

FINAL RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIRST PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 30 June 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. G.O. Ijewere

(Nigeria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

<u>Algeria:</u>	Mr. A. TAFFAR
<u>Argentina:</u>	Mr. R. GARCIA MORITAN Mr. R. VILLAMBROSA
<u>Australia:</u>	Mr. D. SADLEIR Mr. R. STEELE Mr. T. FINDLAY
<u>Belgium:</u>	Mr. A. ONKELINK
<u>Brazil:</u>	Mr. C.A. DE SOUZA E SILVA Mr. S. DE QUEIROZ DUARTE
<u>Bulgaria:</u>	Mr. P. POPTCHEV Mr. K. PRAMOV
<u>Burma:</u>	U MAUNG MAUNG GYI U TIN KYAW HLAING U THAN TUN
<u>Canada:</u>	Mr. D.S. McPHAIL Mr. G.R. SKINNER Ms. C. DE VARENNES
<u>China:</u>	Mr. TIAN JIN Ms. WANG ZHIYUN Mr. PAN ZHENQIANG Ms. ZHOU YUNHUA
<u>Cuba:</u>	Mr. P. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA
<u>Czechoslovakia:</u>	Ms. M. SLAMOVA
<u>Egypt:</u>	Mr. I. ALI HASSAN Mr. A. MAHER ABBAS

Ethiopia:

Mr. T. TERREFE

Ms. K. SINEGIORGIS

France:

Mr. F. DE LA GORCE

Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic:

Mr. H. ROSE

Ms. H. HOPPE

Germany, Federal Republic of:

Mr. H. WEGENER

Mr. W. ROHR

Hungary:

Mr. I. KOMIVES

Mr. F. GAJDA

India:

Mr. S. SARAN

Mr. S. KANT SHARMA

Indonesia:

Mr. N.S. SUTRESNA

Ms. P. RAMADHAN

Iran:

Mr. N. KOZEMI KAMYAB

Mr. F.S. SIRJANI

Italy:

Mr. M. ALESSI

Japan:

Mr. R. IMAI

Mr. M. KONISHI

Kenya:

Mr. P. NGUGI MWAURA

Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES

Ms. Z. GONZALEZ Y REYNERO

Mr. P. MACEDO RIBO

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG

Morocco:

Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands:

Mr. J. RAMAKER

Nigeria:

Mr. G.O. IJEWERE

Mr. A.N.C. NWAZOMUDOH

Mr. J.O. OBOH

Mr. L.O. AKINDELE

Pakistan:

Mr. T. ALTAF

Peru:

Mr. J. MORELLI PANDO

Mr. C. CASTILLO

Poland:

Mr. S. TURBANSKI

Mr. T. STROJWAS

Mr. G. CZEMPINSKI

Romania:

Mr. T. MELSCANU

Sri Lanka:

Mr. H.M.G.S. PALIHAKKARA

Sweden:

Mr. R. EKEUS

Mr. H. BERGLUND

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. V. ISSRAELIAN

Mr. B. PROKOFIEV

Mr. V.M. GANJA

Mr. L.P. MALEV

Mr. G. VASHADZE

United Kingdom:

Mr. L.J. MIDDLETON

Ms. J.E.F. WRIGHT

United States of America:

Mr. L.G. FIELDS

Mr. M.D. BUSBY

Mr. J. McATEER

Mr. P. CORDEN

Mr. B. DURHAM

Mr. J. GUNDERSON

Mr. R. HORNE

Mr. R. MIKULAK

Mr. R. SCOTT

Mr. J. TIERNEY

Venezuela:

Mr. O. GARCIA GARCIA

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Zaire:

Ms. ESAKI-EKANGA KABEYA

Mr. G. OSIL

Under-Secretary-General for
Disarmament Affairs:

Mr. J. MARTENSON

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: I declare open the 221st plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament.

At the outset, allow me to extend a warm welcome in the Committee to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs of the United Nations, Mr. Jan Martenson, who is in Geneva for the opening of the Fellowship Programme and to maintain close contact with the work of the Committee. I also note and welcome the presence of the participants in the Fellowship Programme, who are following this plenary meeting.

The Committee will today consider item 2 of its agenda, "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". Of course, in accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Committee.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Australia, Poland, Cuba and Ethiopia.

I now give the floor to the representative of Australia, Ambassador Sadleir.

Mr. SADLEIR (Australia): Today, Mr. Chairman, Under-Secretary-General, I direct my attention to two items on the Committee's agenda, namely, the items on a nuclear test ban and on radiological weapons. In doing so may I record my considerable pleasure in seeing Ambassador Ijewere, the capable representative of a fellow Commonwealth country, assume the chairmanship of the Committee for the month of June. I also pay tribute to his predecessor, Ambassador van Dongen of the Netherlands, for the characteristically efficient and friendly manner in which he presided over the Committee's activity in April. In addition, I extend a sincere welcome to the representatives who have newly joined us. I have in mind here, in particular, the representatives of Iran, Peru, Poland, Sweden and Zaire.

