

FINAL RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD PLENARY MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 21 April 1982, at 6.30 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. Yoshio OKAWA

(Japan)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Algeria: Mr. M. MATI
Mr. A. TAPPAR

Argentina: Miss N. NASCIMBENE

Australia: Mr. D.M. SADLEIR
Mr. R. STEELE

Belgium: Mr. A. ONKELINX
Mr. J.M. NOIRFALISSE

Brazil: Mr. C.A. de SOUZA E SILVA
Mr. S. de QUEIROZ DUARTE

Bulgaria: Mr. K. TELLALOV
Mr. I. SOTIROV
Mr. P. POPCHEV
Mr. K. PRAMOV

Burma: U MAUNG MAUNG GYI
U THAN TUN

Canada: Mr. D.S. McPHAIL
Mr. J. GAUDREAU

China: Mr. TIAN JIN
Mr. LIN CHENG
Mr. HU XIAODI

Cuba: Mr. L. SOLA VILA
Mr. P. NUNEZ MOSQUERA
Mr. A.V. GONZALEZ
Mr. J. LUIS GARCIA

Czechoslovakia: Mr. M. VEJVODA
Mr. J. STRUCKA
Mr. A. CIMA

Egypt: Mr. I.A. HASSAN
Mr. M.N. FAHMY
Miss W. BASSIM

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

France: Mr. J. DE BEAUSSE
Mr. M. COUTHURES

German Democratic Republic: Mr. G. HERDER
Mr. H. THIELICKE

Germany, Federal Republic of: Mr. H. WEGENER
Mr. N. KLINGLER
Mr. W. ROHR

Hungary: Mr. I. KOMIVES
Mr. C. GYORFFY

India: Mr. S. SARAN

Indonesia: Mr. N. SUTRESNA
Mr. I. DAMANIK
Mr. B. SIMANJUNTAK
Mr. A. BAHRI

Iran: Mr. M.J. MAHALLATI

Italy: Mr. M. ALESSI
Mr. B. CABRAS
Mr. C.M. OLIVA
Mr. E. DI GIOVANNI

Japan: Mr. Y. OKAWA
Mr. M. TAKAHASHI
Mr. K. TANAKA
Mr. T. ARAI

Kenya: Mr. D.D. DON NANJIRA

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

Mongolia: Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG
Mr. L. BAYART
Mr. S.O. BOLD

Morocco:

Mr. S.M. RAHALLI
Mr. M. CHRAIBI

Netherlands:

Mr. F. VAN DONGEN
Mr. H. WAGENMAKERS

Nigeria:

Mr. G.O. IJEWERE
Mr. W.O. AKINSANYA
Mr. T. AGUIYI-IRONSI

Pakistan:

Mr. M. AHMAD
Mr. M. AKRAM
Mr. T. ALTAF

Peru:

Mr. J. BENAVIDES DE LA SOTTA

Poland:

Mr. B. SUJKA
Mr. T. STROJWAS

Romania:

Mr. T. MELESCANU

Sri Lanka:

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

Sweden:

Mr. C. LIDGARD
Mr. C.M. HYLTIENIUS
Mr. H. BERGLUND
Mr. J. LUNDIN
Mr. G. EKHOLM

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. V.L. ISSRAELIAN
Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN
Mr. B.P. PROKOFIEV
Mr. V.V. LOSHCININE
Mr. G.V. BERDENNIKOV
Mr. V.A. KROKHA

United Kingdom:

Mr. D.M. SUMMERHAYES
Mr. L. MIDDLETON
Mrs. J.I. LINK
Miss J.E.F. WRIGHT

United States of America:

Mr. L.G. FIELDS
Mr. M.D. BUSBY
Ms. K. CRITTENBERGER
Mrs. M.E. HOINKES
Mr. J. MISKEL

Venezuela:

Mr. R. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO
Mr. O. AGUILAR PARDO

Yugoslavia:

Mr. M. MIHAJLOVIC

Zaire:

Ms. E. EKANGA KABEYA
Mr. OSIL 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: I declare open the 175th plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament.

The Committee continues today its consideration of reports of subsidiary bodies as well as of its special report to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. As usual, in conformity with rule 30 of our rules of procedure, members wishing to make statements on any subject relevant to the work of the Committee may do so at any time.

Before we consider our business for today, I wish to put before the Committee for adoption the draft decision contained in Working Paper No. 67, dated 21 April 1982. This is on the establishment of an ad hoc working group under item 1 of the Committee's agenda. In that connection, I wish to make the following statement.

Distinguished delegates, you will recall that the small group that was established to draft a mandate for a CTB working group began its work on 19 March, under the chairmanship of my distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Alessi. Since then, in fact for the past five weeks, continued efforts have been made by members of this Committee to draft a mandate that would be acceptable to all. Our work has been long and arduous. This morning our efforts were crowned with success when we learnt that all delegates and all groups were able to accept the text that I now have the honour of placing before you. In submitting this text, as contained in Working Paper No. 67, I have to mention the name of our distinguished Secretary, the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jaipal, who came to our help when many of us, including your Chairman, were beginning to give up hope. It was Ambassador Jaipal who saved the day for us, with the texts which came to be known, affectionately if I may say so, as J-1 and J-2. I wish to thank him for the great service he has rendered to us all. The language of this text, while perhaps not giving complete satisfaction to any of the delegations around this table, does allow for a degree of flexibility in its interpretation. The actual work programme of the working group will certainly be the subject of detailed discussion in the working group itself when it convenes at the beginning of the second half of our 1982 session. And once the substantive discussions start and delegations begin -- I quote from the proposed mandate -- "to discuss and define through substantive examination, issues relating to verification and compliance with a view to making further progress toward a nuclear test ban", they will, in my view, find that there are a great many issues which relate to verification and compliance. Delegations will inevitably find themselves discussing or at least trying to discuss such a broad range of subjects that the future Chairman of this working group will indeed have a hard time. But that is for our summer session. Today, I wish to express my deep respect to all the delegations around this table for the great efforts they have made and for the spirit of constructive compromise that everyone has shown. Each and every delegation has had problems, difficult problems, not only of language, but also as regards substance, or even principle, and I am sure that they have experienced agonizing moments, especially in the course of their discussions, or arguments, rather, with their capitals. They have prevailed upon their Governments, and have enabled us in the Committee to reach a compromise which I consider to be both reasonable and honourable. I once again pay my tribute to all delegations, and particularly to Ambassador Alessi and Ambassador Jaipal for their efforts, and submit to the Committee the draft mandate

(The Chairman)

contained in Working Paper No. 67. 1/ May I take it that this draft mandate is approved by the Committee?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I now give the floor to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons, His Excellency Ambassador Sujka, for a statement concerning the report of his Working Group.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Through you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the Committee on Disarmament that the Working Group on Chemical Weapons had a further meeting last night to discuss some changes in its report. The Working Group then adopted its report subject to the incorporation of the following amendments:

On page 1, paragraph 1, line 12, after the word "weapons" insert the following in brackets: "(CD/48, CD/112)".

At the end of paragraph 1, add the following sentence:

"A list of all the documents of the Committee on Disarmament submitted under the agenda item entitled 'Chemical Weapons', as well as of the documents of the Working Group which included working papers and conference room papers, is contained in the annex to this report."

On page 3, in paragraph 3, at the end of line 9, add the following, "and provisions on the non-stationing of chemical weapons on the territories of other States".

In paragraph 3, line 11, between the words "national" and "means", add the word "technical".

At the end of the document CD/261, add an annex listing Committee on Disarmament plenary documents on chemical weapons as well as the documents of the Working Group.

1/ "In the exercise of its responsibilities as the multilateral disarmament negotiating forum in accordance with paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Committee on Disarmament decides to establish an ad hoc working group under item 1 of its agenda entitled 'Nuclear test ban'.

Considering that discussion of specific issues in the first instance may facilitate progress toward negotiation of a nuclear test ban, the Committee requests the ad hoc working group to discuss and define, through substantive examination, issues relating to verification and compliance with a view to making further progress toward a nuclear test ban.

The ad hoc working group will take into account all existing proposals and future initiatives, and 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."

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

The list of documents has been circulated in photocopied form. Should delegations wish to add to it, I suggest that they inform the secretariat accordingly. Amended in this way, it is my understanding that the report of the Working Group on Chemical Weapons can now be included in the special report of the Committee on Disarmament to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons for his statement.

I now give the floor to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons, His Excellency Ambassador Wegener, for a statement concerning the report of his Working Group.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): Following the precedent of the Chemical Weapons Working Group, at the request of some delegations, the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons also held a short, additional meeting today to reconsider some parts of the report and a certain number of technical errors were corrected and some amendments introduced. With your permission I would like to read out the changes to be made to the printed document we have before us, CD/284, in the English version -- the one with an asterisk.

Yesterday, on introducing the report, I read out a certain number of amendments, but I think it would be clearer to delegates if I were now to read out all the amendments together so that delegates can introduce them into their documents and check on the earlier changes. The title should be amended to read, "Special report to the Committee on Disarmament ...", etc. In paragraph 4, second line, after "Working Group", please insert the words "under the Chairmanship of Ambassador Dr. Imre Komives (Hungary)", and then the text continues as before. On page 2, in the penultimate line of paragraph 6, the words "radiation from the decay of" should be deleted. On page 3, in paragraph 16, in the eighth line, after the words "from attack", a new sentence is to be inserted, reading: "Some delegations expressly reserved their position as to the competence of the Committee to deal with this matter." In the footnote on the same page, after the fifth word, the words "for the purposes of this report" should be inserted. There are no changes on page 4. On page 5, the word at the end of the first line of paragraph 26 should be in the plural, and read "provisions".

Paragraph 28 has been substantially amended, and the text now reads: "The view was widely held that the treaty should enter into force upon the deposit of the instruments of ratification by a lower number than the 25 hitherto discussed, and the number of 15 was advanced in this context, while some delegations reaffirmed their position that the treaty should enter into force upon its ratification by 25 Governments, including the nuclear-weapon States."

In paragraph 27, still on page 5, the last three words of the penultimate line, "points of view", should be replaced by "differences". In paragraph 30, in the second line, before the last word, "centered", the word "and" should be inserted, and in paragraph 31, five lines from the bottom, after "It was pointed out that", the words "attacks on such facilities could" should be inserted.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

In paragraph 52, a number of small inserts was agreed upon to make the language clearer, and I think it would be wise for me, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to read the entire paragraph: "Some delegations proposed that the prohibition of attacks on nuclear facilities should be as comprehensive as possible. Since the basic objective was, in their view, to prevent mass destruction, there could be no justification to differentiate between civilian and military facilities. They also believed that mass destruction would result from attacks on either kind of facilities. However, in their view mass destruction was not the only criterion relevant to this issue. They argued that an important objective of the proposed instrument was to restore confidence among the countries regarding their peaceful nuclear programmes. This confidence had, in their opinion, been severely eroded in the wake of the Israeli attack on the peaceful nuclear facilities of a developing country. Therefore, they argued that the scope of the prohibition should include not only the larger nuclear fuel cycle facilities but also the smaller research reactors and other facilities. To exclude the latter, in their view, would constitute gross discrimination against the developing countries." The last sentence of the paragraph stays as printed.

In paragraph 53, in the fourth line, the word "effect" is to be replaced by "power". Three lines further on, in the sentence beginning, "In this regard, it was particularly emphasized", the words "by these delegations" should be inserted. Equally, in paragraph 54, the second sentence has some new language: after "A partial ban could", the words "in their view" should be inserted.

In paragraph 55 the following sentence was added at the end of the present text: "The delegation whose working paper had been quoted in the preceding paragraph drew attention to the fact that the paper in this context also contains the following statement: 'The political difficulties of protecting military facilities in an international instrument are obvious, and such facilities therefore seem to have to be excluded from a convention'." Whereupon, paragraph 56 also had to be amended, and it now reads: "It was, however, stated by some delegations that such political difficulties as may be involved were not sufficient reason for a partial prohibition. In their view such an approach would leave open the possibility of legitimizing mass destruction in the conduct of warfare".

Finally, the Working Group decided that the example of the other working groups should be followed and that a list of all documents relating to the work of the Working Group should be added. This list is at present being established by the secretariat on the basis of the available documents.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to a certain overlap that could result from the addition to paragraph 4 and paragraphs 11 and 12 with the new paragraph to be included in the Committee's main report, printed in Working Paper No. 53/Rev.2/Corr.2, but I think it is a matter for the secretariat to prevent possible overlaps, as the Group has expressed its understanding that overlaps of this kind should, if possible, be avoided.

So far I have spoken as the Chairman of the Working Group. I would like for a brief moment to take up a matter related to my function as a Chairman, and this is a brief statement of which I have informed you in advance, Mr. Chairman.

Last night, at the informal meeting that was held under your chairmanship, Mr. Chairman, the delegate of the Soviet Union made the following statement, and I quote excerpts from the English translation:

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

"... There were cases when, in spite of the insistent request addressed to the Chairman of one of the groups not to distort situations in the Group, such a distortion did occur ..." and further on, I quote:

"... if, in the report, there is an incorrect presentation of the situation in the Working Group, and nevertheless, that situation was adopted by methods which were somewhat less than democratic ...".

These are serious accusations. The Chairman of one of the working groups is accused before the members of the Committee of deliberate distortion of his Working Group's report, and of undemocratic behaviour in the exercise of his functions. To my knowledge, personal accusations of this gravity have so far never been levelled against any other delegate in this Committee. Should they now become part of our working modes, I would foresee very unfortunate consequences. I do not think, therefore, that the Soviet delegate's utterances should stand uncorrected.

Many delegations have informed me that in their understanding the accusations were clearly directed towards me. This needs clarification. I should like, therefore, to request, through you, Mr. Chairman, an adequate clarification from the Soviet delegate. Should it turn out that I was in fact the Working Group Chairman referred to, I would expect his apology on the record of this meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons for his statement. I would say that I, as Chairman of this Committee, have been accused of being too authoritarian; I have also been accused of being too democratic. I think that the very job of a chairman involves those risks. It is the lot of a chairman to be accused of all sorts of things. I would hope that this matter would not be pursued to undue length.

