

COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.205
22 March 1983
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 22 March 1983 at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. A. SKALLI

(Morocco)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria:

Mr. C. LAOUAR

Mr. A. TAFFAR

Argentina:

Mr. J.C. CARASALES

Mr. R. GARCIA MORITAN

Mr. R. VILLAMBROSA

Australia:

Mr. R. STEELE

Mr. T. FINDLAY

Belgium:

Mr. J.M. NOIRFALISSE

Brazil:

Mr. C.A. DE SOUZA E SILVA

Mr. S. DE QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. TELLALOV

Mr. B. GRINBERG

Mr. P. POPTCHEV

Mr. C. PRAMOV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG GYI

U TIN KYAW HLAING

U THAN TUN

Canada:

Mr. G.R. SKINNER

Mr. M.C. HAMBLIN

Miss C. de VARENNES

Mr. W. OLIVIER

China:

Mr. LI LUYE

Mr. TIAN JIN

Mrs. WANG ZHIYUN

Mr. PAN ZHENQIANG

Mrs. ZHOU YUNHUA

Cuba:

Mr. P. NUNEZ MOSQUERA

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. M. VEJVODA

Mr. A. CIMA

Egypt:

Mr. I.A. HASSAN

Miss W. BASSIM

Mr. A.M. ABBAS

Ethiopia:

Miss K. SINEGIORGIS

Mr. F. YOHANNES

France:

Mr. F. DE LA GORCE

Mr. J. DE BEAUSSE

Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. G. HERDER

Mr. H. THIELICKE

Mr. F. SAYATZ

Mr. M. NOTZEL

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. H. WEGENER

Mr. F. ELBE

Mr. W.E. VON DEM HAGEN

Hungary:

Mr. F. GADJA

Mr. T. TOTH

India:

Mr. M. DUBEY

Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia:

Mr. S. SUTRESNA

Mrs. P. RAMADHAN

Mr. B. DARMOSUTANTO

Mr. I.H. WIRAATMADJA

Mr. HARYOMATARAM

Iran:

Mr. F. SHAHABI SIRJANI

Italy:

Mr. M. ALESSI

Mr. B. CABRAS

Mr. C.M. OLIVA

Mr. E. DI GIOVANNI

Japan:

Mr. R. IMAI
Mr. M. KONISHI
Mr. T. KAWAKITA
Mr. K. TANAKA
Mr. T. ARAI

Kenya:

Mr. D.D.C. DON NANJIRA

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES
Mrs. Z. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. S.O. BOLD
Mr. O. CHIMIDREGZEN

Morocco:

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

Netherlands:

Mr. J. RAMAKER
Mr. R.J. AKKERMAN

Nigeria:

Mr. G.O. IJEWERE
Mr. A.N.C. NWAOZOMUDOH
Mr. J.O. OBOH
Mr. L.O. AKINDELE
Mr. A.A. ADEPOJU
Miss I.E.C. UKEJE

Pakistan:

Mr. M. AHMAD
Mr. T. ALTAF

Peru:

Mr. P. CANNOCK
Mr. V. ROJAS

Poland:

Mr. J. ZAWALONKA
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ
Mr. T. STROJWAS
Mr. G. CZEMPINSKI

Romania:

Mr. L. TOADER

Sri Lanka:

Mr. A.T. JAYAKODDY
Mr. H.M.G.S. PALIHAKKARA

Sweden:

Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. C.M. HYLTEINUS
Mr. S. ERICSON
Mr. G. EKHOLM
Mr. H. BERGLUND
Mr. J. LUNDIN
Mrs. A. LAU-ERIKSSON

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELIAN
Mr. D.P. PROKOFIEV
Mr. G.V. BERDENNIKOV
Mr. P. MALEV
Mr. G.N. VASHADZE

United Kingdom:

Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE
Mrs. J.I. LINK
Miss J.E.F. WRIGHT

United States of America:

Mr. L.G. FIELDS
Mr. M.D. BUSBY
Mr. H.L. CALHOUN
Mr. P. CORDEN
Ms. K. CRITTENBERGER
Mr. W. HECKROTTE
Mr. J.J. HOGAN
Mr. J. MARTIN
Mr. R.L. HORNE

Venezuela:

Mr. O. GARCIA GARCIA

Yugoslavia:

Mr. K. VIDAS
Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Zaire:

Mr. O. GNOK

Secretary of the Committee on
Disarmament and Personal
Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Deputy Secretary of the
Committee on Disarmament:

Mr. V. BERASATEGUI

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I declare open the 205th plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament.

I wish to inform the members of the Committee of the sad news of the death of the veteran United States Ambassador, Adrian Fisher, who was the first United States representative to the Committee on Disarmament and earlier had been accredited to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. He was a highly respected person with a vast knowledge and experience of disarmament negotiations and a strong faith in the common goal we are seeking. As I had the honour and privilege of knowing him and valuing his human and diplomatic qualities, I feel compelled to convey to the United States delegation and the members of Ambassador Fisher's family, on my own behalf and on behalf of the members of the Committee, our deeply-felt and sincere condolences. May I now request the members to rise and observe a minute of silence in memory of our dear departed colleague, Ambassador Fisher.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): Mr. Chairman, it was with sorrow that the Soviet delegation learned about the demise of Ambassador Adrian Fisher. Ambassador Fisher devoted many years of his life to the noble cause of arms race limitation and disarmament. His contribution to the elaboration of the Moscow Treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests in three environments, the non-proliferation Treaty and a number of other important international agreements is well known.

For a number of years I was co-operating with Ambassador Fisher in the sessions of the United Nations General Assembly and in the Committee on Disarmament. As the head of the United States delegation at the bilateral talks on a chemical weapons ban and on the prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, he made not a small contribution to the progress of those negotiations, as a result of which the USSR and the United States submitted to the Committee on Disarmament a joint proposal on the major elements of a treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons and a progress report on the talks on a chemical weapons ban which were highly appreciated by the Committee. Adrian Fisher was a man of extremely broad outlook. He was one of the recognized experts in disarmament issues. His deep knowledge, sharp intellect, sense of humour and kindness gained him respect among those who knew him. We shall keep forever a fond memory of Adrian Fisher. The Soviet delegation expresses profound condolences to the United States delegation and through it to his widow, Mrs. Laura Fisher.