Since the beginning of this summer session the question of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty has attracted special attention, largely because of the draft text put forward by Sweden. The United Kingdom has also made a helpful contribution in its working paper on peaceful nuclear explosions. The Australian delegation has itself sought to play a part by submitting a revision of document CD/95 on the institutional arrangements for a comprehensive test ban. The revised paper has been circulated as document CD/384. We note, moreover, the way in which discussion in the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Nuclear Test Ban is proceeding in line with the established work programme. I take occasion here to express my delegation's appreciation of the flexibility shown by the former Chairman of the Working Group, Ambassador Herder of the German Democratic Republic, in putting the work programme together. I also welcome his successor, Dr. Rose, both to the Committee on Disarmament itself and as Chairman of the Working Group. We wish him every success in pursuing the aim that the Committee has set him.

Recent events in the region of which Australia is a part lead us to pursue, with even greater vigour than in the past, the goal of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. To this end we are concerned that as much constructive work as possible should be done within the limits set by the current mandate of the NTB Working Group. In addition, we look forward to that moment when sufficient work has been done on verification and compliance to enable the Working Group to advance a step further under a revised mandate. We also look forward to the day -- and we hope and urge that it will be soon -- when China and France see it

(Mr. Sadleir, Australia)

as in their interests to take part in the work of that Group. We regret the absence from such discussion of States so important to the world community. We wonder why they should be more inhibited than any other member of this Committee from taking part in what is at this stage, after all, only preparatory work for a future comprehensive test ban.

A development which Australia welcomes with enthusiasm is the draft comprehensive test-ban treaty tabled by the Swedish delegation. The detail that the text encompasses is impressive, as is the advent of three draft protocols. The way in which the proposals of others have been included is pleasing and imaginative. In this connection, I have in mind our own suggestions on the need for a CTB secretariat; but there are other examples.

As the distinguished Swedish representative, Mrs. Theorin, remarked in presenting the draft, it is "an honest attempt to find a compromise that should be acceptable to all as a basis for serious negotiations". It is in the nature of compromises that they cannot satisfy everyone in all respects. None the less, I am confident that the Swedish draft offers the Working Group a rich mine. Australia's approach to it will be positive and helpful. For the moment, I confine my specific remarks to three aspects, as follows:

On the issue of scope, Australia has, as this Committee well knows, consistently been of the view that a comprehensive test ban must ban all nuclear tests by all States in all environments for all time. We are not convinced that articles I and II of the Swedish draft constitute the neatest way of achieving this. We remain sceptical on the prospects of regulating the use of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. We judge the potential economic benefits of peaceful nuclear explosions to be far outweighed by the risk of nuclear weapons proliferation, both vertical and horizontal, inherent in the development and conduct of such explosions. The safe approach it seems to us, both from the arms limitation and the environmental points of view, is simply to ban all nuclear tests. We doubt whether anyone will seriously miss them. At the same time, we maintain an attachment to the definition of scope canvassed by Sweden in article I of the draft treaty put forward by it in 1977. Distinguished representatives will recall that the key first sentence of that article reads as follows:

"Each party to this treaty undertakes not to carry out any nuclear-weapon test explosion, or any explosion of other nuclear devices, in any environment".

As to on-site verification, the second of the points I want to pinpoint on this occasion, my delegation is impressed by the elaborate verification provisions advanced by Sweden, in the context of a treaty to ban attacks on civilian nuclear facilities, which were tabled last week in the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons. Would it not be appropriate for such stringent provisions to be applied to a CTBT which, after all, is much the more important arms control measure?

As to the three protocols and the roles of the various institutional bodies that will support the comprehensive test-ban treaty, it is essential that clarity prevail. In saying that, I recognize that the Swedish drafts are pioneering efforts and seek further refinement. My delegation is not certain, for example, that so "political" a role -- if I may thus describe it -- should be given to a CTB secretariat. In addition, we should prefer a smaller group of experts drawn from among members of the consultative committee. In the past we have, for instance, suggested that the group of experts, because of its management role in relation to the seismic system, might best be described as an "international management panel" or words to that effect. We shall elaborate further on our ideas in the Working Group.

