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The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

PRESENTATION OF REPORTS

The CHAIRMAN: I call first on the representative of Poland, Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, to introduce the report of the Commission.

Mr. WYZNER (Poland), Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission:
It is indeed my privilege to present the special report of the Disarmament Commission to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Since I am speaking for the first time in the Ad Hoc Committee, I should like to express my heartfelt congratulations to you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of this important Committee and to say how happy I am to introduce the report under your guidance.

At its 1981 session the Disarmament Commission considered it important to submit to the second special session a report on the work of its substantive sessions since its re-establishment in 1978 and, consequently, made a recommendation in this regard. At its thirty-sixth session, the General Assembly, by resolution 36/92 B, took note of the report of the Commission and of the recommendations contained therein. At its 1982 session, the Disarmament Commission concluded its substantive work by the end of May, including the preparation of the special report which I am now introducing, as contained in document A/S-12/3.

The report consists of four parts, namely, first, the introduction, which deals with the establishment of the Disarmament Commission by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, devoted to disarmament; secondly, organization of work, which deals with the elections of its officers, its records and rules of procedure; thirdly, work of the Commission at its substantive sessions from 1979 to 1982, and fourthly, conclusions and recommendations to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament.

In paragraph 118 of its Final Document, the General Assembly established, as successor to the Commission originally established by resolution 502 (VI) of 11 January 1952, an organ composed of all States Members of the United Nations.
At its first substantive session the Commission was entrusted with the mandate to consider the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament to be submitted to the General Assembly and transmitted to the Committee on Disarmament for elaboration.

Later, at its subsequent regular sessions, the General Assembly requested the Disarmament Commission to consider various questions in the field of disarmament, as reflected in the agenda of the Commission, which is contained in part III of the report before the Committee, entitled "Work of the Commission at its substantive sessions from 1979 to 1982". In addition to the elaboration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, which was completed in 1979, the Commission completed and concluded recommendations on the elements of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, completed in 1980, as well as items concerning various aspects of the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, and the reduction of military budgets since 1979. In 1981 the Commission included in its agenda an item on the elaboration of the general approach, structure and scope of the study on conventional disarmament, which was completed at the 1982 session. A text entitled "Guidelines for the study on conventional disarmament" was adopted. Under resolution 36/97 A, the Commission was requested to transmit the conclusions of its work on the item to the Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General to undertake the study.

Another item on the agenda of the Commission included a letter from the Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid addressed to the Chairman of the Commission on the question of military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. The item was considered at the 1981 and 1982 sessions, but the discussion was inconclusive; still another letter relating to the item was dated 1 February 1979 and sent from the Secretary-General to the Chairman of the Commission, transmitting all proposals and suggestions listed in paragraph 125 of the Final Document. The Commission has had no opportunity to consider this item.

In considering those agenda items at its various substantive sessions, the Commission conducted its work on the basis of the rules of procedure laid down in paragraph 118 (b) of the Final Document, which states, inter alia, that the Commission shall make every effort to ensure that, in so far as possible,
decisions on substantive issues are adopted by consensus. I am happy to report
to the Committee that the Committee was indeed able to work on that assumption
and to reach consensus, in particular, in approving this report to the special
session.
Like other disarmament bodies, the Commission decided that non-governmental organizations be permitted to attend plenary meetings, make their documents available to delegations and be able to receive official documents of the Commission.

It should be noted that the Commission held brief organizational sessions in December of each year so as to elect its officers for the following year and to consider the elements of the agenda of its next substantive sessions in the light of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

Finally, part IV of the report deals with the conclusions and recommendations to the General Assembly at its second special session on disarmament. It was recommended that the Commission continue consideration of the items concerning the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, reduction of military budgets and the nuclear plans and capability of South Africa. These recommendations are contained in paragraphs 22, 25 and 32 of the report. The Commission also adopted guidelines for the study on conventional disarmament, as contained in annex III to the report. Furthermore, a number of delegations offered suggestions and made proposals on the future role and functions of the Commission, which, owing to a lack of time, could not be considered at the 1982 session. Those suggestions and proposals are listed in paragraph 29 of the report. It is recommended that they be considered at the appropriate time under the appropriate agenda items.

In conclusion, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all the members of the Commission for their unfailing co-operation and spirit of compromise and flexibility demonstrated during the deliberations, which were instrumental in enabling us to conclude our work successfully at the last session in particular. On behalf of the Disarmament Commission, I should like also to express appreciation of the excellent assistance provided by the Secretariat, and particularly of its efforts in preparing this special report.