The revised reports of the working groups on chemical and radiological weapons will be issued later by the secretariat. In the meantime, I would consider that the Committee is prepared to adopt the reports of the four working groups of the Committee as contained in documents CD/231, as amended, for the Working Group on Chemical Weapons, CD/283 for the Working Group on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, CD/284 as amended for the Working Group on Radiological Weapons, and CD/285 for the Working Group on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-Nuclear-Weapon States Against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons. If there is no objection, I will consider that the Committee adopts the reports of these four working groups.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: May I now turn to Working Paper No. 58/Rev.2 and Working Papers No. 58/Rev.2/Corr. 1 and 2, containing the draft special report of the Committee to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. May I take it that this Committee is prepared to adopt the draft special report? I see no objection.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Distinguished delegates, I have on my list of speakers so far for today the following 17 delegations: Canada, Belgium, the United States of America, Czechoslovakia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, Sweden, the German Democratic Republic, Japan, Nigeria, India, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Ethiopia, Kenya, China and Mexico. I give the floor to the first speaker on the list, the representative of Canada, His Excellency Ambassador McPhail.

Mr. McPHAIL (Canada): Mr. Chairman, let me first say to you how much my delegation has admired your presiding over our Committee in these difficult final days of this first half of the session. I want to assess, in general terms, the work of the Committee on Disarmament in the light of the forthcoming second special session, and to make comments on a few specific topics.

The Committee is about to adjourn, and when it resumes its 1982 session the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will be over. It is not difficult to tell what then our concerns will be. These same concerns will be addressed by the second special session. The Committee, however, is charged with a unique responsibility -- to negotiate. Regular sessions of the General Assembly do not -- and cannot -- negotiate. Nor is the special session a forum for negotiation. Against this background, let us examine this Committee's performance as measured against its responsibilities.

We would no doubt all agree that the record, since 1978, when the Committee on Disarmament was established following the first special session, is mixed. The expansion of the work of the Committee, and the rapid proliferation of meetings (so ably recorded for us by the secretariat) do not seem proportionate to the results. Procedural matters consume great amounts of time and it is questionable whether, in some instances, the fundamental purpose of working groups -- to negotiate -- is in danger of occupying second place as the tendency grows to read prepared statements in these groups.

But is not the greatest difficulty the Committee on Disarmament faces the frequent lack of a real negotiating dynamic? This dynamic is present only if a willingness exists among negotiating partners to make concessions in the interest of reaching a mutually-agreed goal.

Demands and exhortations are frequently put to this Committee, but are they related to any larger bargain? Do they contribute to progress through negotiation? For example, are all those who have sought to contain the nuclear "at risk" area and to guarantee protection to nuclear facilities -- objectives commonly shared -- willing to undertake concrete commitments to the future control of nuclear weapons potential?

Furthermore, broad declarations of a willingness to negotiate have not always been followed up with real contributions to the negotiating process. The debate that has been held, for example, on toxicity determinants of precursors to binary chemical weapons is of unproven value in terms of the purposes of the proposed treaty. Equally, the inability of the Seismic Experts Working Group to reach agreement on an extended progress report is a cause for concern. Thus, there are gaps between declared willingness and actual performance.

Yet, the Committee on Disarmament can move no further and no faster than the international situation permits. If progress on major issues has been slow, it is largely because the international atmosphere has not allowed it to be otherwise.

I began with some of the negative elements in the Committee's work. Taken together, they add up to one unavoidable conclusion: since the Committee was established, it has been unable to produce any single agreement on any subject related to arms control and disarmament matters. But is this the sole basis upon which we

(Mr. McPhail, Canada)

should make our judgements? I think not, for the Committee remains, despite its shortcomings, the only multilateral negotiating forum on arms control and disarmament matters. If it did not exist, it would surely be created; if it were disbanded, it would surely be replaced. Accordingly, we should assess the Committee on Disarmament's value, not so much in terms of what it has accomplished, but more in terms of what it may accomplish, once conditions are right: now, measured in this way, already we have some signs of promise.

The first is the establishment of the Committee's working groups. These continue to hold potential as operative forums for business-like negotiations on arms control measures, provided that the subject-matter and the timing are right. A case in point is the Chemical Weapons Working Group which, with its expanded mandate, continues to make real progress towards the eventual conclusion of a chemical weapons treaty.

The second sign is the creation of what is known as "subsidiary bodies", as well as other forms of collective endeavour. I noted that the Seismic Experts Working Group has had difficulties, but it has also had successes; and it is obviously upon the latter that we should build. Similarly, the practical work registered during "concentrated sessions" on chemical weapons has allowed the Committee to focus on technical matters of importance to the eventual conclusion of a treaty. These sessions have been invaluable, not least because points of principle advocated by various delegations often took second place to the range of practical questions which necessarily must be addressed before the actual implementation of a treaty: here, then, debate was replaced by discussion.

The third sign is the demonstrated ability of the Committee on Disarmament to move in worthwhile directions. A working group dealing with certain aspects of a comprehensive test-ban treaty is now close to realization. Already the informal discussions on the working group's mandate have in themselves brought to the Committee a more focused approach to this critical problem. In the near future, other working groups will probably be established also, each dealing with specific aspects of issues of concern to the Committee.

These are the considerations in our minds when reflecting upon how the Committee on Disarmament should relate to the second special session. Some argue that the Committee's special report should review past activities, and account for performance and assign praise and blame accordingly. But we do not agree. Consensus on precisely what are the Committee's shortcomings is unlikely. Nor do we think it advisable to dwell on the past; we prefer instead to move forward on the basis of what has been accomplished -- which indeed should figure in the special report.

I spoke of signs of promise, and of some negative aspects of the Committee's work, both in the context of the second special session, which for many has been the central focus of the Committee's activities for some time. Great effort and indeed ingenuity have been expended in drawing up a comprehensive programme of disarmament. It is now evident that on a number of fundamental points, no agreement has been possible; and so the work on the programme must be carried on by the General Assembly itself, at its special session. The question of time-frames remains the single, most intractable issue; and it is an open question whether it can really be resolved. In the final analysis, is not in fact the issue something of an artificial one? Surely nations will conduct negotiations on the matters listed in the draft CPD only when and if their assessment of their own national security interests allows them to do so. A comprehensive programme which fails to take this into account is unlikely to achieve consensus, either in the Committee on Disarmament or at the second special session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. McPhail, Canada)

I think this is a time for frankness. How much effect will the comprehensive programme have on the work of the Committee? The comprehensive programme remains essentially an agenda, no matter how described, of negotiations on arms control and disarmament. But the Committee has its own agenda, which will still guide our work when the second special session is over, and for this reason, it is all the more important to concentrate on the practical and realizable when the Committee resumes. Statements of broad vision do have their place, and indeed it is a common hope that the second special session will provide the world community with that vision; but the Committee must rightly deal with the mundane, the practical, the negotiable. Negotiation is never easy, and requires both attention to detail and compromise -- not really the stuff special sessions are made of.

In short, we cannot look to the special session to solve problems this Committee deals with because it will not; and the practical issues the Committee confronts will still be present after the second special session is history.

One of these major practical problems is verification. It has been a theme, if not the major theme, of this session. In aspects of the Committee's work where hope is highest, for example with respect to chemical weapons, the emphasis on verification is greatest. The accomplishments of the Committee on Disarmament through the activities of the Seismic Experts Working Group are essentially in the area of verification. The CTB Working Group will address the subject of verification. On the other hand, one of the built-in problems in achieving a mutually satisfactory and universal negative security assurance is that, by its very nature, such an assurance is unverifiable: it deals, not with arms, but with intentions. Perhaps the lesson of verification has only recently been learned. Many have asserted that verification adds to confidence, and does not detract from it. Treaties have been concluded in the past without adequate verification provisions, and the consequences have underlined their resulting weakness. Inherently unverifiable treaties have been concluded, such as the Briand Kellog Pact, which outlawed war. It is this historical experience which troubles many in discussing proposals that cannot be verified. In their view, and indeed in ours, the law is only the law if it is agreed -- and enforced, in the case of international agreement on arms control and disarmament, through verification.

Earlier I noted three positive signs in the Committee's work. There is a fourth. The Committee has moved beyond discussing verification as an abstract principle, and is now considering the means of verification. Views differ, perhaps not as much as before, and solutions are in sight, if not yet within grasp.

The resolution of verification problems is rarely a glamorous business. But it is always essential. The second special session, obviously, cannot do this work. We can and should.

There are some who, while agreeing in principle to verification, are concerned that insistence on absolute verification, or something close to it, is a means to avoid progress on other substantive arms control and disarmament matters. It is easy to sympathize with this concern. That is why we believe our aim should be to seek adequate and mutually-acceptable verification measures. We are confident that with patience and perseverance, this can be done -- even in such technically demanding fields as chemical weapons verification. In the meantime, no agreement of consequence is likely to be achieved without suitable verification provisions. Let us therefore proceed accordingly. We, for our part, in due course, will be putting forward further suggestions on verification, particularly in the area of chemical weapons.

(Mr. McPhail, Canada)

We have worked hard to produce the final agreement on the contents of the special report to the second special session of the General Assembly.

During the course of our work we have heard the views of some who seek to assign responsibility for arms control measures exclusively to the "militarily significant" powers, or to the nuclear-weapon States, by implication perhaps leaving themselves blameless and without responsibility. But is this really the case? Surely, as the United Nations Secretary-General said in Geneva 10 days ago, our responsibilities in those respects are collective.

The international community, at the second special session on disarmament, will, we expect, and rightly so, we believe, reaffirm the validity of and the necessity for this Committee -- not because of its accomplishments but because there is no other choice. The ultimate test of this Committee's credibility is its ability to make progress on significant arms control measures. Whatever the outcome of the second special session, the Committee has yet to meet this test. Let us be guided accordingly in our resumed session next July.

Mr. ONKELINX (Belgium) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, as we are coming to the end of the Committee's spring session, I wish first of all to address myself to you, but I do not know whether it would be better to congratulate you on the way in which you have presided over our work during your period of chairmanship, or instead to express our sympathy with you for having been obliged to act as Chairman in such difficult conditions -- during a period when the organization of the Committee's work was particularly arduous, despite the great efforts of Ambassador Jaipal and the secretariat -- a period of procedural discussions and complications of which the Committee ought certainly not to be proud, and which we should think about as regards the future and our future sessions. In spite of all the difficulties, however, you have given proof of the great qualities we have seen in you ever since we have had the pleasure of working with you, namely, skill, tact, the patience that was certainly needed this time, and your diplomatic finesse, and I think that the Committee will always owe you a debt of gratitude for your display of these great talents which were, alas, very often, and at times harshly, put to the test.

As this spring session of the Committee on Disarmament draws to a close, we have just adopted our report to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament. It is the prospect of this important event that has dominated all our work since the beginning of this year.

In this connection, the agreement reached in the Committee today on the establishment of a working group on a nuclear test ban is a particularly welcome development. Indeed, we are gratified by the success achieved as a result of the difficult negotiations on the mandate of this working group. We are also particularly grateful to the delegations most directly involved in these negotiations for the spirit of compromise they have shown. We now hope that the working group will be speedily set up when the Committee resumes its activities after the special session.

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

In preparing for the second special session, it was quite normal that the Committee should spend most of its time on the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, as it was requested to do by the General Assembly.

It is not my intention to draw any conclusions about the results submitted to us by the Working Group.

These results are, of course, very embryonic and, in view of the many texts on which agreement has not been reached, they may seem somewhat disappointing.

The report of the Committee on Disarmament is, however, only one stage in the negotiating process that will be pursued in New York. We sincerely hope that the combined efforts of delegations will enable this process to be completed at the forthcoming special session.

We should therefore make the best possible use of the few positive elements we now have in our favour.

The first is the negotiating climate. What happened in the informal group led by the delegation of Pakistan showed that progress was possible. There is now a noticeable improvement in the chapter relating to measures. It would be regrettable if these results, however fragmentary they may be, were jeopardized.

The structure of the comprehensive programme of disarmament is also clearer now. The measures have been divided into three stages and, within each one, sets of measures have been more coherently defined, primarily in the fields of nuclear and conventional disarmament.

In addition, there seems to be greater understanding of the need to allow the parties to the negotiation of disarmament agreements some degree of flexibility. Such negotiations ought not to be hampered by arbitrary schedules. The various disarmament measures could very well, if necessary, be incorporated into the programme in accordance with the possibilities for negotiation.

It should not be too difficult to reach agreement on the texts that have been prepared on the chapters relating to the objectives and the principles of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Efforts to this end might be based on those made with regard to the chapter on priorities, the only one that has been fully agreed on by our delegations.

There is also broad agreement on the chapter relating to machinery. There, too, it should be possible to reconcile the texts submitted by different groups of delegations.

The negotiations to be held in New York should focus primarily on the broad conceptual issues that have not yet been resolved.

The main problem is that of the time-frame for the programme. My delegation does not see this problem as insoluble. Precedents exist, particularly in the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. Furthermore, although it seems to us impracticable to lay down, even tentatively, a set date for the completion of each stage, we nevertheless believe that the conferences for the review of the implementation of the programme, and hence of the measures in each stage, could be convened at regular intervals. This periodicity would in itself be an important feature of the comprehensive programme of disarmament, as compared with the documents previously adopted by the General Assembly. For the fact of States agreeing beforehand that their policies in the matter of disarmament should be subject to review would be a particularly significant innovation.

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

Another important problem that has not yet been fully discussed is the nature of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. My delegation is happy to note that the various positions that have been expressed in this connection have shown a definite flexibility and open-mindedness. To what extent the obligation assumed by States as regards the implementation of the comprehensive programme of disarmament should be legally binding is undoubtedly a matter for negotiation. There again, however, it seems to me that a solution acceptable to all parties could be found.