(Mr. Sadleir, Australia)

There is in the Committee a consensus that the key to a successful comprehensive test-ban treaty is a seismic detection system. The Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts has made commendable progress towards establishing such a system. As the Swedish representative noted in her statement of 14 June, many technical problems remain, however, to be solved. Ambassador Theorin also pointed out that Sweden was unable to propose a text on on-site inspection procedures since there was little technical material on the various inspection techniques and their relative value. This suggests that the Group of Scientific Experts faces new challenges. Thus, I propose that, before the Committee ends its session for 1983, it should debate the future of the Group of Scientific Experts. Logically, such a debate should take place after the Group next convenes from 11 to 22 July — perhaps in the immediately following week. Because of the special circumstances bearing on such a review of the Group's future role, it would perhaps be wise for us to ensure that the Group itself does not prejudice or pre-empt any decision which the Committee, as the parent body, might take.

I turn now to the comments I foreshadowed on item 5 of the Committee's agenda, that is, radiological weapons. I address myself, in particular, to current proposals for an international legal instrument on the protection of civilian nuclear facilities.

The Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Bill Hayden, in a statement in Parliament on 24 May, stated that Australia would announce its support for a ban on attacks on civilian nuclear facilities. Many considerations have led us to this position. First, there is the basic need to ensure that resort is not had to radioactive contamination as a method of warfare. Secondly, the relevant provisions of the 1977 protocols to the Geneva Convention of 1949 are inadequate. When the protocols were negotiated, Australia entertained doubts, for example, about the ambiguity and narrow scope, for instance, of article 56 of Protocol I. Thirdly, few countries have, in fact, ratified the protocols, not least, presumably, because of their sheer complexity.

We shall, however, be keeping an open mind on exactly how the ban we seek on attacks on civilian nuclear facilities should be negotiated. We see no bar to the Committee on Disarmament doing so, but we remain flexible on the precise form of an agreement and its standing in relation to other international agreements.

As to a convention on the traditional radiological weapons material, my delegation welcomes the initiative shown by the United States of America in proposing new verification and compliance procedures for a future treaty. We see much merit in a consultative process which encourages compliance problems to be resolved at a low level of what might be described as "political excitability". The verification system for a comprehensive test-ban treaty could, if I may say so, also benefit from such a process.

My delegation is encouraged by the energetic approach to the traditional radiological weapons material shown by the sub-group co-ordinator, Mr. Busby, of the United States delegation. We applaud his efforts to move the Group into definitive negotiations and we urge all delegations to co-operate in a bold attempt to conclude a radiological weapons treaty by the end of this session.

The Australian delegation looks forward to its continuing role in the work of this Committee on a nuclear test ban and on radiological weapons. Both matters offer the Committee clear and major opportunities to strengthen its standing in the eyes of governments and in the hearts of the world public which they represent. The opportunities should be energetically seized.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Australia for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Poland, Ambassador Turbanski.

Mr. TURBANSKI (Poland): Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate you, the representative of Nigeria, on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Committee on Disarmament at the beginning of its summer session. Let me say on this occasion, on a somewhat personal note, that as recently as at the end of April this year I had the pleasant duty of accompanying my Minister for Foreign Affairs on an official visit to your great country, a visit which contributed to the strengthening of the friendly relations so happily existing between our two countries.

I wish also to join all the speakers who intervened before me in expressing warm compliments to Ambassador van Dongen for his effective chairmanship of the Committee on Disarmament in the month of April.

I wish as well to express my sincere and heartfelt thanks to all those distinguished heads and members of delegations who, in their interventions, were kind enough to direct words of welcome to me as the new head of the delegation of my country to the Committee on Disarmament. Let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, and through you all the distinguished members of this Committee, that I shall spare no efforts to contribute to the lofty mission of this noble body, the only forum for multilateral disarmament negotiations.

Let me recall in this connection that my Government took an active part in the process of elaboration of the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament and fully supports its provisions. We strongly believe that its Declaration and Programme of Action provide solid guidelines for the work of our Committee. As the new head of the delegation of Poland I cannot but reiterate the strong conviction of my Government that this Committee constitutes a very important, unique forum for discussing different problems of disarmament and for elaborating disarmament agreements. This conviction stems, inter alia, from my country's deep commitment to the cause of peace and halting the arms race and to disarmament, a conviction that has been proved during the nearly 40-year existence of the Polish People's Republic by its advancing a number of peaceful initiatives and proposals in different international bodies, including this Committee and its predecessors. As the Prime Minister of the Polish People's Republic, General Wojciech Jaruzelski stated recently, "... Peace is our supreme goal. People's Poland has always been on the front line, among its most ardent defenders. In the face of present threats, Poland actively participates in all peaceful efforts of the socialist community of nations and in its constructive efforts ...".

In my first intervention before this Committee on Disarmament I would like to concentrate mainly on the questions of nuclear disarmament, including a nuclear test ban. They are inscribed as the highest priority items on the Committee's agenda; they also figure, as I have mentioned a moment ago, as the most important goals of the foreign policy of my country.

