

CD/PV.78
15 April 1980
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH MEETING
held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 15 April 1980, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. L. SOLA VILA

(Cuba)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. SALAH-BEY
Mr. A. BENYAMINA

Argentina: Mr. A. DUMONT
Miss N. FREYRE PENABAD

Australia: Mr. A. BEHM
Ms. M. WICKES

Belgium: Mr. J-M. NOIRFALISSE

Brazil: Mr. S. DE QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria: Mr. P. VOUTOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV
Mr. K. PRAMOV
Mr. POPTCHEV

Burma: U NGWE WIN

Canada: Mr. D.S. McPHAIL
Mr. J.T. SIMARD

China: Mr. LIANG De-Fen
Mr. YANG Hu-Shan
Mr. PAN Ju-Shen
Mr. XIN Shie-Jie

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. F. ORTIZ
Mrs. V. BORODOWSKY JACKIEWICH

Czechoslovakia: Mr. M. RUZEK
Mr. P. LUKES
Mr. V. ROHAL-ILKIV
Mr. J. JIRUSEK

Egypt: Mr. O. EL-SHAFEI
Mr. M. EL-BARADEI
Mr. N. FAHMY

Ethiopia: Mr. T. TERREFE
Mr. F. YOHANNES

France: Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
Mr. J. DE BEAUSSE
Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI
Mr. KAULFUSS

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. G. PFEIFFER
Mr. N. KLINGER
Mr. H. MULLER

Hungary: Mr. A. LAKATOS

India: Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia: Mr. A. SANI
Mr. M. SIDIK
Mr. D.B. SULEMAN
Mr. H.M.U. SILABAN

Iran: Mr. N. DABIRI

Italy: Mr. M. MORENO
Mr. F. DE LUCA
Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan: Mr. Y. OKAWA
Mr. R. ISHII

Kenya: Mr. S. SHITEMI
Mr. G.N. MUNIU

Mexico: Mr. A. GARCÍA ROBLES
Mr. M. CACERES

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDUMBILEG
Mr. L. ERDENECHULUUN
Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco: Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands: Mr. R.H. FEIN
Mr. H. VAGENMAKERS

Nigeria: Mr. O. ADENIJI
Mr. T.O. OLUMOKO

Pakistan: Mr. M. AKRAM

Peru: Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO

Poland: Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. J. CIALOWICZ
Mr. H. PAC

Romania: Mr. O. IONESCU
Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka: Mr. I.B. FONSEKA

Sweden: Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. L. NORBERG

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics: Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN
Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV
Mr. E.D. ZAITZEV
Mr. B.I. KORNEYENKO
Mr. E.K. POTYARKIN
Mr. V.M. GANJA
Mr. N.P. SHELEPIN

United Kingdom:

Mr. D. SUMMERHAYES

Mr. N.H. MARSHALL

Mrs. J.I. LINK

United States of America:

Mr. C. FLOWERREE

Mr. A. AKALOVSKY

Mr. M. DALEY

Mr. S. FITZGERALD

Mr. H. WILSON

Mr. C.G. TAYLOR

Venezuela:

Mrs. G. DA SILVA

Yugoslavia:

Mr. D. DJOKIC

Zaire:

Mr. KALONJI TSHIKALA KAKWAKA

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

Mr. R. JAIPAL

Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria) (translated from Russian): Comrade Chairman, as I am speaking for the first time at a formal meeting this month, I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating you, as representative of fraternal Cuba, on your assumption of the Chairmanship of the Committee for the month of April, when our discussions on the various agenda items are becoming more detailed. We are sure that under your skilful guidance the Committee will be able to conclude the first part of its session with results that are in keeping with its great prestige.

