conference into a forum for endless scientific studies that are not dictated by or situated within the context of an on-going consideration of a specific text or draft treaty; the temptation to determine our priorities haphazardly and at the instance of individual delegation's predilections like the children's song:

"Do you see what I see?

Do you hear what I hear?"

-- all these have contributed to our apparent inability to take full advantage of the prevailing <u>détente</u> in international affairs so as to negotiate effective measures to reduce the dangers of a nuclear war, to limit the nuclear arms race and to reduce armed forces and armaments.

I must admit that during the last spring session, the CCD has done a tremendous and commendable amount of work in trying to organize its work along acceptable lines and methods. I am sure that the comprehensive review which has been proposed by your own delegation, Sir — the delegation of the United States — will take us further in the same general direction. But reorganization or a viable method of work is not a substitute for the substance of work. We need to plan for specific objectives of negotiation. We need to show results on questions of arms control and disarmament. This is our mandate. This is the only justification for our functional existence.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

I believe that the mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade upon which we are embarking will assist us to develop a strategy for negotiation. Last year, during the Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we reached the virtually unanimous conclusion that the nuclear Powers parties to the Treaty have not yet carried out their obligations "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." We noted that, however welcome were instruments such as the first Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I) agreement limiting the deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems and specifying upper limits for the numbers of offensive long-range missile systems; the Vladivostok Agreement of November 1974; 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; the Convention on Biological Warfare and so on, they were not adequate steps towards nuclear We stressed then that a comprehensive test ban treaty was a matter of exceptional priority, and that the CCD should initiate without delay negotiations to halt the further development of nuclear weapons and delivery systems as well as the production of fissile material for weapon purposes and the reduction and elimination of nuclear stockpiles.

Little did we know at the time that soon thereafter the commercial and economic advantages which the nuclear Powers and other industrialized States enjoyed under the Treaty, and which they strove strenuously to protect during the Review Conference, would soon become a threat to the security of Africa. South Africa, which has refused to accept safeguards and inspection of its atomic and nuclear activities by an international authority, including IAEA; South Africa, which has refused to be a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty; South Africa, which has no need for nuclear energy as a source of power -- it is South Africa which has obtained every external help and assistance to develop a process for producing enriched uranium; it is South Africa to which nuclear Powers parties to the NPT and other industrialized countries are fighting among themselves in a cut-throat competition to supply nuclear reactors -- reactors that it can employ to accelerate and perfect its nuclear bomb in order to terrorize and intimidate Africa. This is at a time when in spite of article IV of the Treaty, there is no record of any offer of help by those parties in a position to do so to assist or co-operate with African States parties to the Treaty in developing peaceful nuclear technology, particularly in the application of nuclear energy and techniques for agriculture and medicine.

Perhaps, this mid-term review exercise will enable us to develop a common perception of the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Perhaps, it will awaken us to the need to address ourselves more seriously to the tasks and duties determined for the CCD in the Disarmament Decade. Perhaps, we may even begin to negotiate some measures of arms control and disarmament, taking advantage of the current political <u>détente</u>. Perhaps, it will encourage the United States of America and the USSR to make good their promise of July 1974 to submit to the CCD at this session a common draft "of an international convention dealing with the most dangerous, lethal means of chemical warfare." Perhaps, it will speed up the timely and welcome offer of the United Kingdom delegation to submit a draft on CWB for our early consideration. Perhaps, it will lead us to expect that our current consideration of the common United States-USSR drafts on environmental warfare is a prelude to other joint initiatives of universal interest.

In a recent statement by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, made at the opening meeting of the sixty-first session of the Economic and Social Council, held at Abidjan on 30 June 1976, he stated inter alia, obviously with regret, that:

"As early as 1960, even before the start of the First United Nations Development Decade, the General Assembly wrote down a quantitative formula for the net flow of financial resources from developed to developing countries. Unfortunately, sixteen years later, little progress has been made towards this target.