Clearly, what will require the greatest expenditure of time on the part of our delegations in New York is the negotiation of the various measures. Efforts to arrive at compromise texts are essential in more than one respect. In fact, on many subjects on which differing views are still being expressed, such compromise texts already exist. We ought not, therefore, to rule out the possibility of using them again in the comprehensive programme. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament defined by the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Declaration concerning the Second Disarmament Decade should continue to be useful sources of inspiration for our future negotiations.

Lastly, it will in due course be necessary to review the organization of the presentation of the comprehensive programme of disarmament in order to avoid, so far as possible, repetitions like those that "clutter" the Final Document. In addition, the question of verification has not yet really been given a proper place in the proposed structure of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We ought not to hesitate to give this important issue full treatment and to devote a chapter to the subject of verification.

It has not been possible to give the other activities which the Committee on Disarmament has carried out in working groups the same priority as the comprehensive programme of disarmament. Considerable efforts have nevertheless been devoted to them.

Progress has undeniably been achieved on what we now call "traditional" radiological weapons questions. The draft treaty in this connection submitted by the Chairman of the Working Group represents, in our view, a compromise that should offer a broadly acceptable basis for the completion of the negotiations on this subject.

The question of the prohibition of deliberate attacks on nuclear installations gave rise to some particularly interesting exchanges of views. However they showed how complex the subject is. They also revealed the existence of a number of widely varying negotiating options. It is thus clear that these exchanges formed part of an as yet very preliminary stage of the negotiating process.

In view of these facts, my delegation has some doubts about the advisability of a symmetrical approach to these two issues. We ought perhaps, therefore, to consider the possibility of bringing the negotiations on the first of these issues to a rapid conclusion and agreeing to continue negotiations on the second, which is not strictly a matter of prohibiting a weapon but rather a question of the regulation of the conduct of hostilities. If necessary, we might envisage the conclusion of a protocol to be annexed to the so-called "traditional" treaty, as my colleague from the Federal Republic of Germany has suggested.

With regard to chemical weapons, I should like to mention in particular the positive development represented by the Committee's conferral on the Working Group of a mandate which permits it to negotiate a convention. The work it has done at this

(Mr. Onkelinx, Belgium)

spring session has certainly enabled the Group to consolidate the results it achieved last year. We ought to try, during the summer session to negotiate all the questions involved more thoroughly and more intensively. My delegation would wish, in particular, to develop its contribution on the definition of chemical weapons so as to take into account as many as possible of the views expressed so far.

We should also like to give more careful consideration to the needs as regards verification of a convention prohibiting chemical weapons. In this connection, Belgium wishes to stress the great importance it attaches to the proposal submitted by Australia, the United States and the United Kingdom concerning the study of verification possibilities of the "recover" type. This question formed the subject of document CD/271 which was recently put before the Committee.

Belgium also hopes that after the discussions that have been held on the subject of the prevention of an arms race in outer space, it will be possible, at the second part of the Committee's 1982 session, to adopt procedural decisions that will permit this important question to be dealt with more systematically.

The results of more than three years of work by the Committee on Disarmament are extremely limited. True, in recent months we have made some progress in so far as our work has focused more on the topics under negotiation and has been less hampered by theoretical or procedural discussions.

Nevertheless, the spirit of negotiation seems to have been lacking. In too many areas, delegations have done no more than restate their positions, without making any effort to seek compromises. All too often, also, interim solutions have been rejected on the grounds that they would merely make it impossible to seek proper solutions.

Such attitudes, which have been evident in particular, for example, in the matters of security assurances and radiological weapons, seem to me hardly compatible with the requirements of the disarmament process, where what is needed essentially is a patient search for small areas of progress which will gradually make it possible to achieve more and more ambitious goals.

I should like now to make a comment of a general nature: my delegation has noted that, throughout its discussions, the Committee on Disarmament has attached overwhelming importance to nuclear disarmament. I understand why the international community regards this as a matter of priority, but I venture to submit for your consideration and reflection that it is wars waged with conventional weapons that are still daily causing victims and that have decimated entire populations in recent decades. It seems to me that the Committee pays too little attention to conventional disarmament, and that it ought to correct this imbalance, while keeping things in proper perspective.

The limited results achieved by the Committee on Disarmament are also and perhaps especially a reflection of the situations of tension in the world to which reference has been made at the beginning and at the end of the current session. Belgium hopes that the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will offer States an opportunity to gain greater awareness of the impact their conduct can have in the sphere of disarmament negotiations. It hopes that the special session will succeed in giving fresh impetus to the work of the Committee on Disarmament, so that the Committee can more effectively carry out the important task entrusted to it.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure, frankly more than I had anticipated yesterday, that I take the floor in the closing moments of our meeting. Under your chairmanship, we have clearly made considerable progress. We owe you a debt of great gratitude, for your even but firm hand, and your wise, kind counsel. It is in no small measure due to your able guidance in April that we can now look forward to the prospect of moving ahead on important issues when we return this summer. I would also like to take this occasion to pay tribute to the distinguished service rendered by the chairmen of the working groups, Ambassador Ahmad of Pakistan, Ambassador Wegener of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico and Ambassador Sujka of Poland. Each of these capable and distinguished gentlemen has guided his Group with wisdom, intelligence and energy.

On one particularly important issue, an issue on which many delegations and more particularly you yourself, Mr. Chairman, your predecessor, Ambassador Alessi and Ambassador Jaipal have expended great and skilful efforts, it appeared until just hours ago that progress would not prove possible. Being one who never gives up, I have been carrying two sets of closing remarks around in my pocket. My hopes, indeed my cherished hopes have been realized and I am delighted to be delivering today the happier version, indeed the one which I had fervently hoped I would be making to this final plenary meeting of our spring session.

In previous years the United States has been unwilling to agree to the establishment of a working group on a comprehensive test ban. We have openly and candidly expressed our position. Again this year, at the outset of this meeting, we frankly stated our most serious reservations. But we fully understood the importance which most other delegations attached to the CTB issue. We listened to appeals that we should not stand in the way of the Committee's proceeding to deal with its agenda item 1, and we ultimately refined our position in a manner which would enable us to join a consensus. On 11 March we indicated our willingness to agree to the establishment of a working group which would address the fundamentally important areas of verification and compliance. Consensus on that basis has now been achieved.

I do not think it necessary to elaborate upon my personal pleasure, which I am sure is obvious. I would, however, like to pledge my Government's commitment to steady progress in the newly-established working group on a CTB. Having come so far toward establishing a working group on a CTB, missing the opportunity would have been particularly unfortunate. But we have chosen the course of accommodation and co-operation rather than confrontation. This outcome is particularly fortunate, for the blocking of a consensus on the CTB issue and the open threat of an overheated atmosphere at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, at this especially critical juncture for the Committee, could only have had most serious adverse effects upon our ability to come to grips with the important questions which will confront us in New York.

However, I do not want to leave the impression that the last-minute success on the nuclear test-ban agenda item is the only matter on which there has been important progress at this session. We have moved forward on other issues. Our progress has been dependent upon a willingness, displayed by all, to compromise. It is that spirit which we hope will prevail at the second special session, and thereafter upon our return to Geneva to continue the important work of our 1982 session.

(Mr. Fields, United States of America)

Our agenda over the coming months is a full one and it deserves our very best efforts. Our work in this Committee cannot be dealt with in the abstract, but has to be considered in the context of the existing international political situation. But at the same time we believe that the possibility of positive developments on the international scene as a result of progress in our Committee's work cannot be overlooked. To this end we remain optimistic.

Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable joy that I can now discard the other version of my speech.

Again, Sir, my deepest thanks to you.

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): the first part of the 1982 session of the Committee on Disarmament was marked by a complicated international situation, which was the result of increased efforts on the part of the opponents of peace, détente and disarmament to engage the world in a qualitatively new round of the arms race, especially in the field of nuclear armaments. Long-term plans for the modernization of strategic nuclear forces declared by the United States administration and new aggressive military doctrines advanced by it represent a direct threat to international peace and security and seriously undermine the possibilities for the achievement of real progress in the field of disarmament negotiations.

The socialist countries continued to advance new proposals aimed at the reactivation of disarmament negotiations. They reaffirmed their readiness to negotiate on any question on the basis of equality and equal security. They went even further and came out with important unilateral initiatives. Among these, the initiative of the USSR advanced by President L. Brezhnev on 16 March of this year, instituting a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear armaments in the European part of the USSR, met with keen interest and appreciation among all peace-loving forces.

The socialist countries attached particular importance to the 1982 spring session of the Committee in view of the forthcoming second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The delegations of the socialist countries did their utmost to enable the Committee to negotiate concrete results which could be presented to the second special session.

Regrettably, given the approach of some western delegations to basic problems of nuclear disarmament and other important items of its agenda, the Committee was not in a position to achieve concrete results.

It is by no means incidental that the vitally important question of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament was regarded as of the highest priority by most delegations. The continuing arms race undoubtedly represents the main threat to international peace and security. The socialist countries represented in the Committee have always supported the creation of an appropriate working group to conduct negotiations on this question. In addition to the documents submitted to this effect by the socialist countries in previous years, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic submitted, during the first part of the 1982 session, document CD/259 reflecting the views of the socialist countries concerning the draft mandate for an ad hoc working group on this question, which was welcomed by many members of the Group of 21. However, the United States and United Kingdom delegations continued to block consensus on the setting up of such a working group.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

In connection with the problem of nuclear disarmament, the socialist countries stressed the necessity of preventing a nuclear catastrophe and drew the attention of delegations to the relevant declaration adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session. The positive effects which would be brought about by an undertaking by all nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons were also underlined.

Together with many other States, the socialist countries vigorously condemned the full-scale production of neutron weapons carried out by the United States. The delegations of the socialist countries reminded the members of the Committee that already in 1973 the draft of a convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of neutron weapons was put before the Committee by the socialist countries in document CCD/559. Neither this initiative nor the proposal of the socialist countries for the urgent establishment of an ad hoc working group for the preparation of such a convention, put forward in 1981 in document CD/219, met with a consensus owing to the negative attitude of the western Powers. The socialist countries regret this development since the production of neutron weapons substantially lowers the threshold of nuclear war and represents an important step towards putting into practice the doctrine of a "limited nuclear war", while the eventual deployment of such weapons in Europe would create a highly dangerous situation on this continent.

The group of socialist countries attaches special importance to the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. They have always considered that the Committee on Disarmament, with all nuclear-weapon States represented in it, should live up to its responsibilities as the single multilateral negotiating forum and start negotiations on this question. Together with the Group of 21, the group of socialist countries therefore proposed the creation of an ad hoc working group to this effect. Regrettably, a lot of valuable time, which could be dedicated to business -- like negotiations in the working group, has been lost due to the opposition of two nuclear-weapon States to the creation of such a working group. The socialist countries have also expressed their views concerning its possible terms of reference in document CD/259 mentioned above.

The socialist countries also studied carefully all other proposals concerning the mandate of such a working group. They also took an active part in the deliberations on a possible compromise formulation in this regard. Their aim was to achieve an agreement on such a mandate which would allow the future working group to address all basic aspects of the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and to negotiate a treaty on this problem. Since it appeared that, for the time being, consensus could not be reached on such a "comprehensive" mandate, the socialist countries, considering the achievement of the nuclear-test ban a question of highest priority, agreed to the establishment of the working group with a compromise formulation of its mandate. They proceed from the understanding that any delegation may raise in the working group any questions related to the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and the discussion of verification questions should not stand in the way of the elaboration of the agreement in all its aspects. The socialist countries also believe that progress achieved in the working group will also be duly reflected in the future through adequate adjustment of its mandate.

The delegations of the socialist countries also hope that the working group on the nuclear-test ban will not wind up in abstract discussions on the question of verification and compliance without any connection to the nuclear-weapon test-ban itself. In this regard they expressed their concern over the over-all shift in the

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

position of the United States towards the problem of a nuclear-weapon test-ban expressed in the statement by Mr. Rostow to the Committee on 9 February when he informed the Committee that, in the view of the United States delegation, negotiation on a nuclear test ban "may not be propitious at the time". The socialist countries also consider inconsistent the United States approach to a nuclear test ban whereby it links progress on this subject to reductions in nuclear armaments while opposing the commencement of negotiations in this respect.

The delegations of socialist countries continue to believe that the resumption and successful conclusion of the trilateral negotiations would be of special significance and would create the possibility for a future nuclear test ban to enter into force provisionally before the two remaining nuclear-weapon Powers joined it.

The delegations of socialist countries continued to work actively in the Working Group on Chemical Weapons. They welcomed the initiation of a new phase in its deliberations marked by the adoption of a new mandate allowing it to work on the text of the future convention, which they favoured already during the earlier stages of negotiations on this question. During the first part of the Committee's 1982 session, a very useful exchange of views was carried out which clearly showed the areas of mutual understanding on a number of substantive aspects of the future convention.

The group of socialist countries continues to maintain that the future convention will be effective only if it takes into account all recent developments in the field of chemical weapons. In this respect they fully shared the view expressed by the overwhelming majority of delegations to the effect that the future convention should also exclude any possibility of the production of binary weapons. The delegations of the socialist countries expressed their views on this question in document CD/258, in which they drew the attention of delegations to United Nations General Assembly resolution 36/96 B which calls upon all States "to refrain from any action which could impede negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons and specifically to refrain from production and deployment of binary and other new types of chemical weapons, as well as from stationing chemical weapons in those States where there are no such weapons at present".

The socialist countries draw the attention of delegations to the draft of a provision for the chemical weapons convention proposed by the Soviet delegation on the non-stationing directly or indirectly of chemical weapons on the territories of other States during the period of implementation of commitments on their destruction or transfer for non-hostile purposes.

The question of the prohibition of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction remains a problem of primary importance and should, in the view of the socialist countries, be given due attention in the work of the Committee. They consider that the time is ripe to set up an ad hoc working group of experts, which could seriously address this matter. The group of socialist countries also considers that the Committee could be helpful in giving consideration to appropriate formulations by which all States, and especially the permanent members of the Security Council and other militarily significant States, would make solemn declarations, identical in substance, condemning any future efforts to develop, manufacture and deploy new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons in accordance with United Nations General Assembly resolution 36/89.