The special report is now being considered by the Ad Hoc Committee under agenda item 9 of the second special session on disarmament, and I am pleased to commend it to the members for their attention.
The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Sweden, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on the Reduction of Military Budgets, to introduce that Group's report.

Mr. CARS (Sweden), Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on the Reduction of Military Budgets: First, I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity you have given me to introduce the report of the Group of Experts on the Reduction of Military Budgets. The Group was appointed by the Secretary-General last year in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 35/142 B. The report is contained in document A/S-12/7. This Group was the latest in a series of expert groups which have been working on various problems in connexion with the reduction of military expenditures. The purpose of all the efforts made by the groups is to promote the conditions for fruitful negotiations and agreements to reduce military expenditures and to facilitate such negotiations whenever they take place.

The tasks with which we had to deal were: to refine further the reporting instrument adopted in 1980, and to examine and suggest solutions to the question of comparison and verification.

Why is it so important to study the problems of comparison? I think the answer is that, if we want to conclude agreements to reduce military expenditure that are expected to last for several years, we have to find solutions that will allow for different rates of inflation in different countries; and, as there are no generally acceptable methods of deflating military expenditures, there is also a need to find adequate solutions to this problem. Also, I think that countries participating in negotiations to reduce military expenditures would be interested in comparing their military expenditures with those of other negotiating parties. It was also with a view to facilitating future negotiations that the Group of Experts carried out the task of examining those questions.

I believe that no expert groups can ever solve the problems that future negotiators will be faced with; they can only point out a number of technically possible solutions, some of which may also be politically acceptable. This may help the negotiators, but definite solutions can be agreed upon only as a result of negotiations. It is therefore important to create the necessary
conditions for such negotiations and to start them as soon as possible. Having said that, it is also worth underlining that time should not be lost waiting for such negotiations; instead we should be active in trying to find solutions to the problems that I have just mentioned, in order to enable negotiations to take place and to facilitate them whenever they are held.

The Group of Experts concluded that, if there is a common understanding among negotiating parties with regard to the selection of appropriate methods and assumptions, it will be possible to solve the technical problems that must be solved to reach agreements on the reduction of military expenditures. That, to my mind, is a very strong and promising statement by the Group. The message is clear: if Governments are prepared to start negotiations on the basis of a firm political determination to arrive at agreements, then experts will be able to provide the satisfactory technical means necessary for the successful conclusion of such agreements.

This report and the suggestion made in it that the Group should continue its work should by no means be regarded as a reason to delay negotiations among States. On the basis of those conclusions, the Group has recommended that the reporting instrument adopted in 1980, which has been introduced, should be used by an ever increasing number of States from different geographical regions and with different budgeting and accounting systems; and that the Secretary-General, assisted by experts and with the voluntary co-operation of States, should undertake the task of constructing proper instruments, such as price indexes and purchasing power parities, for the comparison of the military expenditures of States participating in this exercise. It is the Group's belief that a successful demonstration of the feasibility of constructing such instruments would contribute much to preparing the ground for future negotiations on the reduction of military expenditures. On the conclusion of this mainly theoretical study which has been carried out by this Group, it seems a logical step that the General Assembly should invite Member States to participate in a practical exercise, as suggested in the report.
Finally, the Group has recommended that the General Assembly should urge Member States, and in particular the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, to help create the necessary conditions for fruitful negotiations on agreements to reduce military expenditures and to recognize that in the process of such negotiations a reasonable availability of statistical data would be required. I should like briefly to draw attention to this last sentence, which I think is somewhat of a new element, namely, that the Group does not say that the publication or the reporting of military expenditures should be a pre-requisite for starting negotiations. What it says is that, if one is really seriously interested in fruitful negotiations, one must realize and recognize that there is a need to make data available in the process of such negotiations. And, on that basis, the Group stated, Member States should start negotiations as soon as possible.

It is difficult in five or ten minutes to summarize a report which is the result of work done during one year, but I hope that I have succeeded in summarizing the most essential parts of the message that we would like to convey to this Assembly. I also hope that the results of the study and the conclusions and recommendations presented in it will be useful for our work and will also help to bring us at least somewhat closer to the conclusion of international agreements on the reduction of military expenditures.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): Before the Committee embarks on problems of a more serious nature, I shall make a very brief statement concerning the World Disarmament Campaign.