Mr. DE LA GORCE (France) (translated from French): It was with great sadness that the French delegation learned of the death of Ambassador Adrian Fisher. Our former colleague played an important part in the Committee on Disarmament. His great knowledge of disarmament matters, his exceptional talents as a speaker and negotiator, his great intellectual gifts, his wide culture, his high principles and strength of character together with his brilliance and warmth of personality earned him the respect, admiration and friendship of all. Those who knew him will remember him always. For my part, I shall never forget the great friendship between us or the debt of gratitude I owe him. On behalf of the French delegation and on my own behalf I should like to offer our sincere condolences to our United States colleague and I should be grateful if he would convey to Mrs. Adrian Fisher our very deep and respectful sympathy.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I should like to add the sincere condolences of my delegation to the United States delegation on the death of Ambassador Adrian Fisher, who so ably led his country's delegation to this Committee when it first began its work after the special session on disarmament in 1978. I had the privilege of working with Adrian Fisher when I was here in the two predecessors of our Committee in the late 1960s. I have happy memories of his dedication to the cause of arms control and disarmament, his profound knowledge of the subject and the down-to-earth, practical approach to its problems which made such a major contribution to our work. He will be very much missed by his many friends in the world of disarmament.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, what has been said by the three speakers who have preceded me who, like myself, had the privilege of knowing Adrian Fisher, will allow my statement to be brief. I fully share what has been said here, as I am sure do all those who had the privilege of working with our illustrious former colleague. Adrian Fisher was indeed a man who combined qualities rarely found together. He had a vast knowledge of disarmament matters. He was at the same time a man of great breadth of view and excellent judgement. He was also one who believed in what he did and what he preached, and he realized that for progress to be made in the matter of disarmament, genuine negotiations are required, and that genuine negotiations necessitate reciprocal concessions. I, too, worked with him here in the same way as Ambassador Cromartie did, that is, in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and subsequently in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and I can vouch for the invaluable contribution made by Ambassador Fisher to the drafting of such treaties as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Moreover, Ambassador Fisher had an independence of judgement, even with respect to his own country, which did him great honour. Everyone here will no doubt remember that in one of my statements last year I had the pleasure of quoting what he said with respect to the treaty we have been trying to achieve for a quarter of a century, the treaty on the complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. Ambassador Fisher was very fortunate in meeting the woman who was to be his life-long companion. I believe that all who knew Mrs. Laura Fisher will feel the same respect and affection for her as my wife and I do. I beg the United States delegation to accept my sincere condolences on this sad occasion and kindly to convey our sympathy to Ambassador Fisher's widow.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my delegation and other members of the group of socialist countries, allow me to join you and the other colleagues who paid tribute to the late Ambassador Adrian Fisher, who has passed away all too early. I personally had the privilege of working with him in this body over many years. His diplomatic skill and devotion to disarmament as well as his personal qualities were highly respected by all of us. May I express to the United States delegation, through you, Mr. Chairman, our deep condolences. May I also ask the United States delegation to transmit our condolences to his family and particularly to his wife Laura.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, like those colleagues who have spoken here before me, I have very fond memories of co-operating with Adrian Fisher in this Committee. I therefore wish to join them in expressing both my own and my delegation's profound sadness in learning about his passing away. We remember him as one of the outstanding personalities in the field of multilateral disarmament negotiations. There could never have been any doubts about his own very deep devotion to the cause of

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

disarmament. We also had the feeling that he never hesitated to use his influence in order to obtain decisions which could carry our work forward in a spirit of compromise. He also used his sense of humour and wit to lighten the atmosphere sometimes during discussions. His many qualities have been emphasized by my colleagues and I agree with every word of what they have said. We would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to transmit our condolences both to the United States delegation here and to Adrian Fisher's family, in particular his wife Laura, who herself was a very active and a very beloved member of what one could call the inner wheel of this Committee.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, your beautiful tribute and the generous comments of our distinguished colleagues who knew and worked with Ambassador Fisher were most moving and are deeply appreciated by the United States delegation. They will be much appreciated by Ambassador Fisher's widow and his family, who will find comfort in the esteem and affection which these warm expressions so eloquently reflect.

I had the great privilege of knowing "Butch" Fisher, as he was affectionately known by his friends, many of whom have spoken this morning, for many years, and I have the honour to serve the United States in the Committee, as he did so effectively from 1977 to 1980. "Butch" Fisher was a man of wit and wisdom in the great tradition of statesmen from the southern part of my country. His rich Tennessee accent and his folksy stories became his trademark, but it was his deep commitment to the fundamental objectives of this Committee that was and always will be his hallmark. There were points on which he differed with his colleagues, but his warm, good-humoured nature led even those with whom he differed most often to respect and admire him.

"Butch" Fisher was a man of enormous capacity. The law was his profession and he served it with great distinction. He entered his profession by serving as a law clerk successively to two venerated justices of the United States Supreme Court, Louis Brandeis and Felix Frankfurter. He went thereafter into the Federal Government where he rose to become the youngest solicitor of the Department of Commerce, general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission and legal adviser of the Department of State. He was only thirty-five years of age when Secretary of State Dean Acheson made him the legal adviser to the Department.

While the law was his profession, building a more peaceful world through arms control and disarmament became his passion. He was appointed as the first deputy director of the newly-created Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1961, a position he occupied for eight years. Those were crucial years -- years which produced the so-called "hot line" agreement (June 1963), the limited test-ban Treaty (August 1963), the outer space Treaty (January 1967), the Treaty of Tlatelolco (February 1967) and the non-proliferation Treaty (July 1968). The fine hand and watchful eye of Adrian Fisher were a part of all these landmark agreements and they form a part of his great legacy to us.