"The target for the net flow of official development assistance to the developing world amounts to no more than 0.7 per cent of the gross national product of developed countries, but the actual flow remains below half of the target. It is not that the target has been completely ignored. Some developed countries have set a shining example in this respect; but their efforts have not been matched by others. And the over-all result, therefore, remains disappointing. It is, indeed, staggering to think that, when the world is spending annually about \$300 billion on what are called 'defence activities', the net flow of official development assistance amounts to some \$15 billion a year. Many development requirements could be easily met if resources could be diverted from avenues of destruction to channels of progress."

The 1976 Yearbook of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute has also revealed with characteristic clarity and elegance many disturbing facts about world military expenditure since the proclamation of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade. It

3.1

estimated that "the world's armed forces consume annually a quantity of resources (both human and material) valued at about \$250 billion" and that this sum was "equivalent to the world's total output in the year 1900" or "equivalent to the combined current gross national products of the 65 countries in Latin America and Africa".

In another remarkable publication entitled <u>World Military and Social Expenditures</u>, 1976 by Ruth Leger Sivard, it has been stated that "World military expenditures average \$12,330 per soldier, public expenditures for education \$219 per school-age child", that the arms race "contributes to inflation, retards economic and social development, and diverts resources urgently needed for human well-being" and that "military-related research and development takes an estimated 25 per cent of all the scientific manpower in the world and 40 per cent of all R and D spending."

To think that success or failure of the fourth session of UNCTAD held at Nairobi last May hung on a debate over the provision of only \$3 billion to regulate the international trade in commodities, which accounted for more than 75 per cent of the total foreign exchange earnings of the developing countries, shows the cruel imbalance in world priorities. Otherwise, how can we tolerate a world in which out of a population of 4,000 million, 1,300 million have a per capita income of less than \$200 a year; 1,500 million are without adequate medical care; 700 million adults are illiterate; and 500 million are severely malnourished? It is to redress these inhuman anomalies, it is to emphasize the close link between the Second United Nations Development Decade and the Disarmament Decade so as to determine the abhorrent price of the arms race to the security and dignity of the human race, that this mid-term review exercise is all about. I believe it is the first time the CCD is reviewing its work over a considerable period of time in order to accelerate the pace of its It is essential therefore that we exert our best endeavours to work and efforts. chart a course that is fruitful.

Last Thursday, I requested the Secretariat to provide us with some background papers, including

- (i) copies of the Secretary-General's report A/10294 and Addendum 1;
- (ii) a factual account, with appropriate documentation, of
 - (a) the tasks and obligations established for the CCD by General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV) of 16 December 1969, which declared the decade of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade;

- (b) the agreements and other multilateral international instruments that were negotiated and concluded by the CCD during the first half of the Disarmament Decade (1970-75);
- (c) any existing comprehensive programme of work adopted by the CCD, which deals with any or all aspects of the problem of cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under effective international control and which could provide us with a guideline to chart a course for our further work and negotiations;
- (d) the multilateral international instruments in the field of disarmament and other related disarmament issues which entered the stage of active negotiation during the first half of the decade and which are currently under negotiation;
- (e) up-to-date copies of the Secretary-General's reports on the economic and social consequences of disarmament and of the arms race and military budgets.
- (iii) the provisional agenda adopted by the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament in August 1968;
- (iv) resolution C adopted by the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States in September 1968; and
- (v) a factual report on the present status of the draft treaties on complete and general disarmament submitted by the USSR and the United States of America in 1962, as well as on the implementation of resolution 1617 (XV) on the Soviet Union-United States statement of 20 September 1961 of agreed principles as a basis for multilateral negotiations on disarmament.

I regret that I have not had time to study all of these materials, some of which I have just received. The few I have studied encourage me to hope that after we have spent some time studying and evaluating them, we would come to some definite conclusions that we can report to the United Nations General Assembly and adopt as future guidelines. But I have come to some tentative conclusions as follows;

- (i) that the continuing diversion of human and material resources at an accelerated pace to military and armament purposes, particularly nuclear armament, is contrary to the spirit and programme of the Disarmament Decade;
- (ii) that the primary objectives of the Disarmament Decade, which are to halt the arms race and to adopt concrete measures of disarmament, require the immediate attention of the CCD in a consistent manner;

(iii) that the CCD has not addressed itself sufficiently to the tasks and duties incumbent upon it from the resolution proclaiming the Disarmament Decade;