(Mr. Vejvoda, Czechoslovakia)

The group of socialist countries appeals to all members of the Committee which are in a position to do so to send their experts to the informal meetings which were proposed by the Hungarian delegation in document CD/261 for the second part of the 1982 session.

The necessity of the prevention of an arms race in outer space has now become a question of high urgency. The socialist countries express satisfaction at the fact that the consideration of this problem has been inscribed on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament. They maintain that, in accordance with United Nations General Assembly resolution 36/99 the Committee should start negotiations on a treaty on the prohibition of the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. The most effective approach to the fulfilment of this task would be the creation, at the second part of the 1982 session, of an appropriate ad hoc working group. The views of the socialist countries concerning the terms of reference of such a group were reflected in document CD/272 submitted by the delegation of Mongolia.

The socialist countries attached due importance to the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament in view of the forthcoming second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. They took an active part in an effort to evolve mutually acceptable formulations, which would nevertheless make it possible to stress the necessity to start early negotiations on all urgent problems of disarmament, in the first place in the field of nuclear disarmament, and on the prevention of the danger of nuclear war. With this objective in mind the socialist countries submitted a comprehensive working paper on the CPD in document CD/245.

Regrettably, during the deliberations in the Working Group on vital questions, no common formulation could be agreed upon. The fact that even the inclusion of the achievement of a nuclear-test ban in the first stage of the programme is questioned is a source of serious concern. However, the socialist countries will continue to exert all efforts so that the General Assembly can adopt a programme which will give a new impetus to disarmament negotiations and assist towards the commencement, in the shortest possible time, of negotiations on all priority questions of disarmament.

With respect to the question of the prohibition of radiological weapons, the socialist countries note with regret that further progress has not been achieved in this matter.

While recognizing the importance of the prohibition of attacks on civilian nuclear facilities, the socialist countries are of the opinion that the deliberations on this subject which have taken place up to now and the complexity of the issues involved demonstrate that this question cannot be solved within the framework of a radiological weapons treaty.

A complicated situation has developed in the Ad Hoc Working Group on the strengthening of the security guarantees of the non-nuclear weapon States. The socialist countries continue to maintain that the most effective way of meeting the legitimate security interests of non-nuclear-weapon States in this respect would be the preparation and conclusion of an international convention on this subject. The initiation of concrete negotiations in this regard would, in the present circumstances, represent a positive step forward.

(Mr. Vojvoda, Czechoslovakia)

Document CD/256, submitted by the delegations of the German Democratic Republic and Hungary, reflects the basic view of the socialist countries that the elaboration of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are no such weapons at present would, inter alia, assist the strengthening of the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States. For this reason the creation of an ad hoc working group on this subject has been proposed.

The group of socialist countries continued to pay due attention to the question of the organization of the work of the Committee.

It put forward its specific views and proposals to this effect, mainly concerning the process of the setting up of and activities of subsidiary bodies, contained in document CD/241. The socialist countries also consider that the effectiveness of the Committee's performances should be increased and while advancing their proposals in this respect they took note of all the relevant suggestions by other States. They expressed the view that the present composition of the Committee meets the requirements for a limited multilateral negotiating body. Hence, it would be highly premature to proceed to further alterations in its present membership.

In spite of many difficulties and the slow progress of the negotiations of the Committee on Disarmament, the socialist countries declare their readiness to contribute actively to its further work so that the Committee may eventually achieve concrete and tangible results. In this connection they favour the resumption of the second part of the 1982 session as early as possible after the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Since I have the floor, let me add something which usually takes place at the very end of meetings. I presume that we shall be very tired and any prolongation of our deliberations then will be unwelcome. What I am going to say, I certainly do not want to be unwelcomed by the Committee and that is, that I want, on behalf of the socialist group, to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, for the manner in which you performed your duties as Chairman for the closing month of our spring session. I should definitely add that I could say much more, but allow me to express briefly our admiration and thanks. We also owe our thanks to the chairmen of the working groups, Ambassadors Sujka, García Robles, Wegener and Ahmad. I also want, on behalf of our group, to express thanks to the secretariat of our Committee, in the first place, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and then, to all those who helped us in our deliberations, starting with the members of the secretariat, administrators, interpreters, translators and all the United Nations professionals either from New York or from Geneva, who performed such valuable services for our Committee.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Taking the floor at a formal meeting for the first time in the month of April, the Soviet delegation would like first of all to welcome you as this month's Chairman of the Committee, to express our satisfaction with and appreciation of your guidance of the Committee's work, and also to wish you success in performing the duties of Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament during the next few months. We are aware that you are faced with the responsible task of presenting the report of the Committee on Disarmament to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I should like, Mr. Chairman, to express particular satisfaction at the fact that it is under your chairmanship that the Committee has

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

succeeded in adopting a decision on the establishment of a working group on the question of a nuclear test ban. The Soviet delegation considers this a token of our sympathy and respect for the Japanese people who were the first victims of the use of atomic weapons in 1945. It is to be hoped that the negotiations in the Committee begun under the chairmanship of the representative of Japan will result in the early conclusion of an agreement on a general and complete ban on nuclear weapon tests by all States and in all environments.

The Soviet delegation has taken the floor in order to give its appraisal of the results of the first part of the current session of the Committee on Disarmament. We do not propose to dwell on separate items of the agenda, since this has just been done with great mastery on behalf of the Soviet delegation, among others, by Ambassador Vejvoda of Czechoslovakia.

Throughout the session, statements by the delegations of most, if not all, of the States represented on the Committee expressed serious concern at the growing threat of nuclear war, the absence of progress in disarmament negotiations and the dangerous development of the international situation as a whole. We share that concern, which reflects the profound alarm of the whole international community at the growing danger of war involving the use of nuclear weapons and the new spiral in the arms race. To say that the present international situation is complex and critical is perhaps not enough. In fact it is one which inspires the profoundest anxiety as to the fate of the world and of mankind as a whole. As was recently observed in a magazine article, the difference between past wars and the threatened global thermonuclear war is that past wars have marked the end of historical eras but a future war will mark the end of the entire human era.

To us the recognition of such a danger is not a cause for dismay and pessimism but a powerful stimulus towards fresh efforts and decisions for the prevention of nuclear war and the curbing of the arms race. In that connection, we should like to emphasize once more the importance of the Declaration on the Prevention of Nuclear Catastrophe adopted by the United Nations as a major landmark on the path towards the elimination of threat of nuclear conflict.

We are often told that we have an ideology of our own.

Yes, we do have an ideology, and we believe in our ideals.

The cornerstone of our ideology and our policy are peace, disarmament and co-operation between peoples. In embarking upon the construction of a new society, the Soviet Union has always proceeded from the belief that, as V.I. Lenin, the founder of our State, said, peace will "advance matters an infinite number of times better than war". Sixty years ago the Soviet delegation at the Genoa Conference spoke of its intention to "propose a general reduction of armaments and to support all proposals designed to lighten the burden of militarism". Exactly 50 years ago, for the first time in the history of mankind, the Soviet Union put forward a concrete programme of general and complete disarmament. That is a matter of history. This year, too, the Soviet State's political will for peace and disarmament has repeatedly found expression, inter alia, at the session of this

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

Committee. In his statement on 16 March of this year, L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, again confirmed proposals for a two-thirds reduction of medium-range and tactical nuclear arsenals stationed in Europe and intended for Europe. The Soviet leadership unilaterally decided to introduce a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the Soviet Union. A number of other proposals were also advanced.

On the eve of the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have repeatedly reaffirmed their determination to contribute towards the success of the preparation and holding of the session. And those are not mere words. There is not one specific disarmament issue either here, on our Committee's agenda, or in the whole spectrum of problems relating to the limitation of the arms race, for the solution of which the USSR and its allies could not come forward with a constructive programme.

Delegations in the Committee are familiar with the Soviet foreign policy initiatives expounded in documents of the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and in a number of subsequent documents of the Soviet State.

During the period between the two special sessions of the General Assembly on disarmament, our country has resolutely and repeatedly expressed itself in favour of the intensification of the work of all international forums in which negotiations on arms limitation matters are being or should be conducted, and, in particular, that of the Geneva Committee on Disarmament. We have reaffirmed our interest in the resumption of all those negotiations which were recently suspended and our readiness to contribute to their successful conclusion. This fully applies to negotiations on a complete and general nuclear test ban, on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, on the limitation of sales and deliveries of conventional weapons, on the limitation and subsequent reduction of military activities in the Indian Ocean and on a number of other issues. We are in favour of an early start to negotiations on such issues as the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons, the prohibition of neutron weapons and the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there are none at present.

Here, in the Committee, the delegations of the socialist countries have made efforts to achieve progress in reaching practical agreements on the prohibition of radiological weapons, the renunciation of the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction and the strengthening of security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States.

The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction that extensive and useful work has been done in the Committee on the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The document which has been prepared still contains a number of provisions on which agreement has yet to be reached. As a whole, however, it can serve as a solid basis for further work on this item during the second special session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

The USSR fully shares the prevailing concern over the growth of military expenditures at the expense of the economic and cultural development of all mankind. We are willing to come to an agreement on a reduction of the military budgets of, in the first instance, States with a major military potential -- either on a percentage basis or in absolute terms. A first step in this direction could be the freezing of the military expenditures of States. The socialist States' specific proposals on all aspects of this major problem are known and they remain in force.

The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction that our proposals, together with the proposals of other States, concerning the need for the adoption of effective measures to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space have aroused interest in the Committee and have formed the subject of constructive discussion. We intend to continue pressing for the establishment of an ad hoc working group on this topic.

The socialist States attach great importance to the prohibition forever of the use of nuclear weapons and the renunciation by all States of the use of force in their mutual relations, and also to the abolition of foreign military bases and the withdrawal of armed forces from the territories of other States.

That, if I may put it this way, is the quintessence of our position on arms limitation questions. It is based on a steadfast political will for peace and real disarmament. And we are glad to note that efforts in that direction come to fruition from time to time.

A year ago a proposal was made from the rostrum of the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for a summit meeting of the leaders of a number of States to study the possibilities of improving the international situation and preventing war. That idea won the sympathy of millions of people in many different countries. During these spring days, world public opinion notes with deep satisfaction that the question of giving effect to the Soviet foreign-political initiative concerning relations between the USSR and the United States of America is now being discussed at a practical level. L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, has reaffirmed Soviet readiness to hold a Soviet-United States summit meeting. Such a meeting must, naturally, be well prepared and conducted in a serious manner, not casually.

There is another matter of substance that should be mentioned in connection with the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. We are witnessing the development of a powerful anti-war, anti-missile, anti-nuclear public movement throughout the world. This movement, as one delegation rightly pointed out at the beginning of the session, is a distinctive "sign of the times"; it reflects the deep concern of the whole world community over the growth of the military threat. Not only we in this Committee but also the representatives of more than 200 non-governmental organizations meeting at a conference in connection with the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly have spoken in this building about the need to put an end to the insane arms race. A vivid manifestation of the will of peoples for peace in these April days have been the numerous peace marches whose routes have traversed the roads of many European States, and of other States also. Their participants were protesting against the absurdity of "overkill" -- the senseless accumulation of stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

under the pretext of strengthening security. The Committee is called upon in its work to provide a response to that concern and alarm on the part of world public opinion.

In that connection I should like to stress that the point at issue is not just the ending of a period between two special sessions of the General Assembly on disarmament. Nothing is more dangerous to the cause of peace and international security than to suppose that the present stage of disarmament negotiations in no way differs from the many periods that preceded it. The refining of weapons is a process which accelerates exponentially. It took 40,000 years for primitive early means of warfare -- stone axes, spears, the bow and arrow -- to be replaced by metal side-arms; it took another 10,000 years for firearms to take the place of sabres and swords. As little as 500 years later (in the course of the First World War), chemical weapons were used. The atom bomb was exploded in 1945, the hydrogen bomb in 1952. The threat of the nuclear self-destruction of civilization is a reality of our century.

In recognizing this, we are not giving way to despair, nor are we seeking to intimidate anyone. On the contrary, we are convinced that the world community will find within itself the strength to put an end to the insane arms race. It is the task of the Committee on Disarmament, as the sole multilateral forum for disarmament negotiations with a limited membership, to be an effective instrument for practical disarmament. The accomplishment of that task is well within its powers, provided the right lessons are drawn from past negotiating experience and provided all delegations are imbued with the conviction that there is no reasonable alternative to disarmament and peaceful co-operation between peoples.

We have already expressed our great satisfaction at the Committee's adoption of a decision to establish a working group for the purpose of conducting negotiations on item 1 of its agenda. In connection with the adoption of that decision, the Soviet delegation would like to state the following.

The Soviet Union, like most other members of the Committee on Disarmament, attaches exceptionally great importance to the earliest possible conclusion of an agreement on a complete and general nuclear test ban. That being so, we have done everything within our power for the successful progress of the negotiations on this issue with the United States of America and the United Kingdom. We continue to consider it essential that these negotiations, which were broken off by the Western participants in them at the concluding stage, should be resumed without delay.

At the same time, the Soviet Union has invariably advocated and still advocates that full use should be made of the possibilities of the Committee on Disarmament for the successful holding of multilateral negotiations aimed at the cessation of nuclear tests in all environments and by all those who conduct such tests. Mindful of this position of principle, the Soviet Union has repeatedly supported proposals for the establishment within the Committee on Disarmament of an ad hoc working group on this issue and it joined in the consensus on the setting up of

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

such a group. The Soviet delegation's agreement to the compromise formula for the mandate of the group was based on the understanding that in the course of the group's work any delegation may raise any aspect of the question of the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. It is our view that the consideration of issues relating to verification should not be used to delay the elaboration of the agreement as a whole, as, regrettably, has been the case more than once in the past, and that such consideration can be useful only if verification is not artificially divorced from the specific content of the arms limitation measure being elaborated but is examined in organic connection with it.