As if these accomplishments were not enough, he endeavoured to reach the minds of young people through yet another career -- teaching. In this pursuit he again excelled by attaining the deanship of the law school of the prestigious Georgetown University. When he left this Committee he returned to teaching and that was his vocation at the time of his death.

I wish to share with you and the members of the Committee our delegation's message of condolence to Mrs. Fisher and her family. It is, I trust, a eulogy in which all of us who knew him can share:

(Mr. Fields, United States of America)

"A great, gentle voice for disarmament is now silent, but Ambassador Fisher's words, thoughts and deeds remain as a legacy and a challenge to those of us who are carrying on this cause here in the Committee. He was a strong leader and friend to many in both this delegation and the Committee and we will mourn his loss. Yet his spirit remains in us and we will press on with renewed vigor to accomplish many tasks which he labored on so tirelessly. May our accomplishments be another memorial to his dedication to the cause of disarmament and the country he loved and served so well."

On behalf of my delegation and, I am sure, the Fisher family, I thank you and my distinguished colleagues for the tributes paid today to the memory of this great and humble American.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the representative of the United States for his statement. We shall now hear the statements planned for the plenary meeting. I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of India, Nigeria, the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia.

I now give the floor to the representative of India, Ambassador Dubey.

Mr. DUBEY (India): Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to echo the sentiments of grief and sorrow expressed by the previous speakers on the sad demise of the late Ambassador Adrian Fisher. We would like to offer our heartfelt condolences to the United States representative through you, Sir, and request him to convey them to Mrs. Fisher.

Mr. Chairman, since I am taking the floor for the first time this month, allow me to offer my congratulations to you, though belatedly, on your assumption of the Chairmanship of this Committee. We are all familiar with your diplomatic skill and your vast knowledge and experience in the field of disarmament. These qualities have already proved of considerable help to us in tackling the difficulties which this Committee has faced during the initial phase of its current session. Hopefully, under your stewardship, we are well on the way to resolving the procedural problems which this Committee has been grappling with and getting down to serious and substantive work without losing more time.

The main purpose of my taking the floor this morning is to introduce before the Committee document CD/354, which contains the text of the New Delhi Message and extracts from the Political Declaration of the Non-Aligned Summit Conference, entitled, "Disarmament, survival and co-existence in the age of nuclear weapons".

From 7 to 12 March 1983, the capital of my country, New Delhi, played host to the Heads of State or Government of over 100 non-aligned countries, who gathered together for the historic Seventh Non-Aligned Summit Conference. The documents unanimously adopted at the Summit Conference represent a unique achievement. For, in a world divided by

(Mr. Dubey, India)

ideological, political and economic barriers, their message is one of co-operation, of brotherhood and of common endeavour for global peace and security. This constructive and co-operative approach of the Summit has been succinctly summed up in the last sentence of the New Delhi Message issued by the Summit, which reads: "The earth belongs to us all -- let us cherish it in peace and true brotherhood, based on the dignity and equality of man." This spirit pervades all the documents adopted by the Summit.

Distinguished delegates will find from this document that the leaders of the non-aligned movement have regarded disarmament and development as being among the central issues of our time. And in the field of disarmament, they have placed the emphasis where it belongs, i.e., on the threat to the survival of mankind from a nuclear war. They have, therefore, called upon the nuclear-weapon States in the name of humanity to adopt urgent measures for the prevention of nuclear war. The leaders of the non-aligned movement have categorically rejected the doctrines of strategic balance and deterrence, the concept of limited nuclear war and of the balanced or equal security of a limited group of countries. They are convinced that the pursuit of these misconceived and obsolete doctrines will result in the annihilation of mankind. They have, therefore, given a call for the common security of all nations and peoples, not through the stockpiling of arms but through their elimination.

There is a clear-cut link in the document between disarmament and development, between peace and prosperity. The leaders of the non-aligned movement have also welcomed the upsurge of public opinion against the arms race and the triumphant march of the peace movements around the world, including in the nuclear-weapon States. Aligning the non-aligned movement with these peace movements, the Prime Minister of India, in her opening statement, said, "The non-aligned movement is history's biggest peace movement."

Among the measures recommended by the leaders of the movement in the field of disarmament, pride of place has been given to urgent steps for halting and reversing the nuclear arms race. In this context, a freeze on the development, production, stockpiling and deployment of nuclear weapons has been recommended. They have also called for a speedy finalization of a comprehensive treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons. Pending nuclear disarmament, the Summit Conference has called for an immediate prohibition of the use or threat of nuclear weapons. Reference has also been made to the obligation that the nuclear-weapon States have to guarantee non-nuclear-weapon States that they will not be threatened or attacked with nuclear weapons. Among other measures called for in the Declaration

(Mr. Dubey, India)

are: a ban on chemical weapons, measures to ensure that outer space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes and the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament for submission to the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session.

The above package of measures constitutes a serious effort on the part of the non-aligned countries to avoid a further deterioration in the existing situation, which is fraught with grave dangers. Almost all these measures are on the agenda of this Committee and have, therefore, an immediate bearing on its work. The leaders of the non-aligned movement have called upon our negotiating body to fulfil this mandate and adopt concrete measures of disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament. We hope that our Committee will live up to the expectations reposed in it by the non-aligned movement.

An important aspect of the document to which I would like to draw the Committee's attention is the recommendation made by the Summit Conference that the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly should be used for a collective appraisal by Heads of State or Government of all Member States of the United Nations with a view to finding speedy and just solutions to some of the major problems of the world. The input that this Committee is expected to provide is going to be of crucial importance for such a collective appraisal. This will, however, depend upon the outcome of its work between now and the next session of the General Assembly. We hope that the results of the Summit relating to disarmament issues will impart a sense of urgency and purposefulness to the work of this Committee.