- (iv) that the CCD should adopt a comprehensive programme of actions to negotiate specific arms control and disarmament agreements, beginning with CTB and CWB and establishing priorities for negotiating other arms control and disarmament measures;
- (v) that the CCD should demonstrably reaffirm its role as the only forum for multilateral negotiations in the field of arms control and disarmament, representative of all the geographical regions of the world and responsive to the aspirations of all States to negotiate on the basis of equality and sovereignty, as expressed in United Nations resolutions;
- (vi) that the CCD is concerned at the meagre achievement of the Disarmament Decade in terms of truly effective disarmament and arms limitation agreements, and therefore should strive during the second half of the Disarmament Decade to re-enkindle mankind's hope in the virtues of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and disarmament;
- (vii) that the CCD should take a fresh look at its 1968 provisional agenda so as to adopt or up-date it as a basis for its work beginning next spring;
- (viii) that the CCD should appeal to the United States of America and the USSR to review their draft treaties on general and complete disarmament under strict international control submitted in 1962 so as to revise and up-date them for retabling before this Conference for serious negotiation;
- (ix) that the CCD should make a serious effort to study and synthesize all proposals on specific issues of arms control and disarmament put before it, so as to compare and contrast them with a view to elaborating appropriate drafts for negotiation purposes;
- (x) that the CCD should make a survey and study of multilateral proposals on arms control and disarmament measures, such as those contained in resolution C adopted by the Conference of the Non-Nuclear Weapon States in September 1968, in order to relate them to its programme and priorities of work;
- (xi) that the CCD should make more effort to follow negotiations on arms control and disarmament issues in other fora so as to be able to fulfil its role and responsibilities adequately;
- (xii) that the CCD, having adopted a comprehensive programme of reorganization and viable method of work, should decide upon a precise time-table and schedule for the negotiation and implementation of specific instruments, bearing in mind, in this connexion, the need to formulate mechanisms and procedures for periodic review and appraisal of its tasks and duties;

- (xiii) that the CCD should evolve a procedure whereby concerned non-member Governments and international organizations can address it or submit ideas and proposals to it a precedent being the recent excellent Finnish paper bearing on CWB;
- (xiv) that the CCD should consider anew the timeliness and advisability of addressing appeals in humanitarian and considerate terms to the other two nuclear-weapon States to participate in the work of the CCD;
- (xv) that the CCD should consider forging closer links with the United Nations General Secretariat in order to fulfil its responsibilities to the United Nations more efficiently and to use United Nations facilities to provide the public with more in-depth information on its activities on a regular basis;
- (xvi) that the CCD should publish periodic reports on its activities so as to assure the general public of its material preoccupations at given sessions.

I am sure that other delegations, after reviewing the progress made at this point of the Disarmament Decade, will come to their own conclusions. But they may not be much different. That being the case, we may assume that a general agreement to take some specific and concrete initiatives in the field of the arms race and the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and other weapons of mass destruction in the course of the second half of the Disarmament Decade does exist. Similar agreement also does exist with respect to specific measures in respect of general and complete disarmament — the object being the attainment of international peace and security on the one hand and the transfer of human and material resources from armament to economic and social development of all nations and peoples, particularly the developing countries, on the other hand.

In conclusion, I would venture to suggest that at the end of this mid-term review exercise, the CCD should resolve to work out at its 1977 spring session "a comprehensive programme dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, which would provide the Conference with a guideline to chart the course of its further work and its negotiations" and "to accelerate the pace of its efforts to negotiate truly effective disarmament and arms limitation agreements".

At a later stage of our discussion it is proposed that a working paper on the subject matter be tabled to facilitate our conclusions and report to the General Assembly of the United Nations. I do appreciate that disarmament is not like a building, the outcome of which depends on the technical correctness of a

draughtsman's sketches on a drawing-board. It is more like a growing child, dependent on all manner of experience, empiricism and care. But it does help to plan for his education, for his future. Sometimes, it is the planning which counts.

Mr. ALLEN (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, at our meeting on Thursday 15 July, the distinguished representative of Sweden drew our attention to the very large number of working papers which have been tabled, and of plenary statements which CCD delegations have delivered, on the subject of chemical weapons. He suggested that "we need a compilation and sorting out of facts and views".