As members of the Committee know, agreement on the group's mandate was preceded by lengthy and difficult consultations. In the course of those consultations the parties naturally put forward various proposals. The socialist countries, too, played an active part in the consultations. I should like to take the opportunity to thank all members of the drafting group, and particularly the representatives of the group of socialist countries in that group, Ambassador G. Herder and Ambassador B. Grinberg. In proposing their formulations for the group's mandate, they were guided by the desire to improve it to the greatest extent possible, so that it might truly contribute to effective negotiations towards the earliest possible conclusion of an agreement on a complete and general nuclear-weapon test ban.

It is a cause for regret that some representatives at the plenary meeting on 20 April did not understand or did not wish to understand that it was this same objective that inspired our proposal in document CD/287.

In particular, it is a complete distortion of our position to assert that the Soviet Union's actions in connection with achieving agreement on the mandate proceeded from the "state of confrontation between the super-Powers". We do not propose to engage in polemics with the delegations in question. We believe that the successful outcome of the consultations on the group's mandate is the best answer to their over-hasty polemical sallies.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the Soviet Union, together with its allies and friends, will continue to walk shoulder to shoulder with those who are in favour of genuine and effective measures for the limitation of the arms race and for disarmament.

In accordance with the tradition, I too should like to express our thanks to all the chairmen of the working groups: Ambassador B. Sujka (Poland), Ambassador A. García Robles (Mexico), Ambassador H. Ahmad (Pakistan) and Ambassador H. Wegener (Federal Republic of Germany). All of them have done a great deal of useful work. As for the remarks addressed to me by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, I bow to your appeal, Mr. Chairman, and do not propose to develop this theme, considering the incident closed. I should also like to thank Ambassador R. Jaipal, whose contribution to the drafting of the mandate you have already rightly noted, the Deputy Secretary of our Committee, Mr. V. Berasategui, all the secretaries of the working groups, the technical staff and the interpreters, who have had a particularly hard time during the last few days. I wish all my colleagues a successful conclusion to this session of the Committee and a successful preparation for the second special session of the General Assembly, where we shall all undoubtedly meet again.

Mr. SUTHERHAYES (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, I shall refrain from giving you a catalogue of my country's views. But a few impressions of the session do seem to be justified.

My delegation, like others, came here in January with the expectation of making real progress on several items of our agenda, believing that we ought to have and would have some solid achievements to report to the special session. Thanks to the consensus just reached today for the setting up of a nuclear test-ban working group based on Ambassador Jaipal's "J-1" draft mandate, we now have at least one important forward step to report to the General Assembly. We are glad that the group of socialist countries finally decided to join the consensus and that the working group will be able to meet from the beginning of our summer session. On some other agenda items, however, progress has been much less than it should have been.

In particular, the work on radiological weapons has been disappointing to my delegation. We had real hopes that substantial progress would be made towards the drafting of a treaty banning radiological weapons under Ambassador Wegener's able and energetic chairmanship. In the discussion of draft articles for the treaty, my delegation was ready to compromise on many key points. We considered that the draft text prepared by the Chairman, while not acceptable in its entirety, represented a real advance on earlier texts and formed a suitable basis for further work. We were sorry, therefore, that it did not receive more general endorsement.

My delegation has previously expressed doubts whether the prevention of attacks on civil nuclear facilities could be contained within the text of a radiological weapons treaty. The discussions on this topic indeed demonstrated the complexity of the problem and thus tended to confirm us in our belief. We considered, frankly, that the suggestions put forward by some delegations were rather far removed from the basic purposes of the treaty. We can see no prospect of agreement being reached on this topic, in this or in any other form, unless there is a greater readiness to compromise in the future.

Before I comment briefly on our work on the drafting of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, I should like to note the real appreciation that my delegation feels is due to Ambassador García Robles, and to pay tribute to the devotion he has shown in his difficult task as Chairman of the Working Group.

In looking at the Working Group's report in document CD/203 and its annex, I must make the comment that we had hoped it would be possible to obtain here in Geneva at least outline agreement on fundamental aspects of a CPD. We had also hoped that it would be possible to forward to the special session a more concise text with fewer bracketed areas. We do nevertheless feel some encouragement at the results of our work, and particularly at the results of the consultations which took place in the last few weeks of the session on the measures section of the programme. In spite of our slow progress here, this recent work gives hope that the special session may eventually be able to adopt a CPD by consensus. But there is a great deal to be done before then. In this connection, my delegation supports the suggestions already made that any consultations on a CPD that may be held between now and the beginning of the special session should focus on the fundamental aspects of the programme, such as its nature and the question of time-frames. But we shall need a period to reflect on the results of our work here before discussions are resumed in New York.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

Turning briefly to the subject of chemical weapons, my delegation is encouraged with the progress which has been made in the Working Group under Ambassador Sujka this session and welcomes the business-like report it submitted to the Committee. Although the work of the Group has perhaps been less intensive than we would have hoped, given the importance of the item, we believe that the presentation of draft elements has clarified the positions of delegations and that we now have a sound basis for the continuation of our work in the summer. In July, we shall have the task of reconciling differences of opinion on particular aspects of a chemical weapons convention. My delegation believes that, for this, the advice of technical experts in the field of chemical weapons will be of great value, and we welcome the Committee's decision that the Chairman of the Working Group on Chemical Weapons should hold further technical consultations early in August. We hope that the scope of these discussions will be widened so that experts can begin examining the technical aspects of the verification of a CW convention. That is the only possible basis for progress.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to offer you my most sincere thanks for the exceptional services you have rendered to the Committee this month. We are all greatly in your debt.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, I shall address my brief statement today to one subject only. Certainly, I have felt tempted to try to present, like the previous speakers in their interesting statements, an overview of the Committee's accomplishments during this session in which I would, in particular, have expressed my delegation's sincere satisfaction at witnessing such a large amount of serious and constructive work in all the four working groups under the leadership of their energetic and skilled chairmen. I certainly would also have been remiss had I not associated my delegation with the expressions of great appreciation which have been addressed to you, Mr. Chairman, by the previous speakers. The naturally declining attention and increasing restlessness in the audience because of the late hour and the long list of speakers prompt me, however, to focus on the item which I hope will make this day well worth remembering -- because of the importance of the possibly even historic decision we have just taken to establish, at long last, an ad hoc working group on a nuclear test ban.

Representatives of my country have never hesitated to speak out strongly against the senseless arms race. Since Sweden became a member of the predecessor of the Committee on Disarmament 20 years ago, it has consistently and vigorously advocated a comprehensive nuclear test ban in order to stop the nuclear arms race. The nuclear powers frighten us with their persistent neglect of the risks to which they expose the whole of mankind through their continued accumulation of nuclear weapons.

In her statement on 16 February, the Under-Secretary of State, Mrs. Thorsson, expressed criticism particularly against one of the Superpowers because of its role in blocking the efforts of the Committee on Disarmament to fulfil its obligations under its mandate and agenda. When the representative of that Superpower a month later announced a certain change in its attitude, it gave me a welcome opportunity to express my delegation's satisfaction. It seemed to give reason for hope that at last the Committee could start the consideration of this subject in a working group, which is the most effective organ for the performance of the functions of this Committee. The ensuing negotiations on a mandate for such a working group turned

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

out to be, as you yourself stated, Mr. Chairman, both long and arduous, despite the skilled leadership which you yourself exercised, as also your predecessor, Ambassador Alessi. The compromise formula which was worked out by Ambassador Jaipal and which is known as "J-1", certainly is far from what my own delegation and other delegations from the Group of 21 had proposed originally. My delegation has nevertheless agreed to this formula, because we see it as an opening, as an opportunity to start concrete work on the subject. "J-1" has deficiencies like those of the original mandate of the Working Group on Chemical Weapons.

Because of the experience of that Group, we see no reason why useful work cannot be carried out also on a nuclear test ban, even with a mandate that is so limited. We are convinced that the strength of our arguments will sooner or later lead to the conclusion of an agreement on a test ban. We are also convinced that this process can be shortened through the achievements of the forthcoming working group.

It was therefore with great surprise and deep disappointment that we saw the other Superpower and its allies reject this opportunity. Like the distinguished delegate of Brazil in his statement yesterday, my delegation could see such behaviour fitting into the power game which has become all too familiar in the history of multilateral disarmament negotiations. We were also prepared to react most strongly against such a misuse of the Committee on Disarmament.

However, let me now express again my delegation's satisfaction at seeing another change of attitudes, which has made it possible to come to this truly important decision of setting up an ad hoc working group on a nuclear test ban. It will, of course, be possible to judge the real importance of this decision only when it becomes apparent to what degree the nuclear-weapon Powers are prepared to participate in its work with substantive contributions.

As I have announced already in one of our informal meetings, my delegation intends to submit again for the consideration of the Working Group, when it meets during our summer session, the draft treaty on a comprehensive test ban which it presented for the first time in 1977. We see nothing in the mandate which prevents a full consideration of that draft treaty.

In conclusion, I want to say that with today's decision the Committee on Disarmament can envisage the critical assessment of its work during the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly with a good deal more confidence than seemed possible only yesterday.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): Mr. Chairman, Ambassador Vejvoda of Czechoslovakia has already very ably presented the views of my country on our assessment of the results of the spring session. Therefore I would like to confine myself to making only a few comments on the decision taken by the Committee on the establishment of an ad hoc working group on a nuclear test ban.

As in the past, my delegation during the first part of the Committee's session this year took an active part in the efforts to establish an ad hoc working group to negotiate a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. It is in a spirit of compromise and co-operation that we today join the consensus on a mandate which was prepared by Ambassador Jaipal and amended by the Mexican delegation. It is the understanding of my delegation that this mandate and

(H. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

the working group to be set up will give fresh impetus to the initiation of real negotiations on a CTB, thus enabling the Committee on Disarmament to discharge its responsibilities as the multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, as was stated expressis verbis in the mandate.

The endorsement of this mandate, of course, does not change the position of principle of my country concerning negotiations on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. This position was explained many times in this Committee and reaffirmed in the statements my delegation made on 16 and 25 February this year.

With regard to a CTB as well as other problems of arms limitation and disarmament, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, now as before, proceeds from the principle that the form and modalities of the verification to be provided for in any specific agreement depend on and should be determined by the purposes, the scope and the nature of the agreement. This was clearly stated in paragraph 31 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Having in mind these basic considerations, my delegation interprets the provisions of the mandate before us as allowing for the examination of all specific issues relating to a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, and not only for the discussion of problems of verification and compliance. Furthermore, we believe the provision that "the ad hoc working group will take into account all existing proposals and future initiatives" provides for the consideration of all comprehensive proposals with regard to a nuclear test ban. In that connection we note the intention expressed by the Swedish delegation to put before the working group its draft treaty of 1977 (CCD/526 and Rev.1).

The delegations of Italy, Brazil, Nigeria, India and of other States as well as you yourself, Mr. Chairman, have given similar interpretations to that stated above. We note that nobody not even the United States delegation, has questioned these interpretations.

Lastly, we proceed from the assumption that the stipulation of the mandate concerning further progress towards negotiations on a nuclear test ban provides for the preparation of actual negotiations. A first step on this way could be this mandate which will cover the second part of our session this year. Next year, we could then move a step further in adopting a more comprehensive mandate. Documents CD/259 and CD/181, which reflect the respective positions of the group of socialist States and the Group of 21, could serve as appropriate guidelines for this new mandate.

Finally, I would like to express the hope that all delegations will contribute in a constructive manner to the work of the future CTB working group. Nobody would win, but lose, if this group was to be involved in an abstract debate on issues of verification and compliance. Such an approach, as we know from our long experience, could only lead to the blocking of any progress on the road to a CTB. It could be used by forces interested in creating new nuclear weapons to upgrade their "deterrent forces" for camouflaging their real position on a CTB. Being prepared to take an active part in the working group, my delegation will continue to strongly reject any attempts in this regard.

(Mr. Herder, German Democratic Republic)

In conclusion, I would like to express my thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, and to all representatives, particularly those who have co-operated with me so closely in the drafting group, who by their activities and attitude made this result possible. I was particularly impressed by those many representatives, and I am grateful to them, who never, at any stage of our efforts, showed any signs of doubt about the objective fact that the socialist countries are honestly and consistently defending the cause of disarmament, that they have never, and do not, block progress to this end, but are trying to do their best in order to make headway towards real negotiations and definite agreements on effective disarmament measures.

Mr. TAKAHASHI (Japan): Mr. Chairman, at the close of the spring session of this Committee, on behalf of my delegation, I wish to speak briefly on the agenda item to which my delegation attaches the greatest importance, i.e. the nuclear test ban.

My delegation welcomes the establishment of the ad hoc working group under this agenda item with the mandate as adopted today. The achievement of a comprehensive test-ban treaty has always been regarded by my Government as a measure of the highest priority in the field of arms control and disarmament.

While welcoming the trilateral negotiations on a CTB, we have consistently and continuously stressed the need for such a treaty to be achieved through truly multilateral negotiations in this Committee.

On 23 February of this year, the leader of my delegation reiterated our appeal for the commencement of multilateral negotiations in this Committee in order to achieve a comprehensive test ban at the earliest possible date. In this connection he expressed his continued hope that a consensus could be reached to set up a working group or other subsidiary body of the Committee to deal with this question in the most effective and concentrated manner.

In this context, we welcomed the initiative of the United States delegation as announced by Ambassador Fields on 11 March as a significant step forward.

Since then, my delegation has been actively engaged and involved in the drafting of a possible mandate for the proposed working group.

In the drafting exercise, we have recognized, in all fairness, a significant compromise gesture by all delegations concerned.

In particular, with the forthcoming second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament a few months ahead, my delegation shared the view of many other delegations that we should avail ourselves of every possibility for moving forward in the direction of a CTBT.

My delegation supported the draft mandate frequently referred to in this Committee as "J-1", which contained the most promising elements for a possible consensus, though not completely satisfactory to all.

In this connection, my delegation joins with many other delegations in expressing our gratitude for the painstaking efforts by the personal representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Jaipal, in producing this draft text.

The mandate adopted today may not be as wide or as explicit as one would have hoped. As a matter of fact, it is different from any of the various draft texts my

(Mr. Takahashi, Japan)

delegation prepared for the consideration of the drafting group. It is a result of a compromise by all those concerned. But it does offer a very good starting point. It opens up possibilities for the future.