In his statement in the general debate on 10 June, the Prime Minister of Finland dealt with the significance of public opinion in Finland and in many other countries and its importance in support of efforts towards measures of disarmament. He stated that public opinion was a real, potent force. Furthermore, he gave the support of Finland to the World Disarmament Campaign launched at this special session.
Finland welcomed the report by the Group of Experts on the Organization and Financing of a World Disarmament Campaign, in document A/36/458, on which the General Assembly took action last autumn. We have noted with satisfaction the broad support the report received. The report serves to underline the necessity of greater public awareness of the threats of the arms race and its economic and social consequences. We fully concur in the general purpose of the Campaign, the mobilization of world public opinion on behalf of disarmament measures by addressing the priorities laid down, in particular, in the Final Document of the first special session.

We have also welcomed the report prepared by the Secretariat containing an outline of the Campaign, document A/S-12/27. As that document is being discussed in a Working Group set up by the Ad Hoc Committee, I shall not dwell on the substance of the Campaign at this time. I would only like to say that we fully concur in what is outlined in the report as the concept of the Campaign.

The study of the Group of Experts identified three primary objectives for the Campaign: to inform, to educate and to generate public understanding and support for the goals of the United Nations in the field of disarmament on the basis of General Assembly decisions.

The Campaign will have to be carried out in all regions of the world in a balanced, factual and objective manner. It is of importance that United Nations information and education activities must be global in scope and content and use those means of communication which are most appropriate in reaching the largest possible number of people. Although the means of informing and educating may vary from region to region, the basic thrust of the activities for the campaign should be equally effective in all regions of the world.

I have the pleasure to announce that the Finnish Government has decided to pledge 250,000 Finnish marks - equal to about $55,000, to the World Disarmament Campaign. This pledge is subject, of course, to customary parliamentary approval. It is the hope of my Government that the Campaign will receive as broad support as possible in terms of both its financing and its practical implementation.
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE 1980s AS THE SECOND DISARMAMENT DECADE AND CONSIDERATION OF INITIATIVES AND PROPOSALS OF MEMBER STATES (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those members who wish to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The statement that I am going to make will, of course, be in Spanish. However, first of all I should like to make a few remarks and, to be especially clear, I shall make them in English. These remarks refer to the original English text in document A/S-12/AC.1/L.3.
(spoke in English)

This draft resolution was delivered to the Secretariat by my delegation in one language, English. The original language of the document, as rightly pointed out, is English.

We were somewhat surprised to find that, probably with the best intentions, some of the officers in charge of reproduction of documents have changed the original text that we delivered to the Secretariat. We would therefore request that, following the usual procedure, a new text be issued that faithfully reflects the original text that we delivered, with the usual foot-note that this has been done for technical reasons. I shall explain in detail to the Secretariat later the changes that we cannot accept.
I now have the honour to submit to the Committee the draft resolution contained in document A/S-1:/AC.1/L.3, sponsored by the delegations of Mexico and Sweden, the aim of which is to urge the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, as the States having the largest nuclear arsenals, to proclaim an immediate nuclear-weapon freeze as described in the draft resolution.

My task on this occasion is quite simple, as the structure and the content of the document are clear and unambiguous. The draft resolution is based upon well-known declarations formulated unanimously by the General Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament which, as is well known, took place four years ago. In those declarations, the Assembly expressed its alarm at the threat to the very survival of mankind posed by the existence of nuclear weapons and the continuance of the arms race. It pointed out that mankind was confronted by an unprecedented threat of self-destruction brought about by the massive and competitive accumulation of the most destructive weapons ever produced, as the existing arsenals of nuclear weapons alone were more than sufficient to destroy all life on earth. It stressed that lasting international peace and security could not be based upon an accumulation of weapons by military alliances or be preserved through a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority, and after having underlined that the most critical and urgent task at this time was to eliminate the threat of a nuclear war, it concluded:

"Mankind finds itself before a dilemma; we must stop the arms race and go on to disarmament or face annihilation."

The first two preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution summarize the substance of the declarations of the Assembly to which I have just referred. In the third preambular paragraph, it is suggested that the Assembly should note
That the conditions prevailing today are a source of even more serious concern than those existing in 1978 because of several factors, such as the deterioration of the international situation, the increase in the accuracy, speed and destructive power of nuclear weapons, the promotion of illusory doctrines of "limited" or "winnable" nuclear war and the many false alarms which have occurred in recent years owing to the malfunctioning of computers, which might well in the future have tragic and incalculable consequences for mankind.