Nuclear weapons are perhaps the most dangerous evil that has confronted humanity in its history. It is a cruel irony of fate that people created this evil themselves. I think, therefore, that it was rightly pointed out at the beginning

(Mr. Turbanski, Poland)

of this session that the total prohibition of the testing of nuclear weapons could be a starting-point for the large-scale process of nuclear disarmament. The quest for a comprehensive nuclear-weapon test ban has been one of the major preoccupations of this Committee and its predecessors. It was contemplated in the preamble to the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water. In the more than 40 resolutions it has so far adopted on this agenda item, the United Nations General Assembly has repeatedly reiterated its grave concern and reaffirmed the greatest urgency and highest priority it attached to the elaboration of a treaty prohibiting all nuclear test explosions, by all States and for all time. Nobody can afford complacency in ignoring urgent calls in this respect from the highest recognized authorities of the international community.

Poland together with other socialist States as well as the overwhelming majority of non-aligned countries have for years been advocating a comprehensive agreement to ban all nuclear-weapon testing. In an eloquent manifestation of this position, the Soviet Union submitted, in document CD/346, the "Basic provisions of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests" at the beginning of the 1983 session of the Committee on Disarmament. The Soviet document takes into consideration the extent of agreement achieved during the discussion of the problem of the complete cessation of nuclear tests in recent years. It takes into account the observations and wishes expressed by many States, in particular in the Committee on Disarmament, on many aspects of the treaty, including questions relating to verification of compliance with it. Right at the beginning of the summer session we have received another important document in this connection, a "Draft treaty banning any nuclear-weapon test explosion in any environment", submitted by the delegation of Sweden. My delegation welcomes this Swedish proposal. We have found in it very many detailed and elaborated provisions and consider them an important contribution to the negotiations on a nuclear test ban. We note also with satisfaction that in many points the provisions of the Swedish draft are convergent with the Soviet "Basic provisions".

It is discouraging, however, to hear that these and many other specific and constructive proposals actually do not serve their purpose because in the relevant Ad Hoc Working Group, even under its present narrow mandate, attempts are being made to shift the discussion to secondary or technical problems. In other words, despite the existing, solid base for concrete negotiations, they are not conducted because of vaguely formulated, political reasons.

Furthermore, let us realize that there will be no ideal solutions to all specific problems, the complexity of which are well known. I refer to the question of peaceful nuclear explosions. Several important statements on peaceful nuclear explosions were made both in plenary and in the Working Group. But to recognize the difficulties and to suggest giving them a "further detailed study" sounds like putting this complex problem on the shelf.

Let me also repeat the long-standing position of my delegation that the early resumption of the tripartite negotiations on a nuclear test ban would give a fresh impetus to our activities in this respect.

(Mr. Turbanski, Poland)

Current developments in the international situation and the general direction of its evolution do not provoke any optimistic thoughts. The statements, declarations or decisions recently made by the leading NATO member States either at Williamsburg or in Paris or Washington bring another phase of sharp political confrontation.

Upon the conclusion of their meeting in Moscow just the day before yesterday, the Party and State leaders of the member States of the Warsaw Treaty Organization once again expressed their grave concern over the situation that is shaping up at present. In an in-depth analysis of this situation and the causes that have led to its aggravation, they confirmed and developed the proposals contained in the Political Declaration of 5 January 1983 which constitute the programme for peace. The leaders of the socialist countries furthermore lent their full support to the Soviet proposals on the on-going disarmament negotiations which could lead to an effective reduction of armed forces and armaments, provided they are conducted in strict compliance with the principle of equality and equal security. The important statement they adopted which I am sure will be distributed as an official document of this Committee and which I trust will be studied with the attention it deserves by all the members of this Committee, confirms that the member States of the Warsaw Treaty Organization are doing and are ready to do everything possible on their part to halt the arms race. At the same time they express their grave concern over the fact that there is no progress in the existing forums for disarmament negotiations, including the Committee on Disarmament.

As everybody can see, it is not the socialist countries which departed from the policy of détente. It is not the policy of the socialist countries that led to the present aggravation of the international situation. In a recently published interview, the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs stated, among other things, that the historically shaped balance of forces between the USSR and the United States, the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO, has over the last decades become a factor of peace in the divided world we live in. The questioning of that parity by the current American administration, the United States' striving to regain a dominant role in the world, is the most important reason for the current tension.

The delegations of the socialist countries which took the floor recently have pronounced themselves in equally clear terms in this connection.

