

tion system which would make such a system non-discriminatory and workable for all. We have thought, together with others, that one method of achieving this could be by way of making verification through access available to any State party to the treaty, through its own means or with the full or partial assistance of any other State party to the treaty, if so requested. When it becomes feasible, such verification could also be carried out by an appropriate international agency or arrangement.

121. We believe that that is the minimum provision necessary to give meaning to the system of verification, at least for small and medium-sized States. Meanwhile we remain open-minded and ready to hear the comments of other delegations in our effort to secure a verification system that is equal in its practical application.

122. It is the objective of my delegation, while we are engaged in this rather comparative approach to the two texts before the Committee, to try to find more grounds for an agreement which would best secure man's benefit and betterment in this vast and promising human environment.

ENDC/PV.422 Sweden/Myrdal

24.7.69

pp.17-19

53. Coming now to the question of control, one might object that the control procedure is made more complex by the delimitation of two different zones: the three-mile limit for the obligation not to install nuclear weapons further out, and the twelve-mile limit for the exclusive use and control of the coastal State. It has, however, been stated by the United States representative that nuclear installations on the sea-bed will be large affairs. They should be observable with enough accuracy to set in motion the additional control machinery to be provided in the treaty. Here I wish to emphasize that in regard to the twelve-mile maritime zone observation, if carried out in consistence with international law, would not be hampered by the exclusive rights of a coastal State which I have mentioned earlier.

54. Let me now leave the question of observation and turn to the further measures of control — that is, verification. In the earlier part of today's intervention I tried to pinpoint the differences in approach on this score between the Soviet and the United States draft treaty texts. We for our part wish to retain in principle the idea of free access contained in the Soviet draft, as I stated in my intervention on 22 April (ENDC/PV.405, para.91). In this context I wish to recall in passing that a number of delegations, including my own, have earlier criticized as unsatisfactory that part of the Soviet text which contains the notion of reciprocity in control functions. Further, a strong appeal has been made for including the possibility that the verification process might, when this becomes feasible, be committed by a party to an appropriate international organization.

55. Finally, appeals have been made that a party should also have the possibility to ask for the full or partial assistance of any other party to the treaty for carrying out the verification procedure. The representative of the United States in his recent statement (ENDC/PV.421, paras.48 et seq.) gave his reasons against international arrangements and against commitments for third-party assistance. Like several other delegates — most recently the representative of the United Arab Republic, Ambassador Khallaf, in his intervention on 22 July (ibid., paras.113 et seq.) — I wish, however, to support these appeals as being important to many countries throughout the world. They are fully in line with the formula of co-operation used in the United States draft, and do not imply any binding obligation on a particular party to give such assistance in a particular case.

56. A further important point in connexion with control is the one I outlined earlier of giving the coastal State in principle the exclusive right but also the obligation to carry out verification in its maritime zone. This provision is not in contradiction to either of