The two following paragraphs are intended to enable the Assembly to express its conviction on the one hand that it is a matter of the utmost urgency to stop any further increase in the awesome arsenals of the two super-Powers, which already possess enormous retaliatory power and an overwhelming capacity for super-saturation or overkill and on the other that it is equally urgent to activate negotiations on the substantial reduction and serious qualitative limitation of existing nuclear arms.

The sixth preambular paragraph is one of the most important of the draft resolutions. It specifies that the freeze should not be considered an end in itself and, at the same time, stresses that it would constitute the most effective procedure for securing the two objectives just mentioned, since it would provide a favourable climate for negotiations on reduction and would also prevent the continued increase and qualitative improvement of existing nuclear weaponry while the negotiations were taking place.

As to the seventh and final preambular paragraph, its importance is equal to that of the preceding one, for through it the Assembly would express its firm conviction that present conditions are most propitious for such a freeze, since the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America are now equivalent in nuclear military power. That fact, which should be obvious to my objective observer, is undoubtedly what led the
thirty-first Pugwash conference held in Banff, Canada last October
to consider that "in general, there is parity between the two super-Powers with
regard to nuclear military capacity". It was that same fact that prompted
the Palme Commission to include an identical conclusion in the report which was
unanimously approved in Stockholm on 25 April of this year and which led
Leslie H. Gelb - who headed the Office of Political and Military Affairs of
the State Department from January 1977 to July 1979 - to affirm in
The New York Times last Sunday that after having made a careful comparative
study of the land, sea and air nuclear weapons of the two super-Powers, as well
as of their respective systems of command, control, communication and intelligence,
"the experts who analyze all these factors conclude that there is parity"
between the United States and the Soviet Union with regard to their nuclear forces.

The operative part of the draft resolution contains only three paragraphs,
the first of which is the fundamental one. In that paragraph, the two super-Powers are
urged to proclaim, either through simultaneous unilateral declarations or through
a joint declaration, an "immediate nuclear arms freeze", which would be a first
step towards the comprehensive programme of disarmament", whose structure and
scope are described as follows.
In accordance with the foregoing, the freeze would embrace four elements: a comprehensive test ban of nuclear weapons and of their delivery vehicles; the complete cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and of their delivery vehicles; a ban on all further deployment of nuclear weapons and of their delivery vehicles; and the complete cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

Also according to that paragraph, the proposed freeze would be subject to all relevant measures and procedures of verification which have already been agreed to by the parties in the cases of the SALT I and SALT II treaties, as well as those accepted in principle by them during the preparatory trilateral negotiations on the comprehensive test ban held at Geneva.

The last two operative paragraphs of the draft resolution are the ones customarily inserted in similar cases, since in the first of these the two States in question are requested to submit a report to the General Assembly, prior to the opening of its thirty-seventh session, on the implementation of the resolution, while, by virtue of the second, the Assembly would decide to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session an item that would permit examination of the manner in which that resolution had been implemented.

In conclusion, I should like to say two things.

First, the fact that an immediate freeze, which is the objective of the draft resolution, is requested of the United States and of the Soviet Union faithfully reflects the letter and the spirit of the Final Document, which stipulates that:

"In the task of achieving the goals of nuclear disarmament, all the nuclear-weapon States, in particular those among them which possess the most important nuclear arsenals, bear a special responsibility."

(resolution S-10/2, para. 48)
If, as we venture to hope, the two super-Powers heed the urgent request which is being made of them, it is to be hoped that the other three nuclear-weapon States will follow their example, or, if they do not, that the General Assembly will lose no time in addressing a similar appeal to them.

Secondly, in order to preclude any concern about the strict fulfilment of the commitments entailed by the requested freeze, the draft not only expressly envisages that the freeze would be subject to all the relevant measures and procedures of verification already agreed upon by the parties in the case of the SALT I and SALT II treaties – which give rise to verification problems far more complicated than any which might arise in the case of the freeze envisaged here – but also takes into account the commitments accepted in principle by the parties in the course of the preparatory bilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test ban held at Geneva from 1977 to 1980.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): I have the honour to introduce, first, draft resolution A/S-12/AC.1/L.2, dated 29 June, sponsored by India and Mexico, on the subject of prevention of nuclear war under agenda item 11.

In doing so, I should like to refer to General Assembly resolution 36/81 B, adopted by consensus on 9 December 1981, which called upon all States, in particular the nuclear-weapon States, to submit to the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament their views, proposals and suggestions designed to secure the prevention of nuclear war. It is indeed a matter of regret to all of us that so far only a few replies have been received in response to this request.