In the New Delhi Message, the leaders of the non-aligned movement made an appeal to the great powers "to give up mistrust, engage in sincere, forward-looking negotiations in a spirit of shared good faith to reach agreement on various disarmament matters ...". They also stated: "Unitedly, the members of the non-aligned movement are prepared to do everything in their power to assist in this process."

The Prime Minister of India, Chairman of the non-aligned countries' Summit Conference, underlined in her concluding remarks on 12 March: "The Non-Aligned Movement is not a mere or usual collection of individual States. It is a vital historical process. It is a mingling of many historical, spiritual and cultural streams. It is an expression of the aspirations of the long deprived and the newly free. It is the assertion of human kind's will to survive despite oppression, the growing arms race and ideological divisions."

We trust that the unanimous voice of the highest-level representatives of two thirds of humanity will find a positive response from our partners in this Committee so that our common objective of peace and prosperity for all humanity can be realized.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank Ambassador Dubey for his statement. I am sure that the members of the Committee have noted the importance of the message you have transmitted to us today from the last Summit Conference of the non-aligned countries, which was held in your country. Its high quality will no doubt prompt all members of our Committee to think about it very seriously. I would also like to thank the representative of India for the very kind words he addressed to the Chair.

I now give the floor to the representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Ijewere.

Mr. IJEWERE (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, let me, on behalf of my delegation, congratulate you, the distinguished representative of Morocco, a brotherly African country, on your presiding over the affairs of the Committee on Disarmament in the month of March. Nigeria is proud of her excellent bilateral and multilateral ties with the Kingdom of Morocco. No doubt, the task ahead of our Committee at this crucial time is an enormous one, but with your sense of purpose and wealth of experience in the diplomatic field no one doubts your ability to guide us successfully in our deliberations.

My delegation pledges its full support and co-operation throughout your tenure of office. I also want to congratulate your predecessor in the Chair, the distinguished Ambassador Erdembileg of the People's Republic of Mongolia for the able manner in which he steered the ship of the Committee through the turbulent month of February.

My delegation would like also to join in the generous tribute paid to the late Ambassador Adrian Fisher. We share with his friends, his colleagues, the United States delegation and members of his family a sense of loss and grief occasioned by the passing away of this great man. To my mind, the greatest tribute we can pay to such a man, having regard to the work he has done, is to work with relentless vigour and in good faith to achieve success in the field of disarmament.

My delegation notes with deep regret that seven weeks after the opening of its 1983 session, the Committee has not been able to adopt its draft provisional agenda and programme of work, owing to the lack of consensus on certain agenda items, particularly the inclusion of the subject of the prevention of nuclear war as a separate item on the agenda.

Since this year has been regarded generally as a crucial year for international peace and security, a lot is expected of the Committee in terms of fruitful negotiations. It is sad, however, to note that the question of the inclusion of an item on the prevention of nuclear war is one of the things that have stalled progress in the Committee's work this year. The question of the prevention of nuclear war has been dealt with in unambiguous terms in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Paragraph 8 of that Document states:

"While the final objective of the efforts of all States should continue to be general and complete disarmament under effective international control, the immediate goal is that of the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war and the implementation of measures to halt and reverse the arms race and clear the path towards lasting peace".

(Mr. Ijewere, Nigeria)

The operative word in that paragraph is "immediate". The document of the General Assembly did not say "eventual" or "long-term goal" as certain delegations now seem to regard even disarmament itself.

It appears to my delegation that those who are vehemently opposed to the inclusion of an item on the prevention of nuclear war want the Committee on Disarmament disbanded because to them it has become irrelevant.

We would accept that reasoning from them were we to see a progressive decline in nuclear armament as a result of negotiations being carried on elsewhere; but unfortunately, this is not the case. The concern of the Group of 21 on the question of the prevention of nuclear war was further amplified by the United Nations Secretary-General in his address to this Committee on 15 February 1983 when he said:

"Since it poses a threat to the survival of the human species, nuclear war is a matter of concern to all".

We realize that war generally is dangerous but we believe that this Committee was set up to avert the threat of global war and particularly nuclear war.

My delegation wholeheartedly supports and endorses the position of the Group of 21 as contained in document CD/341. We feel that it is reasonable and considerate and speaks the minds of mankind, especially those who are genuinely concerned about the obvious consequences of a nuclear war.

Permit me to say that the Group of 21 is so concerned about what happens to mankind in the event of a nuclear holocaust because it cannot protect itself and its peoples in such a situation. As recently stated by a member of the Group of 21 before this Committee, when a malfunctioning nuclear satellite was on its way back to earth, the very powers responsible for the proliferation of nuclear terror mounted appropriate and timely protective measures for their various peoples. The rest of us could do little more than chest-beating between bouts of frantic prayers.

My delegation shares the view expressed by the distinguished Ambassador of Brazil on the vertical dimension of nuclear proliferation in his statement before the Committee on 3 March 1983. As he succinctly put it: "The elusive search for superiority seems to be the mainspring of vertical proliferation".

The increasing build-up of nuclear arsenals by the two Superpowers, and their failure to honour the various nuclear freeze proposals they have made does not, in any way, help to promote the cessation of the arms race and nuclear disarmament -- one of the priority items on the Committee's draft agenda.

As a matter of fact, the possibility of a nuclear war breaking out by mistake is very real. A few weeks ago, in this very Committee, we were reminded of occasions when, owing to computer error, the very buttons that could wipe off all life on earth were almost pressed.

(Mr. Ijewere, Nigeria)

On the other hand, there is no doubt that before 10,000 troops of a country start marching into another one, the belligerent intentions of the aggressor country would be very obvious. In other words, conventional war could not just start by mistake or miscalculation as a nuclear war could. Such a nuclear war would engulf even those not involved in the confrontation.

My delegation initially felt that the prevention of nuclear war is such a vital issue as to constitute a separate item on the Committee's agenda, as proposed by the Group of 21 in document CD/341. However, in view of the present impasse over the adoption of our agenda and programme of work for the current session, we have decided to demonstrate some flexibility and goodwill by accepting the reformulation of the Group of 21's proposal being put forward by the group of Western countries in order that we can get down to concrete deliberations in the Committee on Disarmament.