The greatest and most serious threat to peace comes from the madness of the nuclear arms race. No other task is more urgent today, therefore, than the speediest possible ending of that evil and a transition to disarmament. Of key importance in this respect is the elimination of the danger of nuclear confrontation on the European continent. Unfortunately, as the Soviet First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Comrade Gromyko, said in his exposé on Soviet foreign policy, "... It is becoming increasingly clear that the present American administration is pursuing a course not for reaching agreements but for fulfilling its programme of building up strategic arms and deploying new medium-range missiles in western Europe ...".

In a joint statement after the Moscow meeting I have just referred to, the leaders of the socialist countries emphasized again the urgency of this problem and renewed their appeal in this respect. Let me quote: "... Striving to fully free Europe from nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical ones, the

(Mr. Turbanski, Poland)

participants in the meeting consider it necessary to achieve at least an accord that would rule out the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in western European countries and provide for a corresponding reduction of the existing medium-range weapon systems in Europe with the aim of ensuring a balance at the lowest possible level".

According to the latest press reports, unfortunately, the preparatory work for the deployment of these missiles in several countries of western Europe is under way, despite an unprecedented mass movement against this deployment and despite constructive proposals offered by the Soviet Union and supported by all member States of the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

We are, therefore, deeply concerned. We are concerned that the deployment of "Pershing-II" and "cruise" missiles will bring about a new and qualitatively even more dangerous situation in Europe: the risk of a nuclear confrontation will be further greatly increased. I wish, therefore, to quote one phrase from the speech of Pope John Paul II pronounced during his recent visit to Poland, a visit which, despite many perverse press and other media reports, started and continued under the sign of and with a fervent call for peace. The Pope said "The memory of the terrible experiences of the war lived through by Poland and by the other peoples of Europe causes one to renew, once more, the impassioned plea that peace should not be disturbed, and in particular that, at the earliest possible moment and in an effective way, namely, by frank and constructive negotiations, the arms race be remedied".

My delegation, like the delegations of other socialist countries and very many others, is firmly convinced that the Committee on Disarmament is indeed the body called upon to proceed without delay to negotiations on the question of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, as recommended by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 37/78 C.

In fact, I would like to state before concluding that because of the gravity of the present international climate, following the recommendations of numerous United Nations resolutions, this negotiating body may bring real hope to the international community by the elaboration in the near future of satisfactory agreements on such agenda items as those on a nuclear test ban, chemical weapons and radiological weapons. The only condition is, it seems, to start the concrete work. I am in full agreement with what our distinguished colleague, Ambassador Issraelyan, said the other day, namely, that the time for general discussions, evaluations, assessments, etc., in this Committee has already passed. I myself, frankly speaking, a homo novus here, was struck by the lack of speakers during one plenary meeting of the just resumed session and the cancellation of another one because of the lack of speakers. I wonder if it is not a proof that the chapter entitled "General considerations" or "Preparations for negotiations" has been exhausted. We have a sufficiently solid base, enough good proposals for conducting concrete negotiations.

Let us then, start here serious negotiations to provide the General Assembly, as soon as possible, with a "final product": draft agreements. We are strongly convinced that, provided there is a political will, with regard to the prohibition of chemical weapons and radiological weapons, such agreements are within our reach and that with regard to a nuclear test ban further progress is possible during this session.

The Moscow statement of 28 June to which I referred earlier leaves no doubt that on the part of the socialist countries this political will does exist.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Poland for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair and to my country. I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba, Mr. Nuñez Mosquera.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Allow me, Ambassador Ijewere, to express the pleasure of the Cuban delegation at seeing you presiding over the work of the Committee on Disarmament at the beginning of the summer part of our 1983 session. It has been said that this year will be crucial in the matter of disarmament, and it has been your responsibility to assume the chairmanship of this forum at the opening of its summer session.

I should also like to express our thanks to your predecessor in that office, Ambassador van Dongen, and to welcome the new representatives who have joined us here and with whom we shall co-operate closely in the tasks that lie before us. May I also welcome Mr. Jan Martenson, Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations for Disarmament Affairs.

The Committee on Disarmament is meeting at a time when the demands for disarmament and peace are gaining strength in all corners of the globe. In Prague, the Assembly for Peace has just ended its meeting, in which representatives of important organizations from all the continents took part. In Prague, world public opinion has demonstrated once again that it is engaged in a stubborn struggle to halt the preparations for a nuclear war.

The participants in the meeting strongly condemned the plan to deploy in Europe 572 new medium-range nuclear missiles, a plan they described as one of particular gravity, and they reaffirmed the need for a world without wars, without poverty, without misery and without exploitation.