The Bulgarian delegation attaches particular importance to the consideration this week of agenda item 2 entitled "Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament". The reasons for this approach are as follows:

First, the socialist countries, including the People's Republic of Bulgaria, are convinced of the need to assign a central place in our work to efforts to elaborate measures for curbing the nuclear arms race and for the transition to nuclear disarmament. This position of ours, as the delegations of other socialist countries have already stated, is set forth in the Moscow Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty member States of November 1978. It was reflected and further developed in the new concrete proposals contained in the communiqué of the meeting of the Committee of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Warsaw Treaty member States held at Berlin on 5 and 6 December 1979 (document CD/58). In this connexion the Bulgarian delegation would like to stress that the USSR has performed outstanding services in the struggle against nuclear weapons. As Comrade Todor Zhivkov, President of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, declared in his recent speech, "the Soviet Union has submitted proposals and tirelessly fought for a ban on nuclear weapons, for a ban on nuclear-weapon tests, for the progressive reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons leading to their complete elimination, and for commitments by States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons".

The special priority of the question of nuclear disarmament was noted in the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and also in resolution 34/83J.

Secondly, we are alarmed by a whole series of events that are related to the problem of nuclear armaments. These events occurred after the Committee's session last year and are important in particular because of their negative effect on the prospects for negotiations on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

I should like to dwell in greater detail on these events.

The process of limiting strategic offensive arms was slowed down and is threatened by a unilateral decision by one of the sides to postpone ratification of this important treaty. At the previous session of the Committee on Disarmament, the vast majority of delegations expressed the opinion that the SALT II Treaty, although bilateral, was of paramount importance for peace and security on our planet and also had a direct effect on possibilities for a further reduction of nuclear weapons as a whole. The United States Government's decision to postpone indefinitely the ratification of SALT II places an obstacle in the way of SALT III, which was intended to lead to a further significant reduction in the number of strategic nuclear weapons and also in their qualitative indicators, without any departure from the principle of equal rights and equal security for the sides.

The position as regards the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament is further complicated by NATO's decision of 12 December last year to deploy nearly 600 United States medium-range nuclear missiles in the territory of a number of West European States. It should be stressed first of all that the official Soviet proposal for starting negotiations on medium-range missiles has thus been left without an answer. The Soviet proposal expressed the USSR's willingness to reduce the number of medium-range missiles in the Western regions of the Soviet Union by comparison with the present level if no new types of United States medium-range nuclear missiles were deployed for the purpose of changing the existing strategic balance in Europe. A quantitative reduction of armaments and a limitation of fire power were also proposed. However, no corresponding willingness was displayed by NATO. On the contrary, a decision was taken to produce and deploy Pershing-2 rockets and Cruise missiles.

Even after NATO had taken this decision, the Soviet Union expressed a clear position regarding the negotiations, declaring that they would be possible provided that the NATO decision was cancelled or its implementation officially suspended. But the facts show that NATO's nuclear plans are being put into effect as scheduled. Reports have already appeared in the newspapers concerning the conclusion of a contract with the firm producing the Cruise nuclear missile. Furthermore, the new United States nuclear programme for military purposes is so extensive that according to some calculations there will not be enough fissionable material for weapons production during the present decade.

(Mr. Vrutov, Bulgaria)

There is yet another problem that is related to NATO's decision to produce and deploy medium-range nuclear weapons, this is the link between nuclear and conventional weapons, a link which people in NATO circles like to stress. It is well known that in December last year the representatives of NATO member States took a number of concrete decisions in Brussels with a view to modernizing their conventional weapons systems as well as their nuclear systems. Thus the programmes elaborated in Washington in May 1978 are being put into effect.

Clearly, this is a question of a new military and strategic concept based on the desire to raise the level of NATO armaments by sophisticated means with a view to achieving strategic superiority over the Warsaw Treaty member States already in the course of the present decade.

The development of international relations in the past decade, and particularly mutual relations and negotiations between the States in the sphere of disarmament, were based on the principles of equality and non-impairment of the security of any of the parties. Rejection of this principle -- and, objectively speaking, this is precisely the path which certain circles in the West are taking -- means embarking on a new spiral in the arms race, unprecedented in scale and fraught with dangers for the maintenance of peace on our planet. There is no doubt that this is very well understood by all representatives of countries members of the Committee on Disarmament who are present here.