As a representative of one of the delegations which have been consistently calling for the achievement of a CTBT, as a step towards nuclear disarmament, I wish to express the determination of my delegation to participate actively in the work of the working group and to contribute to the progress of the work of this Committee at its forthcoming summer session.

Mr. IJEWERE (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, as we get ready to round off the first half of the 1982 session of the Committee on Disarmament, I merely wish to associate myself with the warm felicitations already conveyed to you for the modest but significant achievements recorded under your able chairmanship.

As distinguished delegates here will recall, I opened my statement made in plenary on 8 April 1982 by saying that good things do happen to me in the month of April -- being the month in which I was born. The consensus that we have reached in this Committee today on the protracted issue of a nuclear test ban is a testimony to my belief, and my delegation would like to express its sincere gratitude to the group of socialist countries for their latest display of a spirit of compromise in accepting a consensus mandate for the ad hoc working group on item 1 of the Committee's agenda.

This decision is significant in many respects -- not only in the context of the long and hazardous journey towards the initiation of multilateral negotiations on a nuclear test ban, but also because of the need for this Committee to change drastically its dwindling credibility as the sole multilateral organ on disarmament matters.

Obviously, this show of flexibility by the Superpowers is a step in the right direction, and my delegation hopes that the negotiations that this Committee will embark upon in the second half of the 1982 session will not exclude detailed consideration of existing proposals, new ideas and fresh initiatives that would make for progress towards the achievement of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

The second special session, in the view of my delegation, should be a forum for the harmonization of the divergent positions and views of States, especially those of the nuclear-weapon States. We sincerely hope that the session will not turn into a forum for cold-war politics and confrontation, as this would certainly have an adverse effect on our deliberations during the summer session of our Committee.

Finally, I would like to thank my colleagues in the drafting group, other delegations, and the distinguished Secretary of the Committee, Ambassador Jaipal, who all contributed, in no small measure, to this significant achievement. No one group, in my opinion, has been able to achieve all that it set out to achieve. We in the Group of 21, expected the proposal christened "J-1" but which has now been given the symbol Working Paper No. 67 to be more precise and direct but we have had to agree to a considerable degree of dilution of our original objective. I expect also that both the western group and the socialist group, out of a spirit of "give and take", accepted Working Paper No. 67 by way of compromise. My delegation is pleased, if not flattered, to learn that our humble appeal and that of others have had some good effect.

Mr. SARAN (India): Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to express its satisfaction that it has finally been possible to obtain consensus on an appropriate mandate for an ad hoc working group on a nuclear test ban. We appreciate the untiring efforts made by you, Mr. Chairman, as well as by your distinguished predecessor, Ambassador Alessi of Italy, in this regard, as well as the spirit of compromise and flexibility which has been displayed by all delegations, we believe, in the best traditions of this Committee. Needless to add, Mr. Chairman, the delegation of India fully shares the sentiments that you yourself expressed at the very key role which Ambassador Jaipal played in making this compromise possible. We are also particularly glad to know that the group of socialist delegations has, after careful reflection, agreed with our interpretation of the mandate that we have adopted. It has been our position from the outset, and we would like to underline this again, that the issues of verification and compliance relating to a nuclear test ban, as in fact, with regard to any measure in the field of disarmament, cannot be considered in isolation or separately from issues of scope, duration and entry into force of a proposed ban; otherwise, all that we would be engaged in would be an academic and sterile exercise. It is our understanding that the mandate as agreed upon takes fully account of the three essential elements that my delegation has emphasized right from the outset. These elements are, firstly, that any such mandate should recognize the role of the Committee as the single multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament, including with regard to a nuclear test ban. Secondly, the consideration of issues relating to verification and compliance must not exclude consideration of issues relating to other aspects of a nuclear test ban, and lastly, the mandate must lead towards the actual drafting of a treaty on this subject. It is on this understanding that we have accepted this mandate, even though our present situation remains as set out in document CD/181.

My delegation would also like to make a statement with respect to the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons. It is the position of my delegation that the distinction drawn in this report between the so-called traditional and non-traditional subject-matter of negotiation in the Ad Hoc Working Group is an artificial one, and detracts from the very clear-cut and precise mandate of this Group. The subject-matter of our negotiations is nothing more and nothing less than a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons.

To conclude, I would like to express to you, Mr. Chairman, the warm congratulations of my delegation on the successful conclusion of the first half of the Committee's current session. It is a tribute to your wisdom and unfailing patience and courtesy that we have been able to chart our ship safely into harbour, albeit a day after our target.

Mr. JAYAKODDY (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, at the tail end of this protracted and difficult session of this Committee, may I be permitted to make a few observations regarding our work during the past three months. I would like to touch on two aspects of what we have tried to do at this session.

The first relates to the wide gap that exists between our achievements or lack of achievement in this Committee and the aspirations and hopes of hundreds of millions outside. As we all know, since this Committee came into being there has been, and quite justifiably, rising hope in the world that the Committee on Disarmament could

(Mr. Jayakoddy, Sri Lanka)

succeed even marginally in negotiating agreements on disarmament which would alleviate the concerns and anxieties that were expressed so lucidly in the Final Document of the first special session. There has been continuing and insistent pressure from Governments and people from all corners of the globe that the Committee on Disarmament get down to achieving something tangible on the path towards an end to the nuclear arms race, and help initiate the process of nuclear disarmament. In addition, there has been insistent demand that some degree of progress be achieved in negotiating other disarmament agreements.

However, when we look at the report that we have prepared for the second special session, it becomes evident to us, and it will be evident to those who will read it outside, that very little has been achieved. It becomes necessary, therefore, to reflect on why the level of achievement has been so little. To us in this Committee, it is clear that the lack of achievement has not been due to an inadequacy of effort or perseverance on the part of delegations. I think we have witnessed at this session, and in the previous sessions, a great deal of hard and committed work which has been directed towards achieving success. The main constraining factor has not been the procedures of the Committee or its membership or a lack of contributions from its members. The cause of the problem is elsewhere. Time and time again, we have heard that what is lacking is political will to negotiate on the part of member States, and as long as this political will is not forthcoming little will be achieved. The work of this Committee at this session has clearly demonstrated that this in fact is the case.

Political will can come only from the mind. It is, therefore, only in the minds of those who decide policies that the struggle for disarmament can be won. We, as representatives of Governments in this Committee, carry out our instructions which are based on the policies that our Governments have chosen to implement. It is, therefore, only natural that as long as there is continuing reliance on age-old theories of deterrence, parity and superiority to preserve security and safeguard peace, there is little chance for a change in the will to move towards disarmament. It has been clear all along that until this change in will, attitude and posture takes place, there is very little that can be achieved in this Committee, or elsewhere, in the field of disarmament negotiations. True enough, small, limited, tentative steps may be taken where arms control is concerned, but the more radical, decisive steps that need to be taken on the path towards genuine nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament will not be taken until a change of will and attitude has taken place. In this world of ours, tigers do not become vegetarians, but we do hope that by August this year some change for the better will have taken place in minds and wills so that real disarmament negotiations can take place in this Committee.

The second matter I wish to refer to is item 1 of our agenda. A major concern in this Committee over the last three and a quarter years has been nuclear disarmament. High priority was given to a nuclear test ban. After a long and protracted period of trying to agree on the setting up of a working group with an adequate mandate on this item, we now face the hopeful prospect of having such a working group with a mandate that has been adopted by consensus. Let me say, frankly, that the mandate that has been adopted for the ad hoc working group on a CTB is not exactly what my delegation had hoped for, or wanted. However, together with other member States in the Group of 21 we have always been ready to accept a mandate that meets our concerns and which could be

(Mr. Jayakoddy, Sri Lanka)

adopted by consensus in this Committee. My delegation would like to express its sincere thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, to Ambassador Alessi, our Chairman for the month of March, and all the distinguished representatives in the Committee, as well as to Ambassador Jaipal, for the very hard and dedicated work that was put in towards arriving at a solution to this difficult problem. I would like also to express our sincere thanks to all the delegations which have shown the utmost flexibility and a great degree of reasonableness so that this Committee, before it closes this session, could adopt a decision on the setting up of a working group with an acceptable mandate. We feel that taking into account your statement of today, all the explanations, interpretations and definitions that have been given, there is a real possibility of commencing a course of work, on the basis of the mandate, which can eventually result in a CTBT.

In conclusion, may I say that we hoped for more tangible results at this session, but this was not realized. We hope that the second special session of the General Assembly will give a new impetus that can move the Committee towards a higher level of achievement at its summer session.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with all the previous speakers who have expressed a deep debt of gratitude to you for the invaluable contribution you have made this year to expediting the work of the Committee and to achieving a measure of consensus in our work. Your patience and guidance have contributed immeasurably towards the little success that we have had in this Committee.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, allow me first of all to congratulate you on the way in which you have directed the work of this Committee during the month of April. We asked to be included in the list of speakers for today because of the very important decision which the Committee on Disarmament has just adopted. It has decided to set up a working group on the first item on our agenda, entitled "Nuclear test ban", with a mandate acceptable to all members of this Committee. My delegation wishes to express its great satisfaction that it has proved possible to take this decision, and to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and Ambassador Alessi of Italy, for your conduct of the negotiations which led to this agreement. We should also like to offer our congratulations to the delegations that were most closely involved in the negotiating process, to the Committee on Disarmament itself and, of course, to Ambassador Jaipal, the Personal Representative of the Secretary-General.

Mr. TERRIEFFE (Ethiopia): Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my statement at this concluding stage of our spring session is to underline my delegation's position concerning certain points and also to explain the manner in which we assess the progress of the work of the Committee on Disarmament, whose special report to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament we have now adopted.

Since the first special session in May 1978, the Committee on Disarmament has been conducting its negotiations in a changing and sometimes disturbing environment. One can observe that 1979, the year immediately after the first special session, was perhaps the most productive in terms of cross-fertilization of ideas and healthy exchange of views on disarmament measures, particularly nuclear disarmament. During this period, the Group of 21 in particular urged the major nuclear-weapon States to make more concrete

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

disarmament measures. In its working papers the Group insisted on the need to establish working groups on specific items of the agenda. The Group of 21 has also urged the parties to the tripartite negotiations on NTB to inform the Committee on Disarmament on the progress of their negotiations and to involve more directly and actively the Committee on Disarmament in these negotiations. It has also sought clarifications on outstanding issues. The Group of 21 has repeatedly requested the United States and the USSR to resume and complete their bilateral negotiations on a chemical weapons convention. Unfortunately, the responses to these requests have not always been satisfactory. The bilateral and tripartite negotiations are now suspended, thus preventing the Committee from focusing its attention on two most important items of its agenda. Moves have also been made to upset priorities set in the Final Document.

New types of weapons of mass destruction are being deployed and developed, including the neutron bomb and more sophisticated types of chemical weapons. The danger of the outbreak of a nuclear war has greatly escalated. In the face of all this, mass demonstrations have been held expressing opposition to the continuing escalation of the quantitative and qualitative development of nuclear armaments and against the policy of preparing the stage for a possible nuclear war. People all over the world are calling for the cessation of the arms race, and for the total elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and for a freeze on nuclear weapon tests. Leading and knowledgeable personalities and organizations have challenged the doctrines of nuclear deterrence. It seems that such a spontaneous mass movement cannot go unheeded, particularly in view of the fact that mobilizing world public opinion in favour of disarmament is one of the objectives of the forthcoming second special session devoted to disarmament, whose agenda includes such items as disarmament education, training and public information activities. My delegation therefore expresses the hope that certain nuclear-weapon States may be persuaded to reject the theory of a so-called "limited nuclear war" since there will be no winner in such a war.

My delegation believes that the consideration and adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament is one of the most important tasks that the Committee on Disarmament is tackling. The report of the Ad Hoc Working Group included in the Committee's special report to the second special session is a noteworthy document and deserves thorough study. My delegation is fully behind the proposal that for such a programme to be realistic it has to include time-frames, and clearly defined objectives, principles and priorities to be negotiated. The world has anxiously waited for over two decades to see the beginning of a comprehensive programme such as the one we are trying to design. A time-frame not beyond the year 2000 is therefore reasonable. In the spirit of paragraph 50 of the Final Document, my delegation earnestly hopes that the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapon systems will cease and that this will be followed by the cessation of the production of all such weapons and their delivery systems, leading finally to a comprehensive phased programme for the progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles with a view to the ultimate and complete elimination of such weapons at the earliest possible time. The Committee on Disarmament was requested by the General Assembly in resolution 35/152 J and resolution 36/92 F to continue its negotiations on the elaboration of a CPD for submission to it at its second special session. The section on a CPD in the report we have just adopted, although not entirely free from square brackets, nevertheless represents over two years of hard work. The able leadership provided to the Ad Hoc Working Group by Ambassador García Robles of Mexico is highly appreciated by my delegation. My delegation expresses the hope that outstanding issues relating to measures, stages and the nature of the programme will be negotiated seriously in the future.

(Mr. Terrefe, Ethiopia)

Mr. Chairman, thanks to your relentless efforts, as well as those of Mr. Alessi, and the skills which you have applied, we have now reached a consensus and produced a mandate for an ad hoc working group on a nuclear test-ban treaty. This consensus, it seems to me, was possible not only due to the flexible position taken by the Group of 21, but also to the spirit of co-operation and compromise displayed by the group of socialist States, particularly at the consultation meeting held this morning under your Chairmanship. My delegation congratulates all of those who contributed to this success. It is my delegation's understanding that this mandate will enable the ad hoc working group to negotiate, in the spirit of the Group of 21 document, CD/181, issues relating to the scope, verification of compliance, final clauses and other elements that would go into a draft treaty, and a treaty which would lead hopefully to general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. It is also understood by my delegation that the ad hoc working group will take into account all existing proposals and future initiatives in preparing the draft treaty. It is in this spirit, Mr. Chairman, that my delegation associates itself with your statement expressing appreciation to all those delegations that have shown a spirit of compromise and co-operation in our work.