It is to be regretted, however, that this remarkable mass movement and the demands for peace of the international community have not met with the same response throughout the world. Neither, indeed, have the just demands of the peoples for a new international economic order. Information has come to us from the Sixth United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, now in its final phase, of the intransigence of a group of developed capitalist countries, which insist on ignoring the connection between disarmament on the one hand and trade and development on the other, while refusing to include in a draft resolution ideas they earlier accepted. It is abundantly clear that in the case of some governments, the lack of political will to negotiate, in the most diverse spheres, and in spite of solemn declarations, is in fact a daily reality. In the Committee on Disarmament, items of the highest priority are still not the subject of active negotiations or of any tangible agreement.

As regards the subject of a nuclear test ban, the Working Group set up last year is continuing with a limited mandate, although it is clear that there is no time for further delay on this matter. In addition to documents submitted to us in the past, including the basic provisions presented by the delegation of the Soviet Union, we now have the draft treaty just put before us by the Swedish delegation, which is yet another contribution to our search for solutions acceptable to all. By way of preliminary comment only — since we shall have the opportunity to go into greater detail in the relevant Working Group — I should like to refer briefly to document CD/381, with a view to clarification for the sake of progress in the actual negotiations on the subject.

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

In my delegation's view, the references to large non-nuclear explosions are out of place in the context of the proposed treaty, which is to be on nuclear weapon tests, and the inclusion of such references could complicate and delay the negotiations and the achievement of the relevant agreements. Similarly, and although we recognize the value of the arguments put forward in the Working Group, we do not believe that it is necessary for the purposes of the treaty we are to negotiate to include provision for a system of exchange of data on atmospheric radioactivity as part of the verification process. As far as the so-called on-site inspections are concerned, the details of these should be considered during the actual process of negotiation of a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests; their complexity is yet one more proof of the need to broaden the mandate of the Working Group without delay so that we may all be in a position to discuss every aspect of the problem. The same applies to the proposed consultative committee. Detailed consideration of such a committee requires actual negotiations and a negotiating mandate for the Working Group.

The documents the Committee has before it on the subject of a nuclear test ban and the valuable exchange of views which took place in the Working Group show that we have already reached the stage at which we should be beginning the process of negotiation. Repeating time and again that it is "necessary" to discuss technical details in no way helps forward the work of this forum. The documents we have before us prove once more that there is in the Committee on Disarmament a sufficient basis for negotiation. The vast majority of States, as was shown by the non-aligned countries at the recently concluded session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, consider that there are no longer any technical obstacles to the adoption of the treaty, and it is therefore extremely anti-democratic and dangerous to invent new verification obstacles. This merely reveals the lack of political will on the part of certain delegations.

Another important item in the work of the Committee on Disarmament, and one on which serious efforts are being made to achieve concrete agreements, is that of the prohibition of chemical weapons. However, the drafting process has yet to be begun in the relevant Working Group, although it is repeatedly said that areas of agreement are being identified. If there are indeed areas of agreement, why, then, do we not begin the process of drafting?

The situation is also disturbing with regard to the comprehensive programme of disarmament which the Committee is required to submit to the General Assembly this year. It has to be admitted that little progress has been made, at least as regards the important chapters, since the conclusion of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. There are still delegations which insist on ignoring the priorities laid down in 1978, at the time of the General Assembly's first special session on disarmament, in particular with regard to the need to adopt urgent measures of nuclear disarmament. Those delegations do not move from their initial positions and in effect exclude the possibility of any fair agreement in accordance with the interests of the international community and the demands of the majority

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

of peoples. It is essential in this connection to consolidate what has already been achieved and to try to reach agreement on outstanding issues. Work on the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament should be continued intensively and the Committee ought not to shirk this task.

There are other items on the Committee's agenda which are not being considered in this forum, in spite of the fact that they are subjects of recognized priority; and there are still other items, also priority ones, which do not even appear on the Committee's agenda, despite requests made by the United Nations General Assembly.

What has happened up to now with respect to the item on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, which is the subject of our plenary meeting this week? What are we going to tell the General Assembly this year about the consideration we have given to this item? In my delegation's view, it is essential for us to redouble our efforts to secure the establishment of a working group to initiate concrete negotiations on this subject, taking into account the documents which have already been submitted to the Committee and any others which may be submitted in the future. It is incomprehensible that owing to the persistent opposition of a small group of Western countries the Committee on Disarmament should have been unable to establish a subsidiary body to negotiate on the cessation of the nuclear arms race, in spite of the urgency of the question. It is high time for us to adopt serious measures in this connection, or confidence in our work will decline even further.