While the vast majority of Member States, which are non-nuclear, evidently would like nuclear-weapon States to agree not to use their nuclear weapons, there is so far no such general agreement among the five nuclear-weapon States, although two of them have given unilateral pledges of a reassuring nature. The danger of nuclear war, none the less, remains undiminished.

The ultimate answer, obviously, lies in the total elimination of nuclear weapons, as stipulated in paragraph 56 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament. Here again, unfortunately, there has been no progress towards nuclear disarmament. On the other hand, the nuclear arms race is continuing, despite massive nuclear over-arming. Furthermore, new weapons
technologies threaten to cause further destabilization, thereby increasing the danger of so-called pre-emptive first strikes and of a general nuclear war.

In this context it is useful to recall paragraph 20 of the Final Document of the first special session, which states that, besides nuclear disarmament,

"... other measures designed to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war and to lessen the danger of the threat or use of nuclear weapons should be taken."

The same thought is also expressed in paragraphs 32 and 58 of the Final Document — namely, that

"All States, in particular nuclear-weapon States, should consider various proposals designed to secure the avoidance of the use of nuclear weapons, and the prevention of nuclear war."

Regrettably, we have still not received any such concrete proposals, either from the nuclear-weapon States or from other States.

Paragraph 58 of the Final Document of the first special session also speaks of the need to ensure the survival of mankind through the participation of all States

"... in efforts to bring about conditions ... in which a code of peaceful conduct of nations ... could be agreed and which would preclude the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons."

Unhappily, we have not yet evolved such a code of conduct for survival in the nuclear age.

It will be abundantly clear from what I have said that the prevention of nuclear war has been accepted as the most acute and the overriding task since the first special session on disarmament, in May 1978. It is high time, therefore, that we gave this urgent matter sustained and methodical attention, not only because the possible use of nuclear weapons hangs over us like the sword of Damocles, but also because parties to disputes seem tempted increasingly to turn to the use of force as inevitable. The responsibility for the prevention of nuclear war is primarily that of nuclear-weapon States. But others too have a right, as well as an obligation, to play a role in achieving this objective.
It is necessary for everyone collectively to explore measures and procedures that would help to de-escalate tensions and to neutralize pressures that could build up towards nuclear war. What better way to explore this possibility than, in the first instance, to seek the advice of the wisest men from various walks of public life around the globe? Clearly, we stand to gain a great deal from the enlightened, fresh approach that will become available from outside the limited framework of normal United Nations diplomacy. Thereafter, we will have the opportunity to examine and carefully consider the various proposals made by that group of eminent persons. In our draft resolution, we have suggested that the Secretary-General should appoint a representative group of public persons of great eminence consisting of statesmen, scientists, physicians, jurists, religious leaders, philosophers and others. Their task will be to advise on special measures and procedures of a practical, political and legal nature that could be employed for the collective control, management and resolution of critical and/or confrontational situations which might otherwise escalate into nuclear war. I should like to make it clear that those measures and procedures are intended to be in addition to those already provided for in the Charter of the United Nations. It is encouraging to note that some other delegations have also been thinking along similar lines. On 11 June of this year, the Foreign Minister of France, Mr. Claude Cheysson, spoke about the contribution that could be made to peace by eminent, independent personalities. He said:

"The international community should be able to benefit from the independent reflections of outstanding men, figures of great authority, and religious, scientific and moral leaders chosen by the Secretary-General from among the various currents of thought." (A/S-12/PV.9, p. 73)

Similarly, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of the Federal Republic of Germany, who addressed the second special session of the General Assembly on 14 June, stressed the fact that

"The danger of a nuclear war has still not been contained ... The threat to peace and the safeguarding of peace are no longer exclusively the concern of Governments." (A/S-12/PV.10, pp. 41, 42)
It is in the same spirit that the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, in her message to the second special session of the General Assembly, pointed out that

"the path to peace and security cannot and does not lie through an arms race or theories of deterrence." (A/S-12/PV.9, p. 93-95)

She stressed the need for co-operation from all in order to save humanity from extinction. In her words:

"In a war, the dominant thought it is win. Can we do less for peace?" (ibid.)

I would strongly commend draft resolution A/S-12/AC.1/L.2 for adoption by consensus when it comes up for consideration before the Ad Hoc Committee and the plenary Assembly.