Finally, my delegation is pleased to note the progress which has been made in the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons, chaired by Ambassador Sujka of Poland, the Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Wegener and the Working Group on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-Nuclear-Weapon States Against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons, which has been chaired so ably by Ambassador Ahmad of Pakistan.

Mr. DON NANJIRA (Kenya): Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates, this session of the Committee on Disarmament is about to adjourn, and I would like to take the liberty of expressing the genuine appreciation and satisfaction of my delegation at the impartial manner in which you, Mr. Chairman, have guided our deliberations during your chairmanship of the Committee. As you know, Sir, dramatic developments in our negotiations have taken place particularly during the last four days or so, and, fortunately, the ultimate result of your tireless efforts has not been too negative, especially if measured against the background of the discussions we have held since we convened here on 2 February last.

Let me also, Sir, express my delegation's gratitude to your predecessors, Ambassadors Alessi of Italy and Mahallati of Iran, as well as to the Ambassadors of Mexico, the Federal Republic of Germany, Pakistan and Poland who have impartially served as chairmen of the four working groups. I also wish to pay tribute to the Secretary of the Committee, Ambassador Jaipal, and his entire staff, as well as the interpreters, for the excellent services they have rendered us in the past three months.

It is not the intention of the Kenya delegation to give a full evaluation of the work of the Committee on Disarmament. I must, however, reiterate one of our central points of view, namely, that many loopholes still exist in the negotiating character of the Committee on Disarmament and that this Committee must fully address itself to this question. The forthcoming special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will offer us a good opportunity for this purpose, and I hope that as we review and appraise the implementation of the recommendations of the first special session, we shall pay particular attention to and resolve to implement the vital requirement that

(Mr. Don Nanjira, Kenya)

the Committee be the single multilateral negotiating forum, to carry out substantive negotiations, and not a mere community for debating disarmament issues. On a more positive note, I believe that the Committee has, at its current session, reached agreement on important areas of its work and these decisions should be borne in mind and built upon, not only during the second special session but also during the Committee's summer session of 1982 and beyond. One, is the agreement, perhaps the best achievement of the session, which we have reached on the special report of the Committee to the second special session of the General Assembly. It is, in my opinion, a balanced report, even though it lacks a recommendatory character which my delegation would have liked to see in such a report, which is customarily submitted only once in five years. Therefore, while conforming in structure and content to the special character which it was supposed to assume, on the basis of the guidelines given by the Committee at the beginning of this session, the special report should have offered some specific and practical recommendations for the consideration of the General Assembly at the second special session rather than limiting itself to the mere statement in summary form of "the state of disarmament negotiations since the first special session".

Another quite welcome agreement has just been reached on the establishment of an ad hoc working group on a nuclear test ban, on the basis of the proposal contained in working paper No. 67, dated 21 April 1982, prepared by Ambassador Jaipal, following his consultations with various delegations. We have particularly welcomed this positive development because it touches on an issue on which the Committee has spent a lot of time, both formally and informally, during its current session. My delegation has therefore decided not to stand in the way of the creation of a working group on the basis of Working Paper No. 67, not because the proposal per se offered the best mandate for the working group on a CTB, but basically because of four reasons. One, my delegation has come to the conclusion that the proposal in Working Paper No. 67 would offer the best chance so far for a consensus. Two, the mandate in that proposal is open; that is, it will enable the working group, once created, to discuss all issues relating to item 1 of the Committee's agenda. Three, the proposal does not in any way diminish the validity of the position of the Group of 21, of which my country is a member, contained in document CD/181, dated 24 April 1982. And finally, I strongly believe that as the multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, recognized by the international community and in accordance with paragraph 120 of the Final Document of the first special session, this Committee must not be prevented from exercising its legitimate right and corresponding duty to carry out multilateral negotiations on a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests. I believe that the block politics, tactics and military confrontation of the two military alliances and Superpowers should not at all be allowed to victimize the Committee on Disarmament. They should not at all obstruct the cause and universal character of disarmament, and the Committee on Disarmament itself should not be turned into a battleground for ideological and related purposes. As the distinguished Ambassador of Sri Lanka told us yesterday, there is a saying in Sri Lanka to the effect that "when two elephants make love, it is the grass that suffers most". That is the saying in Sri Lanka, but there is also another saying in Swahili to the effect that "when two elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers most". What would happen if the elephants were to both fight and make love? In the context of the Committee, then, the grass would be the Committee itself, and the Group of 21. We shall therefore support every move calculated to enable the Committee to negotiate a treaty on a nuclear test ban.

(Mr. Don Hanjira, Kenya)

Other agreements reached during this session on other items have included, in particular, agreement on a consolidated text for the CPD, and all these agreements, as I have said before, are welcome to my delegation. Obviously, we would have liked to see greater progress on a CTB, but under the circumstances it has not been possible to achieve this. It is my hope that acceptance of the idea of stages for a CTB will lead to acceptance of the other concepts of a CTB, including, in particular, the critical questions of time-frames, review and appraisal, as well as the binding character, political will and firm commitment which the CPD must assume. Otherwise, this CPD will be a worthless document. My country stands ready to play its role in the cause of disarmament, and as a developing country, we shall continue to attach the greatest importance to the close relationship that exists between disarmament and development, and we shall call for the urgent allocation of the hundreds and thousands and billions of dollars -- the colossal amounts of money squandered annually on the arms race -- to social and economic development, in particular, of the developing countries, in the context of the New International Economic Order.

My delegation believes that it will be very worthwhile for our informal consultations to be resumed in New York right from the very beginning of the special session, and if possible, even during the meetings of the Preparatory Committee for that session. Finally, I wish to say that the Committee still owes the public at large a better way of informing the world community about the Committee's activities. Many things do happen within this Committee, some of them of a serious nature, but I must confess that the world at large knows very little about them and therefore I am really convinced that for the better cause of disarmament, it is essential that improved programmes of education of the masses and education of the policy-makers be initiated, and this in the not too distant future. Mr. Chairman, these are the few remarks that I wanted to make at this stage of our session, and I thank you very much for giving me the floor.

Mr. TIAN JIN (China) (translated from Chinese): Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to point out that China's position on a nuclear test ban is well known. Now, the various sides have agreed to the setting up of a working group on a nuclear test ban in the Committee on Disarmament. The Chinese delegation would not stand in the way of reaching a consensus. However, it reserves the right to make further comments on this question.

Thanks to the efforts of various delegations, the current session of the Committee on Disarmament has yielded some results. The Chinese delegation appreciates very much the diplomatic competence and effective guidance demonstrated by you, Ambassador Okawa, in your work as the Chairman of the Committee for the month of April. However, we could not fail to note that the current grave international situation characterized by Superpower aggression, expansion and occupation and by the increasingly intensified arms race between the countries possessing the largest nuclear arsenals, has exerted an unfavourable effect on this Committee's work and rendered it impossible to make greater progress.

(Mr. Tian Jin, China)

The Chinese delegation greatly hopes that a comprehensive programme of disarmament will be approved during the coming special session on disarmament on the basis of the reasonable proposals put forward by the Group of 21. Similarly, we hope that the special session will see progress on the question of nuclear disarmament. On the question of security assurances provided to the non-nuclear-weapon States, it is our hope that the countries with the largest nuclear arsenals will change their attitude. We expect faster development in the elaboration of a chemical weapon convention during the summer session.

Finally, we hope that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which is attracting world-wide attention, will make a major contribution to promoting the cause of disarmament.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, since I gave the Committee yesterday a description and brief analysis of the draft comprehensive programme of disarmament, although my delegation still thinks that it will be the central item on the agenda of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, I think it is unnecessary for me to take the subject up again today. I have asked for the floor only in order to make a few comments on another subject, the one which rightly occupies first place on our agenda.

The position of the Mexican delegation on the prohibition of all nuclear weapons tests is well known. We have been stating that position for years, both in the First Committee of the General Assembly and in the negotiating bodies that preceded the Committee on Disarmament as well as in the Committee itself. The last time we presented our position at some length was at the opening meeting of the Committee's present session, held on 2 February 1982.

The verbatim record of that meeting can easily be consulted and there is therefore no need for me to repeat now what I said then. I will only say that our position has not changed and that it is on the basis of that position that the Mexican delegation will submit to the working group "proposals" and "initiatives" which, according to the last paragraph of the decision we have adopted today and which is incorporated in paragraph 38 of the Committee's report, should be "taken into account" by the group in discharging the task entrusted to it. And it will be the principles and purposes on which our well-known position is based that will guide our action when we reach the stage, referred to in the last part of the paragraph I mentioned, of adopting a decision on the course of action to be followed next year in this connection.

Until then, I should like to end this brief statement by offering our sincere congratulations and expressing our deep appreciation both to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your predecessor in the Chair, Ambassador Alessi, and also to Ambassador Jaipal who, as Secretary of the Committee, has given you both his constant co-operation. The efforts of the three of you have been rewarded today by the establishment of the working group to which I referred earlier and which, we earnestly hope, may be the first step towards the achievement in the near future of the goal that all the peoples of the world have been pursuing in vain for more than a quarter of a century, namely, the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting all nuclear weapon tests for all time and in all environments.

Mr. SUTRESMA (Indonesia): Mr. Chairman, my delegation wishes to make some remarks now that our Committee is about to finish its spring session. Looking back at what the Committee has tried to accomplish during these last three months, my delegation has reason to state that there are things which all of us, I believe, can be proud of and many others, regrettably, on which further perseverance, resoluteness and more laborious work will have to be put into before minimal progress can be achieved. It has been evident throughout our work during this session, as has been stated by many delegations, that the spirit of mutual accommodation, or the lack of it, continues to be the determining factor for the progress or failure of our endeavours in the Committee. This, I think, is normal in all negotiating forums, and particularly so in the case of our Committee as the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament.

With regard to item 1 of our agenda my delegation, being one of those which have pressed for the early establishment of a subsidiary body to negotiate a treaty on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests, wishes to join the previous speakers in expressing our satisfaction at seeing that it has finally proved possible to set up an ad hoc working group on the CTB under a mandate acceptable to all delegations. I wish to convey my sincere appreciation to all delegations for their commendable display of the spirit of compromise which has enabled the Committee to arrive at this situation. I believe this achievement constitutes a symbol that our Committee is responding in part positively to the appeal of the United Nations General Assembly, and however modest it may appear to be, it has shown that the Committee on Disarmament is able to maintain, if not enhance, its own credibility in view of the increasing importance attached to it by the international community. The fact that it is occurring during your tenure of office, Mr. Chairman, is also a source of gratification to my delegation, as your country and Indonesia continue to enjoy excellent relations. I should be remiss if I did not pay tribute also to the distinguished Secretary of our Committee, Ambassador Jaipal. It is to a great extent due to his skillfulness that we have at long last reached the stage in which we find ourselves today. There is still a long way to go, but I submit that the Committee has made a good start.

On item 2 of our agenda, my delegation cannot but express its disappointment that, notwithstanding the fact that it also is regarded as an item of the highest priority by the Final Document, it again proved not to be possible during the spring session to reach a consensus. My delegation would not like to see this being regarded as a collective failure on the part of the Committee.

On the item concerning negative security assurances, very briefly, I wish to express the hope that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament will give a new impetus that will enable our Committee in the summer session to make significant headway in the discharge of its task in this connection, although regrettably the obstacles appear at present to be insurmountable. But my delegation still entertains the hope that eventually the sense of objective realism will prevail.

With respect to chemical weapons, my delegation entertains the hope that it will be possible, at the summer session, for the Chairman to find a method of work that will enable the Ad Hoc Working Group to advance the process of elaborating the provisions of a convention at the earliest possible date. The importance of its early conclusion, I believe, is quite clear, particularly as we are racing against time in view of rapid technological innovations.

(Mr. Sutresna, Indonesia)

On the item concerning radiological weapons, my delegation realizes that there are many unresolved problems in the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group. However, my delegation shares the hope that the obstacles that have been identified during this spring session may eventually be overcome. It is our view that the Chairman's paper, together with the proposal that has or might eventually be submitted, could provide a starting point for our future work on this item.

On the CPD, it is true, as you may have noticed, Mr. Chairman, that a great part of the report contained in document CD/285 still reflects wide differences of view, some of which are of a fundamental nature. But my delegation is hopeful that during the second special session of the General Assembly, or even before, through informal contacts or consultations or otherwise, these differences may perhaps be resolved in a manner acceptable to all. I agree with some of the previous speakers, although they expressed themselves in a rather pessimistic tone, that each and all of us will have to display a sense of realism, or we shall not be able to overcome these obstacles. But I submit that in applying this sense of realism to our further efforts towards resolving those differences, we should not lose sight of the objectives we wish to achieve through the CPD. Ambassador García Robles, the able Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on a CPD, in his statement introducing the report, touched upon the question of the nature of the CPD to which my delegation will briefly address itself. My delegation, for its part, will be prepared to go along with the consensus which might be evolved in New York to introduce an element of a binding character, because my delegation continues to believe that political commitment alone is not enough, as we have noticed from the experience gained from the Final Document. Ambassador García Robles alluded to several ways in which this could be done. In this context, I would venture to submit for consideration, that in the event of the adoption of the CPD by the General Assembly at its second special session, the programme could perhaps be signed by the heads of delegations, with the full powers of their respective Heads of Governments. This, in the view of my delegation, would be more practical, in view of the urgency that all member States attach to the CPD.

Much has already been said on the great importance attached to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. There seems to be practically nothing which my delegation could add to this. What my delegation wishes to say, however, is that a long period of four years has passed by since all the States members of the United Nations, by consensus, adopted the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, and there can therefore be no better opportunity than the second special session to translate into real deeds the political commitments we all made during the 1970 session. We members of the Committee on Disarmament would do well -- as I gather that many of us will be going to New York to attend the special session -- if we, collectively or individually, also manage to display a spirit of compromise and mutual accommodation there on this important occasion.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, through you, I wish to express on behalf of my delegation, our heartfelt thanks and appreciation to all members of the Secretariat, including those who have been working behind the scenes such as the interpreters and security officers for the commendable services rendered to the Committee during this session.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Sutresna for his statement. The Committee has heard the last speaker on the list of speakers. Would any other delegation wish to take the floor?