The same can be said in connection with the prevention of nuclear war and the setting up of a working group to begin negotiations on the practical measures which should be taken towards this end. My delegation believes that it is clear to everyone what steps the peoples of the world wish us to take to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war. There are working papers on this subject which have been submitted by representatives of the Group of 21, the group of socialist countries and the group of western countries. There is no reason why, after discussing questions of procedure in this connection for six weeks during the spring part of the session, this negotiating body should not have set up a working group on this subject. Everyone knows how much we have been urged to initiate concrete negotiations on the prevention of a nuclear war, and we ought to discharge our responsibilities in this connection without further delay.

As regards outer space, consultations have been begun with a view to setting up a working group to negotiate an appropriate solution for the prevention of an arms race in that environment. As you all know, practical working papers containing well-defined mandates have been submitted to the Committee on Disarmament both by the non-aligned and neutral countries and by the socialist group of countries. These documents were submitted some time ago and we are still awaiting the reaction of the group of western countries. We are aware that they are ready to submit their own ideas on

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

this subject, which we hope will be consonant with the negotiating function expected of us. Anything less — a limited mandate, like the one given to the Working Group on a Nuclear Test Ban — would be regrettable.

In conclusion, I should like to refer to another subject to which my delegation attaches considerable importance, namely, the need to draft a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. In its resolution 37/100 C of 13 December 1982, the United Nations General Assembly decided to transmit a draft convention on this important question to the Committee on Disarmament and it requested the Committee to undertake negotiations as a matter of priority with a view to achieving agreement on this subject, taking as a basis the text of the draft convention I have referred to. The non-aligned countries have likewise recently reaffirmed the urgency of the need to eliminate the use of nuclear weapons for ever. The Cuban delegation believes that it is high time for the Committee to begin considering appropriate measures in response to this request, so that we may be able to give the General Assembly at its next session satisfactory information on the results of our efforts.

These are some of the outstanding issues still before us, important issues which call for speedy and decisive action on our part. My delegation will work tirelessly to try to achieve progress in them for the sake of the survival of mankind, and to this end we are prepared to co-operate with you, Mr. Chairman, and with all our colleagues.

Allow me, lastly, to welcome the new participants in the fifth United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme which began yesterday, who are among us today. We wish them all success and we urge them to make every effort to prepare themselves for the struggle to bring about a world without arms, without poverty, without misery and without exploitation.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Cuba for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Ethiopia, Ambassador Terrefe.

Mr. TERREFE (Ethiopia): Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on this last occasion because I did not want to miss the opportunity, today being the last day of your chairmanship, to congratulate you, especially as a member of the Group of 21, and as a founding member, in fact, of what used to be the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. At that particular date, some 20 years ago, the group was a minority of eight, but it has now grown to a majority of 21. Your country, Sir, having served from the formative stage to the present, is in a better position to know how frustrating it is that progress is slow. In feeling this, I wish to tell you that you are not alone: most of us feel the same way about the lack of progress on the concrete disarmament issues for whose negotiation this multilateral forum was created.

Secondly, I would like to take the opportunity also to thank your predecessor, the distinguished Ambassador of the Netherlands, and to express to him, through you, the satisfaction of my delegation for the work that was well done. I would also like to say a few words regarding the participants in the Fellowship Programme. Again, Mr. Chairman, it was your country which took the initiative in securing the decision in 1978 which has in fact become the cornerstone for the Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament designed for these young diplomats who would like to specialize in the field of disarmament. It is proper and fitting, therefore, that the fifth group of such trainees should have started its programme during your chairmanship of the Committee. My delegation warmly welcomes the 1983 participants in this programme, which I am sure will greatly benefit the majority of the States that are represented here.

I would only express the hope that in their search for knowledge and international peace the participants will give particular attention to the nuclear threats faced by the regions they come from, and that the countries they are to visit will provide them with information which will enhance their grasp of the problems involved.

I have particularly in mind the area of our continent, Africa, where the nuclear threat has become a real one now that South Africa has gone ahead with its nuclear programme and has become a real threat to the region. For most of these members and for the participants I think this would form a very important part of their programme. Needless to say, for some of us coming from the developing world, the lack of scientific knowledge prevents us from having a good mastery of the issues involved, which are very important for effective participation in the deliberations of the Committee on Disarmament.

I would like now to turn, even though it is in a less formal way, to certain issues. The first issue I want to raise concerns the mobilization of world public opinion in favour of disarmament; and I am pleased that we have the presence of the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Martenson, whose efforts will, I believe, be of assistance in the conduct of the World Disarmament Campaign the decision concerning which was supported by the United Nations. It seems to me

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

that in the light of this we should perhaps stress the importance of education and public information activities. My delegation firmly believes that, to borrow the words of the UNESCO Constitution, "Since war starts in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defence of peace must be established". This point is, I think, very relevant and a current one, and it is to us the light of hope which should guide the work of this Committee, especially at this particular time when there appears to be much reticence about getting things done and accomplishing some concrete work of negotiation.