My delegation would also like to take this occasion to introduce a draft resolution India has submitted on a freeze on nuclear weapons, issued as document A/S-12/AC.1/L.1 dated 1 July 1982. My delegation has submitted to this special session a draft convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons which, we believe, is a first and most urgent step in the effort to root out the menace posed to mankind by nuclear weapons. The prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons will provide the basis for concrete measures for nuclear disarmament. Various proposals and counter-proposals, declaratory statements and suggestions for cuts, freezes and control measures have been put forward in the course of the public discussions and disputation between nuclear-weapon States. Not only is the situation a rapidly changing one, but, given the very character of the nuclear arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States, it would be unrealistic to look for absolute parity or total agreement on the existence of parity in the destructive capacity of the nuclear arsenals of those States.
Our proposal, therefore, is simple, straightforward, comprehensive and universal in character. The nuclear-weapons States should agree straightway to a freeze on nuclear weapons which would, inter alia, provide for a simultaneous total stoppage of any further production of nuclear weapons and a complete cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. The simplicity of that proposal is that it covers all the nuclear-weapon States and goes to the heart of the problem, namely, the expansion and modernization of the nuclear-weapon stockpiles of the nuclear-weapon States. The logic of such a move was effectively expressed by the delegation of the United States in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC) as early as 1964, when it argued that in order to bring about progress it was necessary to stop the nuclear arms race somewhere and at some point. Indeed, we cannot conceive of halting and reversing the arms race or reducing the nuclear-weapon stockpiles without first calling for a freeze in the production of such weapons.

My delegation would like to advance the argument that, apart from the exercise in casuistry that typifies the disputations as to the size and character of nuclear arsenals, the argument that a freeze will in effect freeze the existing inequalities does not really contribute anything worthwhile. We would certainly favour simultaneous negotiations and deep, significant cuts in nuclear arsenals. Even then, however, that should be taken together with the first step, namely, the freeze in production.

If a dialogue on who should be the first party and what should be the first step taken to redress a perceived imbalance is initiated, that would result in no more than a chain reaction to redress such perceived imbalances and would further exacerbate the arms race.
We therefore feel that a freeze is absolutely unassailable and unavoidable as an earnest of subsequent cuts. My delegation is aware of the other proposals on a freeze which have been put forward. We think that they deserve very careful consideration. Our own proposal, however, has the advantage of being direct, simple and all-embracing.

The Chairman. At a meeting held early this afternoon the Bureau of the Ad Hoc Committee gave thought to the organization of our work for the next few days. It was the view of the Bureau that the various Working Groups should be enabled to make their final reports to the Ad Hoc Committee in the next few days so that the Committee can take up whatever issues are outstanding in the various Working Groups and try to resolve them appropriately. Based on that recommendation of the Bureau it was suggested, and the Chairman of Working Group II agreed, that that Working Group should be in a position to conclude its work today and report to the Ad Hoc Committee. I understand that the Working Group has in fact met and that its Chairman, the representative of Australia, is now in a position to report to the Ad Hoc Committee. I therefore call on him.

Mr. Sadleir (Australia), Chairman, Working Group II: In line with the decision of the Ad Hoc Committee at its third meeting, on 17 June 1982, concerning the organization of work, the mandate of Working Group II is to deal with the various subjects under item 9 of the agenda (A/S-12/20), namely: Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The Working Group held seven meetings from 18 June to 2 July 1982.

At its third meeting, on 21 June 1982, the Working Group decided to establish two drafting groups. Drafting Groups A and B, with the purpose of considering the subject specified in the composite paper in Annex I of the report of the Preparatory Committee (A/S-12/1) as the basic document. The mandate of Drafting Group A is to deal with the section 'Programme of Action' of the composite paper. The mandate of Drafting Group B is to consider all other parts of Annex I as well as all other matters included
in agenda item 9, notably the question of studies. At its fifth meeting, on 22 June, the Working Group decided to appoint Ambassador A.T. Jayakoddy, representative of Sri Lanka, as the co-ordinator of Drafting Group A. At its sixth meeting, on 23 June, the Working Group decided to appoint Ambassador Mana S. Sutresna, representative of Indonesia, as the co-ordinator of Drafting Group B. At the same meeting the Working Group further decided that 1 July should be the target date for the drafting groups to finish their work and that 2 July should be the target date for the Working Group itself to complete its work.

At its seventh meeting, on 2 July, the Working Group received oral reports from the co-ordinators of Drafting Groups A and B on the progress of the work entrusted to them. I shall now summarize that progress.