My delegation finds this an excellent suggestion — we would certainly find such a compilation most useful. We suggest that the Secretariat be asked to look into the problems involved in such an undertaking and to put forward a proposal to the CCD as to how this job might be tackled and what, if anything, it would cost. We would hope, of course, that the cost could be met from existing resources.

The CHAIRMAN (United States of America): On behalf of the Co-Chairmen, I would like to bring to the attention of the Committee a revised text of the decision proposed by the delegation of Sweden concerning the establishment of an <u>ad hoc</u> group of scientific experts to consider international co-operative measures to detect and identify seismic events. The revised text is the result of informal consultations involving several delegations.

I will read out the full text of the proposed decision as revised and then identify the specific revisions that have been made.

"The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, having considered the proposal made by the delegation of Sweden at its 704th plenary meeting on 22 April 1976, agrees to establish, under its auspices, an Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider international co-operative measures to detect and identify seismic events.

"Membership in the Ad Hoc Group will be open to scientific experts nominated by any CCD member State. In order to enable the Group to draw on expertise of other States, membership in the Ad Hoc Group will also be open to scientific experts nominated by States Members of the United Nations that are not represented in the CCD, upon invitation of the CCD. By nominating experts to participate in the Group, States do not commit themselves to the adequacy of the international co-operative measures studied.

(The Chairman, United States)

"The Ad Hoc Group will hold its first meeting during the week beginning 2 August. The CCD requests that the Group submit a progress report to the CCD before the end of the 1976 session.

"The CCD decides that the Group shall elect its own Chairman. It further decides that the Group should seek to achieve consensus in its reports and that, whenever consensus cannot be achieved, each expert will be entitled to incorporate his own view.

"The Group should carry out its work on an informal basis, with unofficial working papers and proceedings, as deemed necessary. The report of the Group to the CCD will be prepared on a formal basis.

"The CCD requests that the Secretariat undertake to provide the Group with the necessary assistance and services.

"The CCD decides that the Group will be guided by the following terms of reference:

"For the purpose of carrying out this investigation the Group should specify the characteristics of an international monitoring system inter alia including:

- (1) A global network of seismological stations, selected from existing and planned installations;
- (2) Data required from the stations to facilitate the analysis for detecting, locating and identifying seismic events;
- (3) Transmission facilities for the timely exchange of data between seismological stations and data centres;
- (4) Facilities, procedures and related financial implications with respect to contributing and receiving centres for detecting, locating and identifying seismic events throughout the world and facilitating the collation and dissemination of relevant documentation;
- (5) The costs which would be incurred if an international monitoring system were established.

"In addition to the items listed above, the Group would endeavour to estimate the detection and identification capability of such an international co-operative system. The estimates would be on the basis of available data or, where desirable and feasible, also on the basis of data obtained from experimental exercises involving the whole or part of the specified global network. The Group

(The Chairman, United States)

should not, however, assess the adequacy of such a system for verifying a comprehensive test ban. Rather it should provide factual results of its analysis for the benefit of Governments to assist them in making such an assessment and in directing future research. The responsibility of the Group would be purely scientific."

The first change appears in the first line of the second paragraph where the word "governmental" has been deleted so that the sentence refers simply to "scientific experts" nominated by CCD member States.

The second change appears in the third paragraph where the words "an initial" have been deleted so that the sentence now requests that the group submit a progress report rather than an initial progress report.

The third change involves the fourth paragraph of the proposed terms of reference of the <u>ad hoc</u> group. This paragraph has been reorganized and a reference made to financial implications.

The final revision appears in the second sentence of the final paragraph where the phrase "experimental tests" has been replaced by the phrase "experimental exercises".

It is my understanding that the Committee may wish to take a decision on the proposal at its next meeting on Thursday, 22 July.

I would like to take this opportunity, and I am sure I speak on behalf of the Committee, to welcome back among us the Swedish Under-Secretary of State,

Madame Thorsson. Madame Thorsson is one of our most distinguished colleagues, and it is a pleasure to see her here again.

The meeting rose at 11.35 a.m.

Carried St. Carried St. Carried St.

<u>a de la companya del companya de la companya de la companya del companya de la c</u>