The second issue I want to raise is that of a nuclear test ban. With respect to the question of a nuclear test ban, my delegation shares the view which was eloquently expressed by the distinguished representative of Brazil, Ambassador de Souza e Silva, in his statement at the plenary meeting on 23 June.

As regards the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Nuclear Test Ban, the question of verification and compliance has, in our view, been adequately addressed. Taking into account the existing means of verification systems, to further delay and postpone the consideration of a treaty on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests is unjustified. My delegation expresses its appreciation to Ambassador Rose of the German Democratic Republic, the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on a Nuclear Test Ban, as well as to his predecessor, Ambassador Herder, for their efforts in trying to find a method of work that would enable the Working Group to advance in a rational manner.

My delegation has in the past stated that the issue of a nuclear test ban is the major question in disarmament negotiations and that partial prohibition in fact did not slow the nuclear arms race. It has been pointed out many times that the rate of testing of new and more devastating weapons continues to grow in the face of persistent international calling for the cessation of the arms race and for a freeze on nuclear-weapon tests. My delegation has also maintained and still maintains the position that our major efforts should be directed towards negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they are completely eliminated from the arsenals of war. This view is shared by the overwhelming majority of the members of this Committee and there should be no reason why we should show any kind of reticence in this particular direction.

I would like to conclude this brief statement by welcoming the new representatives of the German Democratic Republic, Iran, Peru, Poland, Sweden and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor?

The secretariat has circulated today, at my request, a time-table for meetings of the Committee and its subsidiary bodies for the coming week. That time-table has been prepared in consultation with the chairmen of the working groups and, as usual, is merely indicative and subject to change, if necessary. If there is no objection I will consider that the Committee adopts the time-table as circulated, with a minor amendment which is as follows.

(The Chairman)

The meeting of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-Nuclear-Weapon States Against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons, which was to be held at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, 5 July 1983, is to be moved to Wednesday at the same time. That is the only minor amendment. Is there any objection to that? The representative of France has the floor.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (translated from French): My delegation has no objection to this time-table in general, Mr. Chairman. I should simply like to say that we would prefer time-tables to be arranged in such a way that meetings of working groups do not coincide with our plenary meetings. I am fully aware that this is rather difficult to achieve but we would prefer, if possible, that such conflicts should be avoided in the future.

Mr. Chairman, since I have taken the floor at a plenary meeting on the last day of your chairmanship, I should like to take the opportunity to offer you the congratulations and thanks of my delegation for the outstanding way in which you have guided our work during an all-too-brief period, and I should at the same time like to offer our thanks to your predecessor, Ambassador van Dongen, who guided our work during the month of April.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the Ambassador of France. The secretariat has promised to make efforts to ensure that your proposals are taken care of when they next draw up a time-table, and will try to avoid any conflicts between plenary meetings and ad hoc working group meetings. If I may, I would also like to thank you for the kind words you addressed to the Chair.

Mr. SKINNER (Canada): I just wanted to underline something which is obvious in the time-table you have distributed today, but as I think all of us, in a way, are conditioned to meeting at certain times I would like to point out that the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons, which normally meets on Wednesdays, will meet next week on Friday in the afternoon, as, indeed, the time-table points out.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I believe we can now adopt the time-table. I see no objection.

The time-table was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, as this is my last day as Chairman of the Committee for the month of June, I do not intend to make a concluding statement, as this has been a rather short chairmanship and in my opinion it would be premature to draw any conclusions from the work of the Committee. However, I consider it my duty to express my thanks to all members of the Committee for their co-operation during my chairmanship. In particular, I wish to say how grateful I am to my predecessor, Ambassador van Dongen, whose notes when handing over the office were extremely valuable to me. I also wish to thank the secretariat under the able leadership of Ambassador Rikhi Jaipal and his deputy Mr. Berasategui.

(The Chairman)

I need not say that without their co-operation nothing would have been possible. It has been their spirit of co-operation which made it possible for the Committee to adopt its programme of work for the second part of the session very quickly, and I am grateful for the flexibility shown by all in accepting the proposal made by the Chairman. At the same time, we should not delude ourselves into complacency. The programme of work is merely an instrument to enable us to conduct our work in an orderly manner. The Committee is faced with substantive issues, the importance of which I do not need to emphasize. I have been conducting consultations on the question of how to proceed with item 7 of the agenda, dealing with the prevention of an arms race in outer space. The contact group has already met twice and its third meeting is scheduled for this afternoon. I intend to report to the incoming Chairman on the results of these consultations so that he may be in a position to continue our work on that and other questions. I do wish him success during his tenure of office. Again, I want to say **I thank you all for your co-operation.** The next plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament will be held on Tuesday, 5 July 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.