Drafting Group A has held eight meetings since 22 June 1982. It has completed a general examination of all subjects contained in the section headed 'Programme of Action' in the composite paper. As a result of the general examination, a Chairman's working paper was produced containing the suggested text on the section. This is informal paper No. 5, Add.1 and 2, of Drafting Group A of Working Group II. This Chairman's paper served as the basis for consideration in the drafting process. The Group has, however, so far devoted just one meeting to the drafting process, and despite a constructive spirit I cannot hide from this Committee the fact that progress was very limited.

Drafting Group B has held seven meetings since 23 June 1982. It undertook a general examination of the various sections contained in the composite paper as well as a preliminary discussion on the question of studies. As a result of the general examination of the various parts of the composite paper, a Chairman's working paper was produced containing the suggested texts for those sections, that is, informal papers Nos. 2, 3 and 7 of Drafting Group B of Working Group II. That Chairman's working paper was designed to serve as the basis for consideration in the drafting process. However, so far Drafting Group B has not had an opportunity to consider the suggested text contained in those informal papers. Moreover, the Group has so far been unable to give detailed consideration to the important subject of studies. The lack
of progress in the work of Drafting Group B is thus self-evident, and the drafting process needs to be intensified.

Because of the very great amount of work before us, the Ad Hoc Committee might wish to consider the extension of the target date for the Working Group to continue its work so as to fulfil the mandate entrusted to it. In the Working Group we are, however, very conscious of the need for urgency. The Committee may also consider other alternatives so that the Working Group could complete its work as requested. I should add that the dedication of the Working Group in trying by all means to advance work on its mandate is reflected in the fact that, at the last meeting of Working Group II, members of the drafting groups expressed their willingness if necessary to work informally and privately on the tasks before their respective drafting groups and to do so not only today but through the week-end.

In submitting this report I do not want to conclude without expressing my very great appreciation of the efforts made by the co-ordinators of the drafting groups, who have put in a sustained effort to try to achieve progress in accordance with the deadlines that the Working Group set for itself.
The CHAIRMAN: I note that there are no comments on the report of the Chairman of Working Group II; I take that silence to be a sign of deep and severe shock at the information contained in that report regarding the lack of progress achieved in the Working Group.

Nevertheless, I think that we should thank the Chairman of the Working Group and the two co-ordinators who assisted him in carrying out the duties assigned to the Group. We should not underestimate the complexity and difficulty of the work the Group was expected to do; we must not allow the report we have just heard to make us pessimistic.

The important thing for this Committee is to determine how best to proceed with that work, with the assistance, of course, of those who have been actively involved with it until now; I refer primarily to the Chairman of the Working Group, the co-ordinators of the Drafting Groups, and the spokesmen for the various groups of delegations which have participated in the Group's work.

There may still be an opportunity for small groups within the Drafting Groups to take up portions of the document, but as a beginning it was suggested this morning by the Bureau that I might undertake, in close co-operation with the Chairman of Working Group II, an assessment tomorrow of the difficulties the Working Group has encountered, with a view to arriving at some ideas on ways and means of resolving those difficulties and enabling a document acceptable to delegations on the subject of agenda item 9 to emanate, as anticipated, from the Working Group. If there is no objection, then, we shall try over the week-end to see what can be done to advance the work of Working Group II.

Working Group III, having discussed the programme of the World Disarmament Campaign under agenda item 13, is only now beginning its consideration of agenda item 11. It is quite difficult to draft in a full working group meeting, and, to facilitate some form of agreement, or at least of compromise, the Bureau has suggested that it might be wise for the Chairman of Working Group III to designate a small, compact drafting group, composed of delegations representing the various shades of opinion within the Working Group to consider further the World Disarmament Campaign programme. The Working Group itself would then be able to direct its attention to consideration of agenda item 11, in parallel with the new drafting group's consideration of agenda item 13. I take it that there is no objection to that suggestion.
In accordance with an agreement reached in my consultations with the chairmen of the various regional groups, I should like to say that in connexion with the creation of the Chairman's ad hoc contact group, which met yesterday on the question of machinery, there was an understanding that work should proceed on new proposals envisaged under agenda item 11.
There was also an understanding that the new proposal or proposals relating to the prevention of the outbreak of a nuclear war, which in the course of one of our earlier meetings had been referred to in the Ad Hoc Committee and for which several delegations had asked that a subsidiary body be established - a request on which we did not take a decision since at that stage I thought it might complicate the decision we were about to take on the creation of two working groups in addition to the working group on the comprehensive programme - constituted a proper subject for discussion under agenda item 11 in Working Group III and that the Chairman of that Working Group should undertake consultations and discussions on this subject in that body. This would make it unnecessary for the Ad Hoc Committee to embark on a long procedural debate on the establishment of another subsidiary body to take up that particular subject. I hope that the Chairman of the Working Group III, who was present at that meeting, took note of that understanding and that, as part of the discussions on new initiatives and proposals, this subject will be given consideration.