The question arises: how can the Committee on Disarmament contribute to the elaboration of practical measures to halt and then reverse the nuclear arms race.

The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria believes that the role of the Committee as an appropriate forum for conducting negotiations in the field of nuclear disarmament is becoming even more important. It is essential to start consultations in the very near future in order to progress as rapidly as possible to the stage of negotiations on this issue of paramount importance. Already at the previous session of the Committee, the Socialist countries presented their proposal concerning the preparation and stages of negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed (document CD/4). This proposal still holds good. Indeed, in the opinion of our delegation, today, in the international situation which has arisen and with the existing danger of an expansion in the nuclear arms race, this proposal is more relevant than ever.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

It is not the purpose of my statement to analyse the proposal contained in document CD/4. All the sponsors of the proposal have already done that several times. I should like, however, to take this opportunity to stress a few particularly important, and I would say fundamental, requirements for negotiations on the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.

First, the conditio sine qua non is that all five nuclear Powers should participate in the negotiations. In this connexion, the participation of France and China in the multilateral body for disarmament negotiations constitutes the minimum of the essential requirements. In our opinion, it would be useful if delegations which have not yet expressed an opinion on the proposal of the Socialist countries were to do so. In this way, positions on this question will be clarified; and this will facilitate discussions on the practical possibilities of starting consultations. The Bulgarian delegation would like to stress once again the need for strict respect of the principles of equal rights and equal security for the parties.

Negotiations on nuclear disarmament should be accompanied by the elaboration of appropriate international legal guarantees for the security of non-nuclear States. The Committee has already made some progress in the discussion of this question, and we believe that its efforts will lead ultimately to the conclusion of an international convention providing non-nuclear-weapon States with guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against them.

Negotiations on nuclear disarmament which might be started in the framework of the Committee on Disarmament must on no account become a substitute for or obstacle to other negotiations on this subject. We will welcome any talks on strategic weapons. It is essential that the United States of America should ratify SALT II as soon as possible. That will open the way for further progress in this direction, i.e. for preparations for negotiations on SALT III. We are also in favour of considering all problems connected with military détente and disarmament in Europe. We think that it is time to prepare for the convening of a European conference at the political level on these problems, taking into account the proposals made both by the Warsaw Treaty member States and by some Western countries.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

The Bulgarian delegation, mindful of the pressing need for practical measures with a view to starting negotiations on nuclear disarmament, fully endorses the idea of setting up a subsidiary body on this subject at the present session of the Committee. This subsidiary body might be mandated to settle as soon as possible all the organizational problems connected with the preparation and initiation of negotiations on the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of such weapons until they have been completely eliminated. This mandate would be in keeping with document CD/4, which states that:

"For the purpose of preparing the negotiations, consultations should be held in the framework of the Committee on Disarmament. The set of questions to be considered should be determined in the course of these preparatory consultations, during which matters connected with the organizational side of the conduct of the negotiations should also be settled. Although the Committee on Disarmament is the most suitable forum for the preparation and conduct of the negotiations, alternative methods may be considered."

It is clear, then, that a broad and constructive basis exists for work on the preparation of such negotiations, which would be of historic significance. The States members of the Committee on Disarmament should urgently concern themselves with practical measures to settle all the remaining questions in order to open the way for negotiations on the most important disarmament issue — the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.

Comrade Chairman, I should like to revert briefly to the item which the Committee considered last week, namely "New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons". The question of banning the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction has been occupying an increasingly important place not only in the latest sessions of the Committee on Disarmament but also in the complex of disarmament problems as a whole. The need to erect a reliable barrier to the development of ever more types of weapons of mass destruction acquires particular significance in the light of the fact that the arms race, which used rather to be of a quantitative nature, is now increasingly taking the form of qualitative improvements in existing types and systems of weapons and the development of basically new types and systems of such weapons. In the course of the modern

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

technological revolution, new types of weapons of mass destruction, with a lethality not merely equal to but even exceeding that of existing types of nuclear and chemical weapons, may emerge in the near future.