Mr. DON MANJIRA (Kenya): I merely wish to correct part of my statement in which I think there was a lapsus linguae. It should have read "this Committee must not be prevented from exercising its legitimate right and corresponding duty to carry out multilateral negotiations on a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests," and not States as I said.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Dr. Manjira for his clarification.

Distinguished delegates, I think we have come to the conclusion of our final debate in the first half of our 1982 session, and I wish to thank you all for your contributions this evening. I would also like to thank you very sincerely for the most kind words that you have addressed to the Chair.

We have one more item of business to deal with, as you are well aware. We agreed in our informal meeting at the end of the afternoon that we would come back, in the plenary, to the question of the dates of the second part of our 1982 session. I regret to say that there is, at present, no consensus regarding the opening date of the summer session, in spite of the consultations that have been going on behind the scenes during this plenary meeting, and, in my view, no consensus is likely to be reached in the next few days. In the circumstances, I feel I have no option but to convene an informal meeting of the Committee on Disarmament in New York, in June, during the second special session of the General Assembly. It may be possible, at that time, to reach consensus because several matters will be clearer than now. I hope you can agree to this procedure, which is permissible under rule 3 of our rules of procedure.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, I understood you to say that this question to which we are now referring would be discussed after statements and the adjournment of the plenary meeting, at an informal meeting. I would therefore request that the formal meeting now be suspended and that an informal meeting be convened where your views can be stated fully. If you have put forward this proposal as a proposal by the Chair, I am rather fearful that it might precipitate a discussion at the formal meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. You have heard the proposal of Ambassador Erdembileg.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): Mr. Chairman, in order not to prolong too much a discussion which has already gone on for too long, let us consider that there are four delegations interested in this matter -- your own, as the Chairman of the Committee until the month of July, and the delegations of Kenya, Mexico and Mongolia. I therefore suggest that we suspend the meeting and the four delegations, under your Chairmanship, consult among yourselves and the decision you come to, be reported to the Committee in the hope and trust that the Committee will endorse immediately the conclusion that you four may reach.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador de Souza e Silva of Brazil. Would you agree to follow the suggestion of Ambassador Erdembileg and suspend this meeting of the Committee on Disarmament and meet again immediately in another informal meeting of the Committee? Is there a consensus on that procedure?

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished representative of Brazil for so kindly suggesting that I should be a member of this small group, but I assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the distinguished representative of Brazil, that the fact that Mexico is shortly to assume the Chairmanship of the Committee has absolutely no influence, as far as I am concerned, on the choice of a suitable date for the opening of our summer session. I believe, as I said this afternoon, and several distinguished representatives have also done so, that we have already spent too much time on this question. I fully agree with the procedural suggestion you have just made. I was also in agreement with the suggestion you made this afternoon when opening our meeting, and with the amendment to your suggestion put forward by Ambassador Issraelyan. I have nothing against our suspending this meeting and holding an informal meeting, subject to one condition, Mr. Chairman. I think that the informal meeting should last no longer than 15 minutes and that we should then take a decision in plenary meeting immediately afterwards. I would not agree to a suspension of more than 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ambassador Garcia Robles. The proposal to suspend the meeting and move into an informal meeting has been seconded by Ambassador Garcia Robles on the condition that it lasts not longer than 15 minutes. Are there no objections? We suspend the plenary and move immediately into an informal meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 10 p.m. and resumed at 10.20 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: (Ambassador Okawa of Japan) The formal session of the Committee on Disarmament is resumed.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that our Committee has been unable to reach a consensus on the date for the resumption of its work in the summer, we would propose that it should be decided that during the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament the Committee should hold a meeting in New York convened by its present Chairman, the Ambassador of Japan, to decide on the date for the resumption of its session in the summer.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Solá Vila for his proposal. Are there any objections to this proposal? There appears to be no objection, so I will take it that the Committee on Disarmament decides to take a decision to reconvene in an informal meeting in June in New York.

Mr. NAZARKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, before we adopt such a decision, I should like to propose that we make a last attempt to find a solution here and now in Geneva by means of brief consultations. I would therefore request that you suspend the meeting for another three or four minutes.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, we are not here to trifle: we have just had a suspension of 15 minutes, I am opposed to a further suspension.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): I fully support the proposal put forward by the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN: There does not seem to be any consensus, I am afraid, on the proposal just put forward by Mr. Nazarkin of the Soviet Union.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): The Mongolian delegation finds it difficult to agree with the proposal put forward by the distinguished representative of Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the only other alternative is to adjourn the meeting without deciding anything. Or would you like to meet again tomorrow?

Mr. ERDENBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): If the Committee were to disperse without taking a decision concerning the opening date of the second part of our session, that would be a violation of our rules of procedure. So I would request you, Sir, and through you all the members of the Committee, to agree that we suspend this meeting for four or five minutes so that the group can consult among themselves and come forward with a decision, and then we can wind up the work of the first part of this session.

The CHAIRMAN: I suspend the meeting for five minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 10.25 p.m. and resumed at 10.35 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: The 173rd plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament is resumed. I feel that there is no consensus on my proposal to convene an informal meeting of this Committee in June in New York. An alternative would be not to decide anything this evening, but to have a further meeting of this Committee at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow morning. Would there be a consensus on that?

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): I would like to ask that it be 10 o'clock as I have some other business later on.

The CHAIRMAN: I have just been informed that there would be no interpreters, so it would have to be in the afternoon.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I think that some of us here -- myself included -- have made our plans on the basis of the date that was fixed for the closing of this part of our session. I have engagements tomorrow that I cannot change, and in truth, Mr. Chairman, I do not see what can happen between today and 10.30 a.m. tomorrow that can change the situation. There are reasons for hoping that the situation might change between now and when you said, in New York, in June or at the beginning of July, or, if you like, during the early part of May when the Preparatory Committee will be meeting. But between now and tomorrow there will really be no change. Thus what is applicable at the present moment is rule 7 of the rules of procedure which states: "The Committee shall decide, as soon as practically possible, the opening date of the second part ...". For the moment it is not practically possible, and we ought therefore either to adopt the suggestion you made at the outset or to leave the matter open for you to decide when you deem it advisable to convene a meeting of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. It seems clear that there is no consensus on convening a further meeting of this Committee tomorrow. I have another alternative, and that is rule 7 of our rules of procedure which says: "The Committee shall decide, as soon as practically possible, the opening date of the second part and the closing dates of both parts of its annual session, taking into account the requirements of its work". The key words are "as soon as practically possible". We are not able to take any decision this evening, so we shall take a decision as soon as it is practically possible. That seems to be the only way out of the impasse in which we find ourselves.

Mr. MELESCANU (Romania): I am really sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I think you are obliged to announce the date of the next plenary meeting when you close this one and I think this would create a real problem. I am afraid we cannot under the circumstances use the provisions of rule 7 of the rules of procedure, I really do believe that you have to announce at the end of this meeting, whenever you close it, when the next plenary meeting of the CD will take place, be it a formal or an informal meeting. Otherwise, it means that the Committee is either in session -- continues to be in session -- or has ceased to exist. I am sorry, I do not mean to complicate things even more, but I do not see any other way out.

The CHAIRMAN: I would willingly announce the date of our next meeting if that were feasible. But since it is not feasible, under the circumstances, all I can say is that the next plenary meeting of the Committee on Disarmament will be convened on a date to be announced.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Truly, this problem seems to be giving us more trouble than J-1 and J-2. We would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you put before the Committee the proposal that it should begin its work on 3 August and that the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons should start on 23 July. This would meet the demands of a number of members of the Group of 21 as well as of other countries, for we have not heard any objection to these specific dates. There is one thing that disturbs us about this matter: it is that if we do not take a decision we shall be unable, under the rules of procedure, to close this session, and if we cannot close the session this will create a very difficult situation for us because in that case we shall not be able to transmit the report we have approved. We would therefore suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you try to see if there is a consensus in favour of 3 August for the Committee on Disarmament and 23 July for the Working Group on Chemical Weapons, together with the date indicated by the secretariat for the closure of the summer part of the Committee's session.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): The Mongolian delegation does not object but supports the proposals put forward by the distinguished representative of Cuba.

The CHAIRMAN: A proposal has been made by Cuba to convene the Committee on Disarmament from 3 August and the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons from 23 July. Is there a consensus on this proposal which has been recorded by Ambassador Erdembileg?

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): I made a proposal at one of our informal meetings. Let me say that I entirely share the views of my distinguished colleague from Cuba that we would do ourselves a great disservice if we adjourned this meeting without coming to an agreement on the opening date of our summer session. When I made my proposal, I had the impression that it had broad support. The only objection to my proposal that I heard was that this would mean, to some extent, a suspension of one of our rules of procedure. Mr. Chairman, we are at present in a very difficult situation -- I would call it quite extraordinary. I cannot see that it serves us to any extent whatsoever to be restrained in this way by our rules of procedure. It has been said by a number of delegations that the rules of procedure should rather guide us in our work, not tie us unnecessarily. For that reason Mr. Chairman, I would again formally submit my proposal, namely, that we start the summer session on 27 July, with you yourself in the Chair for the rest of the month.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I would like to endorse the proposal of the distinguished Ambassador of Sweden.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): I, too, agree to that proposal, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. AKINSANYA (Nigeria): Just to say briefly, Mr. Chairman, that my delegation endorses that proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: Which proposal?

Mr. AKINSANYA (Nigeria): The Swedish proposal.

Mr. HASSAN (Egypt) (translated from Arabic): I would like to support the proposal made by the distinguished Ambassador of Sweden.

Ms. EKANGA KABEYA (Zaire) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, my delegation also supports the proposal of the representative of Sweden.

Mr. STEELE (Australia): My delegation also supports the Swedish proposal, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): The Mongolian delegation can support the proposal of Sweden with the amendment that in July there will be the appropriate Chairman for that month and not the representative of a country whose period of chairmanship has expired. If I understood the representative of Sweden correctly, he said that in July you should continue serving as Chairman. We cannot agree with that proposal because it would be a violation of the rules of procedure.

Mr. de BEAUSSE (France) (translated from French): Mr. Chairman, I was ready to give my full support to the Swedish proposal but if the distinguished representative of Mongolia insists on the application of the rules of procedure, which is in fact very praiseworthy, I think that we can respect the letter of the rules. We could decide to convene the Committee for its next session in the first days of August, and then we could decide that, in view of the amount of work we have to do, that we need to convene a special session. Since this special session would take place in the interval between two regular sessions, it would be held under the chairmanship of the current Chairman, namely yourself, Mr. Chairman, and this special session could be convened between 27 July and 1 August, or, if you like, between 23 July and 1 August. In this way, the letter of the rules of procedure would be strictly respected. We should in fact be applying rule 8, which authorizes the Chairman of the Committee to convene the Committee in special session without, moreover, including any stipulations as to the reasons for such special session.

The CHAIRMAN: (translated from French): You mean a special session of the Committee? Not an informal meeting?

Mr. de BEAUSSE (France) (translated from French): No, a special session, as specified in rule 8 of the rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the last proposal. Is there a consensus on that one? According to the proposal of France, the present Chairman would convene a special session of the Committee towards the end of July, and the second half of the 1982 session would begin on 5 August. Do I have your consensus on that?

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, if this proposal of France can achieve consensus, I would certainly not block consensus here. I only wish to add that I understood that there was also a proposal that the Working Group on Chemical Weapons should start on 20 July: it was not my intention in any way to change this proposal, on which there already previously seemed to be consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I do not think any delegation objected to that part of our proposal -- that the Chemical Weapons Working Group would meet on 20 July. I think we have reached an agreement.

Mr. ERDEMBILEG (Mongolia) (translated from Russian): Mr. Chairman, as regards the proposal that has just been made by the distinguished representative of France, the Mongolian delegation can be flexible. However, this would likewise be a violation of the rules of procedure. If the Committee were to decide to hold a special session, then I do not think that this could last only a few days. A special session, as its name implies, should be specially convened in order to discuss urgent, high-priority matters. That is how I understand a special session: it is not one that is simply the continuation of a normal session. From this point of view, I have an objection.

Mr. SARAN (India): Mr. Chairman, as Ambassador Erdembileg has said there must be an important question that we must discuss at the special session, since the second special session on disarmament will have just ended, I would propose that our topic for discussion at the special session of the Committee on Disarmament should be a consideration of the decisions and recommendations taken at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: Distinguished delegates, interpretation will stop very shortly. I intend to adjourn the meeting at 11 o'clock.

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): I have kept silent, Sir, but since everybody is speaking, I thought I should ask a question. My question is: what is the specific reason why the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons has to begin on 20 July? Why can it not be convened at the same time as the Committee on Disarmament? What is the specific urgency? That is my question.

Mr. UAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, if you are indeed going to close the meeting at 11 o'clock, I think we have no other choice than to convene another meeting tomorrow afternoon. I would propose that we hold another meeting of the Committee tomorrow afternoon, the 174th meeting of the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. DON HANJIRA (Kenya): My delegation would find it difficult to accept that proposal. I think that would not be appropriate to my delegation.

The CHAIRMAN: I propose to adjourn the meeting at 11 p.m. The next meeting will be announced later.

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): I want to make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that I am not blocking consensus: I simply asked a question.

The CHAIRMAN: Maybe we shall have an answer tomorrow.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): If Mr. Mihajlovic was merely asking a question, then the only difficulty I see in the way of our adopting the solution proposed by the representative of France is the scruple of the distinguished representative of Mongolia about there not being a sufficiently important reason for holding a special session. However, I think that the reason given us by Mr. Saran, the distinguished representative of India, is sufficiently important to justify a special session. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to your announcing the next meeting later, but for the reasons I have already given I have to express my opposition to a meeting being held tomorrow. I am sorry, but that is how things are.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The next meeting of the Committee on Disarmament will be announced later. I will adjourn this meeting.

The meeting rose at 11 p.m.