Permit me to make a few comments on an important issue before the Committee: I have in mind the question of chemical weapons. The prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons has been a major concern of the Committee since its inception. My delegation welcomes the various proposals on a chemical weapons convention that have been presented to the Committee and considers them a useful basis for negotiation.

In the view of my delegation, a future convention should contain provisions aimed at a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. There should be provisions for both national as well as international means of verification but greater emphasis should be placed on international means. The Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons held a number of contact group meetings in January. Consultations on technical issues were also held and experts took part in them. It is our belief that the results of the contact group meetings as contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group (document CD/342) should be translated into action.

On the question of negative security assurances, my delegation is in support of the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It is also our view that the Working Group set up to examine the issue under the Chairmanship of Ambassador Ahmad of Pakistan should be given a sufficient mandate to enable it perform effectively.

My delegation considers that effective measures taken to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons can contribute positively to the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons. In this context, we would like to recall paragraph 59 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In that paragraph, the General Assembly urges the nuclear-weapon States "to pursue efforts to conclude, as appropriate, effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

(Mr. Ijewere, Nigeria)

My delegation considers that the issue of negative security assurances centres on two questions. First, which non-nuclear-weapon States should be eligible for assurances from nuclear-weapon States? Secondly, under what circumstances will nuclear-weapon States withdraw their assurances? In our opinion, nuclear-weapon States should give unconditional assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon States that have undertaken firm commitments not to develop, produce or acquire nuclear weapons. Furthermore, those countries outside the non-proliferation Treaty should be given conditional assurances by way of non-first-use of nuclear weapons.

My delegation notes with satisfaction the statistical information made available to this Committee by the leader of the Swedish delegation at the beginning of last month concerning the various nuclear tests carried out in 1982. We also note the statement made by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union in respect of those tests. We believe that the assurances given by the leader of the Soviet delegation on 17 February 1983 are worth considering by other nuclear-weapon States. On that occasion, the leader of the Soviet delegation said:

"We do not intend either to confirm or to deny these figures. We would only say to all the nuclear-weapon States, regardless of the number of nuclear-weapon tests they have conducted -- let us immediately halt them. Let us not conduct such tests during the negotiations on the conclusion of a treaty, as is demanded by the world community."

My delegation is of the opinion that that pledge should be taken seriously by all nuclear-weapon States as a basis for progress in the long overdue treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests. We feel that it will serve as a basis for the early conclusion of a nuclear test-ban treaty.

Finally, my delegation supports document CD/330 submitted by the Group of 21 in September 1982 on the establishment of subsidiary organs.

As a matter of fact, in view of the present uninspiring state of affairs within the Committee on Disarmament, does the present impasse in the Committee not demonstrate clearly that some groups of delegations are taking advantage of the weaknesses inherent in the rule of consensus? Is it premature, therefore, to consider examining the merits of document CD/330?

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the representative of Nigeria, Ambassador Ijewere, for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of the German Democratic Republic, Ambassador Herder.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): Mr. Chairman, in my statement today I will refer to the subject which has -- with full justification -- dominated our proceedings from the beginning of this session: the prevention of nuclear war.

Many delegations have expressed their views on this problem, particularly during our most interesting special plenary meeting on 28 February, initiated and

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

chaired by Ambassador Erdembileg. The essence of the overwhelming majority of statements on this item can easily be described: prevention of nuclear war is the most urgent, legitimate, fateful and moral issue of our time.

At the beginning of this session, on 8 February, my delegation stated its viewpoint that to avert the danger of nuclear war is the most important objective. Without delay, relevant measures must be taken and all possible solutions must be explored. This central task, namely, to discuss and agree on measures to prevent nuclear war, should, therefore, also be reflected in the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament. Together with the delegations of the other socialist countries my delegation supported the proposal of the Group of 21, contained in document CD/341, to include an item on the prevention of nuclear war in the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament and to set up a corresponding working group.

This position is fully in line with the approach the socialist countries have taken consistently towards solving this issue of the highest priority. It is in line with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, whereby all States members of the Committee on Disarmament adopted the principle that all States, and in particular the nuclear-weapon States, should consider various proposals to secure the avoidance of the use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of nuclear war. This important commitment was reaffirmed at the second special session on disarmament and the thirty-seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Consequently, the proposal made at the beginning of this session to include a new item, "Prevention of nuclear war", in the Committee's agenda and to establish a corresponding working group cannot have come as a surprise. It is all the more astonishing, however, that in view of the history this item has, it took certain delegations several weeks to define their exact position on such a fundamental item and the form of its inclusion in the agenda. One can only express astonishment and dismay at the way the formulation of an agenda item on the prevention of nuclear war has been treated by these delegations.

Nevertheless my delegation, as well as the delegations of other socialist countries, are encouraged by the fact that, after all, agreement on the treatment of the prevention of nuclear war in our agenda seems to emerge. This vital issue certainly cannot be reduced to a procedural question. Time is overdue for this Committee, as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, to start serious consideration of concrete measures to prevent nuclear war.

Guided by these considerations, a group of socialist countries has requested the circulation of a working paper on the prevention of nuclear war, document CD/355, which I have the honour to introduce today. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will briefly explain the major considerations we have in mind, in order to initiate a constructive and action-orientated deliberation of this item.

In view, especially, of the present tense international situation, we believe that the prevention of nuclear war is the most important global problem of our time. It is a problem which concerns all peoples irrespective of differences in their social order, way of life or ideology. Mankind is, indeed, confronted with a choice: to halt the arms race and proceed to disarmament or to face the danger of annihilation.

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

In their recent Prague Declaration, the Warsaw Treaty member States emphasized that "it is essential to act without delay, while there is still a possibility of curbing the arms race and moving towards disarmament. At the same time they assume that all States, if they are concerned for the fate of their peoples and of mankind as a whole, must necessarily be interested in avoiding war".