We noted with satisfaction and wholeheartedly endorse the Soviet delegation's renewed proposal for setting up within the framework of the Committee a group of qualified Government experts which could concern itself both with the preparation of a comprehensive agreement and with the preparation of agreements on particular new types of weapons of mass destruction.

With regard to radiological weapons, our delegation has already expressed its views on this question at the previous session of the Committee. We consider that the Soviet-United States draft constitutes a sound basis for negotiations on the elaboration of a future convention. The Bulgarian delegation will play an active part in the forthcoming negotiations in the Working Group on Radiological Weapons, thus contributing to the conclusion of an international convention on radiological weapons. We are convinced that the successful completion of work on such a convention will help to activate negotiations on other aspects of disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Bulgaria for his statement and for the kind words he has addressed to my country and to myself.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Comrade Chairman, today, the delegation of the Soviet Union would like to express some considerations of a practical nature connected with the Committee's discussion on the question of the prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, and, in this context, the prohibition of individual concrete types of new weapons of this kind.

In this connexion, the Soviet delegation wishes to draw attention to the fact that on 11 April 1980 Mr. A.A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, addressed a letter to Dr. Kurt Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations, on the tasks of the second Disarmament Decade. As this letter stresses, the Soviet Union believes that the main task of this Decade is to preserve, strengthen and further develop the positive results obtained in curbing the arms race during the 1970s, and to secure the adoption of practical measures in this field, in particular the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In the course of the discussion in the Committee on Disarmament — both at the previous session and at the current session — on the question of the prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction and in particular radiological weapons, many delegations have shown a constructive approach to this problem and have stressed the need to start negotiations on this matter as soon as possible. As is known, a joint USSR-United States proposal on the major elements of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons has been submitted to the Committee.

The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction that a number of delegations, including those of Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Sweden, the Netherlands, Belgium, Egypt and Pakistan, have made specific comments on this question and also on the document submitted by the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States of America concerning the major elements of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons; and it wishes to express its gratitude to them. This testifies to the fact that many members of the Committee are displaying a serious and responsible approach to the solution of this important problem. The Soviet delegation will, of course, carefully study the comments and proposals made by other delegations on the question of the prohibition of radiological weapons. The Soviet delegation, for its part, is also prepared to collaborate in every way in fruitful work by the Committee on the elaboration of a draft international treaty on this subject. In our opinion, the necessary conditions exist in the Committee for making a practical start on this work. A decision has been taken in the Committee to set up a Working Group on the Prohibition of Radiological Weapons. There are reasons to believe also that the question of its Chairman — Ambassador Kórnives, representative of the Hungarian People's Republic — can be solved without complications as well. There is the joint USSR-United States proposal on the major elements of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons; and there are also the comments on it made by other delegations at the previous and current sessions of the Committee.

Thus, all the basic conditions exist — and I stress this point — for the Working Group to start work without delay on the preparation of a draft international agreement on the prohibition of radiological weapons. The conclusion of such an agreement would be a genuine contribution to the cause of limiting the arms race and of disarmament.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Comrade Chairman, the Soviet delegation would also like to dwell on another question. As is known, on 1 April, the delegation of the Soviet Union submitted for the Committee's consideration a proposal for the establishment within the Committee of a group of experts which would meet periodically and could concern itself with the preparation of a draft comprehensive agreement and with the consideration of the question of concluding special agreements on individual types of weapons of mass destruction. We note with satisfaction that this proposal of ours has met with a definite response from the members of the Committee. Many delegations, including the delegations of the socialist countries and also of Egypt and Pakistan, have expressed themselves in support of this proposal, viewing it rightly as a concrete step on the way to a practical solution of the problem of the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction. In our opinion, the Committee could already during the present part of the session take an appropriate decision to establish such a group of experts, particularly since no objection has been raised to this proposal during the discussion on the question of the prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. We would be grateful to all delegations, especially those which have responded favourably to our proposal, for their views on the mandate of this group of experts and also on questions relating to the organization of its work.

