

The PRESIDENT (translated from Russian): The 277th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is called to order. The Conference today takes up the consideration of item 7 of its agenda, entitled "New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons". However, in accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure any member may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference. The indicative time-table for this week included the possibility of holding an informal meeting today after the conclusion of the plenary meeting. At the request of a number of delegations, and bearing in mind that today the representative of the Soviet Union is concluding his presidency, I do not intend to hold an informal meeting. The list of speakers for today includes the representatives of Sweden, Burma, India, Venezuela and Mexico. I now give the floor to the representative of Sweden, Ambassador Ekéus.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): Thank you Mr. President. May I, at this late stage in our work for the month, congratulate you on your assumption of the Presidency of the Conference on Disarmament, and also express the appreciation of my delegation for your skill and energy in the performance of your duties, as well as for the good humour and spirit you have brought to this past month. May I also, through you, Mr. President, express thanks for the kind words directed to my delegation with regards to the Presidency of Sweden for the month of June.

Mr. President, the item on this week's agenda is, as you just mentioned, "New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons", and it is on this item that I wish to speak today.

In 1979 the Soviet Union and the United States of America presented a joint draft treaty prohibiting radiological weapons and in June 1980 Sweden proposed that the scope of the draft treaty should be broadened to include also the prohibition of radiological warfare (CD/RW/WP.6). The negotiations have since then reached a certain impasse and during the last year or so progress has been very limited and in some respects practically non-existent. This has particularly been the case as regards the issues falling within the scope of what has generally been called Track B, i.e. the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities.

A few days ago, on 26 July, the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom expressed his disappointment at the lack of progress in the negotiations on radiological weapons during 1983. This disappointment is fully shared by Sweden. Furthermore, this negative trend was worsened during the spring part of the session this year when no negotiations at all took place on this issue. What became most important at this juncture was to bring about serious negotiations on all aspects of the substance.

The very essence of the word negotiation implies that we have to come to terms with our differences, that we must continuously evaluate and re-evaluate our positions and try to give in order to get. Not only are there considerable differences between delegations on substance but the very process of negotiations, the interplay between give and take, has been hampered by the fact that the issues falling under Track A, i.e. radiological weapons in the traditional sense, have been dealt with separately from those of Track B. My delegation therefore felt, and still feels, that the two aspects of the issue should be negotiated within one and the same framework -- or neither of the two aspects are likely to