In the Final Declaration of the Seventh Summit Conference of the non-aligned countries, adopted on 12 March 1983, the leaders of the non-aligned countries equally expressed the growing concern of their peoples in view of the danger of nuclear war, which has been increased by an escalation of the nuclear arms race and doctrines of nuclear deterrence. We welcome the statement in the Declaration that in today's world there is no alternative to a policy of peaceful coexistence, détente and co-operation of States, irrespective of their economic and social systems. This should be considered the background against which the challenge of preventing nuclear war has to be met.

The answer to this challenge has already been given many times. In the Concluding Document of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, all United Nations Member States were urged to consider as soon as possible relevant proposals designed to secure the avoidance of war, in particular nuclear war, thus ensuring that the survival of mankind is not endangered.

Over the past few years the United Nations General Assembly has adopted a series of resolutions which, in fact, offer a broad basis for concrete negotiations on the prevention of nuclear war. In this regard the following resolutions should especially be taken into account:

- 36/81 B, "Prevention of nuclear war";
- 36/92 I, "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war";
- 36/100, "Declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe";
- 37/78 I, "Prevention of nuclear war";
- 37/78 J, "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war";
- 37/100 C, "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons".

Some of these resolutions were co-sponsored by the socialist States, while the others were supported by them.

Recent developments and the realities of a policy of nuclear superarmament adopted by one nuclear-weapon power have made the task of preventing nuclear war even more pressing. The increased danger of war is caused not only by growing nuclear-weapon arsenals, but also by qualitative developments, e.g. the introduction of ever newer nuclear-weapon systems with increased warhead accuracy. It must be of the utmost concern that the United States is placing increasing emphasis on the establishment of a nuclear first-strike potential based on qualitatively new nuclear-weapon systems which are destabilizing and greatly increase the risk of nuclear war breaking out.

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

In this connection allow me to reaffirm the conviction of the delegations of the socialist States that in order to prevent a world-wide nuclear war there must be no further escalation of nuclear confrontation in Europe. There can be no doubt: if a nuclear first-strike potential were to be established in western Europe through the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear systems, that would mean a decisive change in the strategic military situation.

Such deployment could only be considered by the socialist countries as a measure aimed at increasing the surprise factor of an attack.

Furthermore, it cannot be ignored that under present conditions even a coincidence, a mistake or technical imperfections connected with nuclear weapons would have catastrophic consequences for mankind. This can and must be avoided.

The socialist countries consider it necessary to emphasize resolutely that any calculations on winning a nuclear war after unleashing it are senseless. Once nuclear war breaks out, there can be no victors. Yet it cannot be overlooked that the introduction of the above-mentioned new military programmes is inseparably linked with the escalation of such ill-famed strategic concepts and doctrines as those of a "limited nuclear war", "protracted nuclear conflict", etc.

The basis of all those doctrines is the concept of nuclear deterrence, which aims in the last analysis at justifying the existence of nuclear weapons and making peoples used to them. Thus, this concept ultimately is opposed to nuclear disarmament and leaves no room for it. Therefore, it was with deep astonishment that recently we witnessed in this Committee attempts to justify nuclear deterrence. We rather agree with the conclusion drawn by the Group of 21 in document CD/341 that "doctrines of nuclear deterrence lie at the root of the continuing escalation in the quantitative and qualitative development of nuclear weapons and lead to greater insecurity and instability in international relations".

As we have repeatedly stated, we are firmly convinced that the Committee on Disarmament is, indeed, the organ called upon to negotiate and achieve agreement on practical measures of a multilateral nature for the prevention of nuclear war. The procedural steps required for that should be obvious:

The inclusion of a corresponding agenda item;

The establishment of an ad hoc working group with a negotiating mandate;

The definition of a complex of measures for the prevention of nuclear war as a first step towards concrete negotiations within the framework of the working group.

In view of the urgency of the issue, the socialist countries are in favour of taking these steps immediately. In addition, we propose that the following priority measures should serve as a starting-point for discussions:

The renunciation by all nuclear-weapon States of the first use of nuclear weapons,

A freeze by all nuclear-weapon States on their nuclear arsenals,

The declaration by all nuclear-weapon States of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions until a comprehensive test-ban treaty is concluded.

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

The delegations of the socialist countries also supported the proposal made by India and approved by the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session for the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. At the same time, other multilateral steps aimed at the prevention of nuclear war, such as preventing an accidental use of nuclear weapons or avoiding the possibility of surprise attacks, could be discussed.

As far as the general approach to the prevention of nuclear war is concerned, as has already been stated by several delegations, and we support their view, this does not exclude the possibility of a comprehensive approach to the non-use of military force. For instance, obligations concerning the non-first-use of nuclear weapons are in accordance with article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter. They are aimed at its strengthening and practical implementation.

An important step for the prevention of nuclear war could be the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. In this context, attention has also been drawn to the recent proposal by the Warsaw Treaty member States, addressed to the member States of NATO, for the conclusion of such a treaty on the mutual renunciation of the use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations. Thus, there is a broad range of questions which can serve as a basis for serious and concrete negotiations. We firmly believe that the Committee on Disarmament can and must play a positive role in this effort, without prejudicing relevant bilateral negotiations or agreements.

It is our hope that the proposals raised in the document tabled today will contribute to progress in our work in this area, so that we may leave the stage of procedural discussion and proceed without further delay to actual negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament with the aim of achieving agreement on concrete measures for the prevention of nuclear war.

Only in this way can we justify the expectations the international community has placed in this Committee.