Mr. JAIPAL (Secretary of the Committee and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General): I should like to report to the Committee that I have received the following letter from Mr. Corradini, Provisional Secretary-General of the NPT Conference. I quote: "I wish to inform you that the Preparatory Committee for the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, at its third session held in Geneva from 24 March to 1 April 1980, agreed that the report of the Committee on Disarmament on its 1980 session should be made available to participants in the Second Review Conference. Consequently, I should be grateful if you could arrange for a sufficient number of copies of the Committee's report to be reproduced and put at the disposal of participants in the Conference, which will convene at the Palais des Nations in Geneva on 11 August 1980. Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter."

(Mr. Jaipal, Secretary of the Committee and
Personal Representative of the Secretary-General)

My enquiries reveal that the additional copies needed by the NPT Review Conference in its official and working languages are the following: 150 in English, 50 in French, 50 copies in Spanish and 25 copies in Russian. If this Committee sees no objection, when the final text of this Committee's report for this year is approved, the secretariat will request the Department of Conference Services to make available the number of additional copies required for the NPT Review Conference. I am told that simultaneous reproduction of the copies for the NPT Conference, together with our own requirements, will reduce the overall expense. I propose also to inform the secretariat of the NPT Review Conference that the cost of production of the additional copies requested by it will be charged to the Review Conference, whose expenses are borne by the Parties to the NPT.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): I thank the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General and Secretary of the Committee for his statement. If there are no objections, the secretariat will proceed as suggested by Ambassador Jaipal.

Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask whether, before taking this decision, it would not be advisable to consider the effect it might have on the date of the conclusion of the Committee's work in the so-called summer session. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): At the moment we are considering that, as in previous years, the time for the conclusion of the session might be the end of July, bearing in mind that the Review Conference is to begin on 11 August. As the request relates to the report which the Committee is to submit to the United Nations General Assembly, the time lapse between the conclusion of work and the preparation of the report would also have to be taken into account. We think there should be enough time to transmit the report to the NPT Review Conference. If any other delegation so wishes, I do not think that the Chairman and the secretariat would have any objections to the Committee proceeding now to discuss the closing date of the second or so-called summer session.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, my delegation has already had occasion to speak at our first session on this delicate question of the interdependence or interrelationship between the work of our Committee and that of other conferences on disarmament: and we stressed then that in our opinion, in view of the importance of its mandate and its place in the over-all system for the consideration and discussion of disarmament questions and for negotiations on them, our Committee should not in every case make way for other meetings and organize its work in the light of the dates of such meetings, always leaving its decision subject to the decisions of other bodies. This does not in any way mean that, in my delegation's view, we should not consider carefully the needs of all delegations and the organizational and staffing problems raised by such meetings; and in any event, we must arrive at reasonable solutions. In the light of these considerations, I wonder whether we should really think of concluding our session at the end of July, when the NPT Review Conference is starting on 12 August. I wonder whether it is really necessary for us to leave an interval of that length in order to ensure that the report we would adopt at the end of July can be published and distributed on 12 August at the Review Conference. I think that this would really be complying too zealously with the request from the secretariat of the Review Conference. I think that, if we were to finish our work at the end of the first week in August, i.e., on 8 August, we would even then have a relatively short session, since it would have lasted less than two months; if I remember rightly, we are to convene on 12 June. But, according to the proposal I have just heard, we would in fact have a session of only six weeks. Could we not make an effort and, bearing in mind of course the needs of delegations that will be taking part in the NPT Review Conference, finish our work before that Conference? That is a decision we can accept in advance very willingly; but we should at least continue the Committee's work up to the eve of the Review Conference. If we adopt our report on 7 or 8 August, this document could be produced and circulated in the following days, in other words in plenty of time for it to be considered at leisure by the delegations meeting for the NPT Review Conference. I venture to submit these considerations to my colleagues: the second part of the session is already so short that to reduce it by one more week would really raise serious problems regarding the substantial nature of our discussions during this summer period.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I fully share the views just expressed by the representative of France and I consider that we should not artificially shorten the period of the summer session, especially in circumstances when, to put it frankly, we have no reason to boast of great successes. However, in order to determine the Soviet delegation's position, I should like to receive a reply from the secretariat, perhaps not today but at the next meeting. Do any difficulties arise for the secretariat in organizing the work of the Committee on Disarmament in August? Does the availability of technical services for the work of our Committee depend on other conferences and meetings, or could we work independently of any other conferences, including the one to which reference has been made at today's meeting?

Mr. JAIPAL (Secretary of the Committee and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General): Mr. Chairman, I am informed that this Committee can function quite independently and that the Conference Service has made adequate arrangements. There will in fact be no problem, and furthermore I should like to clarify that it is not necessary that the report of this Committee be made available to the NPT Review Conference before it convenes on 11 August. The copies of the reports could be made available during the NPT Conference.

Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, my delegation does not believe it is appropriate for us to try, here and now, to fix the closing date for the summer session. What is more, we feel it would be premature to do so. If I ventured to ask a question on this subject a few minutes ago, it was because I felt that if we were to interpret the Provisional Secretary-General's request as meaning that the report should be transmitted before or, at the latest, at the opening of the Conference, this would mean, as you have rightly pointed out, that we would have to conclude our summer session at the end of July. On this point, I feel that to conclude the session at the end of July would be completely abnormal. The tradition of the CCD always was that we should carry on working until the end of August; and even last year, if my memory does not fail me, we worked until the middle of August.

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

My delegation fully shares the view expressed by the distinguished representative of France, Ambassador de la Gorce; and ever since the last time this matter was discussed, we have placed on record our position, which is the same as that expressed a few moments ago, as I have already said, by the distinguished representative of France -- namely that the sessions of our Committee, which after all is the principal if not the only multilateral organ for disarmament negotiations, are totally independent of other conferences. This does not mean that when, owing to the situation in which a considerable number of delegations find themselves, it is necessary to remember that the gift of ubiquity has still not been discovered, my delegation would not be prepared to accept a solution which would reconcile the interests of our Committee with those of other conferences; but I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that it is rather premature now to attempt to do so. We do not know what the situation will be in June, July and August. My delegation still hopes, it still ventures to hope, that we will this year be able to set up a fifth working group on a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the reply to be sent to Mr. Corradini should be to the effect that the Committee on Disarmament agrees to transmit to him the number of copies he needs, but that its agreement to do so should not be regarded as prejudging in any way the date on which the Committee on Disarmament will be able to transmit them, since the closing date of the summer session has still not been decided upon and will not be decided upon until the summer session.

Mr. JAIPAL (Secretary of the Committee and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General): Mr. Chairman, as concerns our reply to the Provisional Secretary-General of the Second NPT Review Conference, perhaps we might be authorized simply to inform him that, whenever the report of this Committee has been approved, we shall make additional copies available to the NPT Review Conference.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): If there are no objections, the Chair considers that the reply that might be given to the Provisional Secretary of the NPT Review Conference could be a combination of what the secretariat has just said and of the proposal by Ambassador García Robles -- namely, that we are prepared to provide the documents needed for the Conference but without giving a date, since we are unable at present to fix the closing date.

If there are no objections, this could be the decision on the reply to the Provisional Secretary. I see there are no objections.

It is so decided.

The next plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 17 April, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.