Before concluding my statement allow me, Mr. Chairman, to express the conviction of the socialist group that the Committee will quickly achieve consensus on its agenda, so as to enable it to settle down to its work. As far as the working groups are concerned, we favour the immediate beginning of the work of the groups on a nuclear test ban, chemical weapons and radiological weapons, as was reaffirmed last week by Ambassador Tellalov. It stands to reason that in the case of the Working Group on a Nuclear Test Ban, an understanding on a negotiating mandate should be achieved. This would correspond to its previous mandate which stated that the Working Group "will report to the Committee on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the 1982 session. The Committee will thereafter take a decision on subsequent courses of action with a view to fulfilling its responsibilities in this regard". While the first part of this agreement was fulfilled, we are still waiting for action to be taken on the latter part. May I request you, Mr. Chairman, to make the necessary arrangements in order to hold the meetings and consultations required for elaborating the mandate of the nuclear test-ban Working Group, on the basis of the various proposals which have been submitted up to now.

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): Mr. Chairman, I, as others around this table, also had the privilege to know personally Mr. Adrian Fisher, whose demise we all deeply deplore. I fully subscribe to all that has been stated here about his excellent qualities both human and diplomatic. Allow me, therefore, to join the preceding speakers in expressing the most sincere condolences of my delegation and of myself to the United States delegation and to Mrs. Fisher and her family.

This is the first time my delegation is taking the floor in the month of March. I therefore seize with pleasure this occasion to express our deep satisfaction in seeing you, the distinguished representative of a friendly, non-aligned country, in the chair of the Committee on Disarmament. You came to this post at a difficult period when efforts are still being exerted to prevent the Committee from carrying out negotiations on the most important and vital priority problems of today's disarmament agenda.

During the month of February we witnessed a noble effort on the part of the distinguished representative of socialist Mongolia, Ambassador Erdembileg, who did his best to get the Committee working on the basis of an agenda which would reflect at least the basic requirements of the community of States and of world public opinion. We sincerely hope that you, Sir, actively continuing the efforts of your predecessor, will eventually succeed in launching us on business-like negotiations. Let me assure you of my delegation's full support in this respect.

Today I would like to address a top priority item the effective solution of which is long overdue. I mean the complete and general cessation of nuclear-weapon tests.

It is exactly the cessation and prohibition of all tests of nuclear weapons by all States in all environments that would represent an effective means to stop the nuclear arms race. It is well known that the qualitative improvements of nuclear weapons and the development of new types of these weapons are inseparably linked with their tests. Hence, for the real limitation of practical possibilities of the development and production of new types of nuclear bombs and warheads the achievement of the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests stands as a key problem.

The cessation of nuclear tests would also represent an important contribution to the further strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation regime since it would prevent the emergence of new nuclear-weapon States. Nor should we ignore the fact that nuclear explosions can seriously pollute the environment.

The problem of the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests is not a new one. But recently it has acquired an extreme urgency since its effective solution could substantially limit the new spiral of the nuclear arms race. Thus, it would represent a material barrier against the ever-increasing danger.

The problem of the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests was in fact raised by the end of the 1940s. It was incomparably easier to ban nuclear weapons and their tests then than it is today. But the nuclear arms race, initiated by the United States of America, has also given birth to a race in nuclear testing.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

It should be pointed out that some positive results aimed at the solution of this crucial problem have been achieved. Twenty years have passed since the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water. This Treaty limited the possibilities of the development of new types of nuclear weapons. But the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty did not remove the achievement of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests from the agenda. Firstly, the Moscow Treaty was not signed by all the nuclear-weapon States. Secondly, underground nuclear explosions have not been prohibited, which allows for the continuation and intensification of the nuclear arms race.

Czechoslovakia has more than once expressed its concern in view of the fact that two decades after the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty the problem of underground nuclear explosions has not been solved, in spite of the fact that the Soviet Union has repeatedly expressed its readiness to conclude an appropriate treaty and has advanced concrete proposals to this effect.

In 1975 the USSR submitted to the United Nations General Assembly a draft treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, which provided for a ban on all nuclear tests in all environments with unlimited duration. However, in view of the negative attitude of some nuclear-weapon States, the elaboration of the text of the proposed treaty was not undertaken.

The Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests of 1974 could become a further important measure aimed at the achievement of a complete test ban. This Treaty, which prohibits underground explosions over 150 kilotons, narrows the possibilities for the development and improvement of the most powerful and dangerous types of nuclear weapons. Another measure in this direction could be the Soviet-American Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes of 1976. But the United States refused to ratify these two treaties. This negative attitude was explained by the fact that the verification provisions of the Treaty of 1974, elaborated and agreed upon jointly by the Soviet and American delegations, were no longer satisfactory to the United States. Moreover, in the International Herald Tribune of 14 March of this year, we found an article by a well-known American observer, Walter Pincus, confirming earlier reports suggesting that the United States intends, in fact, to revise the Soviet-American Treaty of 1974.

One should recall what Mr. Eugene Rostow, the former head of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency had to say in this connection. He clearly expressed the view that the Pentagon will have to carry out nuclear tests for a long time and, possibly, even tests of weapons of a power exceeding the agreed limit of 150 kilotons.

In view of this evidence one cannot but come to the conclusion that the United States is not only against the prohibition of nuclear tests but also against their limitation by any restraint on the power of the weapons being tested. That is the only possible explanation of the refusal by the United States to let the Soviet-American treaties of 1974 and 1976 enter into force.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

From 1977 to 1980, negotiations on a complete nuclear-test ban with the participation of the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom were conducted in Geneva. As is clear from the tripartite report to the Committee on Disarmament of 30 July 1980, the participants in the negotiations overcame many difficulties, including those pertaining to verification. The whole text of the future treaty had practically been agreed upon, and only several provisions, mainly of a technical nature, remained to be formulated. It is well remembered that optimistic forecasts appeared then in the Western press, including American, that "the treaty will, apparently, be concluded within a year". The prospects for its conclusion became quite real. However, these forecasts did not prove true: the United States first unilaterally interrupted the tripartite negotiations and then decided not to resume them at all.

It is obvious that it was precisely these prospects for the achievement of the relevant treaty that did not suit the United States administration which came to power at the end of 1980, since it based its foreign policy on a reliance on force and openly declared its aim of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union. To this end the White House adopted a broad programme to build up nuclear forces, announced by the United States President on 2 October 1981. Within this programme the United States has developed new warheads for MX, Trident I and Trident II ballistic missiles, for long-range cruise missiles and for Pershing II missiles and also neutron weapons. It is also developing special weapons for B-1B and Stealth bombers. The United States defence directives envisage the production of at least 23,000 new nuclear warheads during the next 10 years.

New systems of strategic and other weapons require new nuclear warheads. Apparently, that is the real reason why the United States does everything to block the achievement of an agreement and even the commencement of specific negotiations on this question here in the Committee on Disarmament. The United States motivates its refusal to undertake these negotiations by the difficulties with regard to the question of verification. This was recently stressed again in the statement before this Committee by the United States Vice-President Bush.

However, it is quite clear that the real difficulty does not lie within the problem of verification but results from the United States intention to continue a broad programme of nuclear-weapon tests without limiting the power of the tested weapons.

The unilateral refusal by the United States to continue the trilateral negotiations on a nuclear test ban, its tendency not to take into account some existing agreements on nuclear weapons limitation and the attempts to revise others, should impel the Committee on Disarmament to undertake immediately active negotiations for the elaboration of the relevant treaty.

The document entitled "Basic provisions of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests", submitted to the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session by the Soviet Union, represents a practical basis for multilateral negotiations on this matter.

There is no doubt that the atmosphere for the elaboration of the treaty would be much more favourable if the relevant negotiations were not accompanied by nuclear-weapon tests. Rather, the full cessation of nuclear tests during the

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

negotiations would be a clear sign of goodwill. Precisely for this reason, Czechoslovakia welcomed the proposal by the USSR that all nuclear-weapon States, as a gesture of goodwill, should declare a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, including those for peaceful purposes, with effect from a mutually agreed date until the conclusion of the treaty itself. The adoption and realization of this proposal would allow the Committee to carry on concrete negotiations on the problem in a quiet, business-like atmosphere.

In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation the Soviet "Basic provisions" contain all the elements necessary to meet the requirements of the overwhelming majority of States.

It is envisaged that nuclear tests would be prohibited in all environments, that the treaty would be unlimited in time and would enter into force after its ratification by 20 governments including those of the permanent members of the Security Council. At the same time, the possibility of the treaty entering into force for an agreed limited period of time with the participation of only three States permanent members of the Security Council — the Soviet Union, the United States of America and the United Kingdom — is not precluded.

I would also like to note that the Soviet proposal pays special attention to verification provisions. Let me point out just some of them.

Firstly, it is the presumption that verification within the future treaty would be based on national as well as international procedures, while the "States parties which possess national technical means of verification may, where necessary, place the information which they obtained through those means, and which is important for the purposes of this Treaty, at the disposal of other parties".

This provision is of particular importance for those States parties to the treaty which as yet do not possess national technical means of verification.

The "Guidelines for the international exchange of seismic data", taking into account the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts on seismic events, represent an important element of verification of an international nature. We also regard as useful the proposal to create a committee of experts which would consider questions relating to the international exchange of seismic data. In this connection, the "Basic provisions" state:

"The Committee shall elaborate, in accordance with Guidelines, detailed arrangements regulating the establishment and operation of the international exchange; it shall facilitate its implementation and co-operation between States parties to enhance the effectiveness of such exchange.

"The Committee shall facilitate more extensive international consultations and co-operation, the exchange of information and the provision of assistance in verification in the interests of compliance with the provisions of this Treaty."

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

Another important element of verification is reflected in the part of the document dealing with on-site inspection. It defines the procedure for the assessment of compliance with the treaty and the procedure for sending requests for an on-site inspection and replies to them. The elaboration of procedures for on-site inspections, including the list of rights and functions of the inspecting personnel and the definition of the role of the receiving party during the inspection are also envisaged.

My delegation also welcomes the fact that the Soviet delegation expressed its readiness to offer any necessary clarifications on its document and to answer questions which might be raised in connection with the "Basic provisions" in the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Nuclear Test Ban. We hope that this Group will be accorded a mandate which will enable it to undertake without any delay negotiations for the elaboration of a treaty banning all nuclear tests in order to respond to the call by the United Nations General Assembly to the States members of the Committee on Disarmament "To exert their best endeavours in order that the Committee may transmit to the General Assembly at its thirty-eighth session the multilaterally negotiated text of such a treaty".

The discussions on a nuclear test ban and on the mandate of the relevant Working Group would confirm that the majority of delegations would like to see specific negotiations on a treaty instead of mere expressions of good intentions. Let us hope that the States members of the Committee will display the necessary political will in order to take a decisive step in the direction of the achievement of a nuclear test-ban treaty.

My country, together with the other socialist countries which adopted the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty Organization in Prague, considers it essential to intensify negotiations on a number of specific questions, including in the Committee on Disarmament, with a view to accelerating the achievement of concrete results in the sphere of disarmament. The Declaration of the Non-Aligned Summit Conference presented to us today by the distinguished representative of India in document CD/354 also urges the speedy negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It also pertains fully to the deliberations on a nuclear test ban, which require a new, fresh impetus. It is our considered view that this problem can be solved and we speak in favour of the most energetic actions which might overcome the existing stalemate. And there is no other way to do this than to start immediately business-like negotiations on this matter in the Committee on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from French): I thank the representative of Czechoslovakia, Ambassador Vejvoda, for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I have no further speakers on my list. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? I see that that is not the case. I should

(The Chairman)

like to assure the Committee that the Chairman is actively continuing his consultations in the hope of reaching a consensus both on the agenda and on the establishment of the working groups. I venture to express the hope that at the Committee's next plenary meeting, on Thursday next, given the understanding and co-operation of all delegations, it may be possible for the Committee to adopt its agenda and to re-establish all the working groups.

The next plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 24 March 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.