I need hardly remind members of the Committee that we are about to enter the final week of the special session and that we should all be prepared next week to spend as many sleepless nights as we can comfortably spend without having to call in our doctors, because there is really no alternative when we look at the state of play on the various issues before the session.

I am sure that we are all looking forward to a successful conclusion at the end of next week. In order to ensure success there is, of course, a minimum at which we should aim, and it will require a lot of exertion, a lot of compromise and a lot of the spirit of give and take on the part of all members in order to achieve that minimum.

Meanwhile, therefore, I would again emphasize the need for all of us to be willing to exert ourselves and work over this weekend so that by Monday we can record some significant progress.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): The delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan categorically rejects the slanderous accusations of the representative of the United States with regard to the so-called chemical warfare in Afghanistan which were repeated at the meeting before last of the Ad Hoc Committee. These baseless fabrications are part of the larger scheme of United States imperialists against the young revolutionary Government of Afghanistan and the South-East Asian countries.
The accusing Government, whose conduct and credibility in the international arena leave much to be desired, is itself guilty of using tens of thousands of tons of chemical weapons against the peoples of South-East Asia. It was United States imperialists that used chemical and biological weapons against the peoples of Kampuchea, Laos and Viet Nam. United States imperialists not only killed thousands of people with their horrendous chemical weapons, but also devastated hundreds of thousands of hectares of fertile land, turning them into wasteland. The use of Agent Orange has had drastic effects on the armed forces of the United States as well. Evidence of such matters is surfacing daily.

Through its slanderous accusations and hostile propaganda, the United States Government seeks to justify the massive build-up of its chemical-weapon arsenals. Millions of dollars are allocated for the production and stockpiling of new types of chemical weapons. Under a new programme of developing its chemical weapons, the United States Government has allocated a total amount of $2,665 million over a period of three years to the development of chemical weapons. Under that programme the United States arsenal of chemical weaponry, which already includes enormous stockpiles of combat toxic agents, will be substantially expanded and qualitatively updated.

The United States has already stockpiled more than 3 million bombs, mines and grenades filled with neuro-paralytic gases. There are some 150,000 tons of such weapons in stock, enough to arm 50 United States divisions for chemical warfare in the course of 100 days. The magazine Der Spiegel reported that at present the West has a quantity of chemical weapons sufficient to completely eliminate life on earth.

No wonder that at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, the United States found itself the only one out of 157 United Nations Member States to vote against the draft resolution calling on all States to abstain from the production and development of binary and other new types of chemical weapons as well as from the placing of chemical weapons on the territory of those States where there are no such weapons at present. It is well known that the Pentagon intends to increase its stockpiles of chemical ammunition in the territory of other countries, and above all in Europe.
Finally, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has on many occasions drawn the attention of world public opinion and of the United Nations to the facts of the use by counter-revolutionary bandits in Afghan territory of chemical weapons supplied to them from United States sources. For instance, on 25 March 1980 a military patrol of the Afghan armed forces recovered from terrorist bands in Herat province United States made chemical grenades. Samples of those grenades as well as of other chemical weapons captured on different occasions were displayed at a press conference in Kabul. The bandits also ruthlessly used chemical weapons against the civilian population, including schoolchildren.

These irrefutable facts clearly show who the real culprit is in this matter.

Afghanistan has been a true advocate of the banning of all weapons of mass destruction, including chemical and bacteriological weapons. We support the complete elimination of such weapons from the arsenals of all countries.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): Mr. Chairman, I have a brief technical point that I should like to see reflected in our records. Two days ago my delegation introduced two working papers from the Federal Republic of Germany and found that in the Russian translation of those documents the name of my country was wrongly translated. I request the Secretariat through you, Sir, to reissue the Russian version of those working papers for technical reasons and, further, ask that the language section be instructed henceforth to translate my country's name in the correct and accepted way.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat has taken note of the remarks made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany and the appropriate amendments will be made.
Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGLEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): In my delegation's view, it is highly desirable that, with regard to the organization of our work, the Secretariat, in particular the Translation Services, should catch up with the Committee's work and that of its working groups so as to provide immediate translation of the working documents, thus ensuring a more effective participation by all delegations.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretariat has, I am sure, taken note of the remarks of the representative of Zaire and will make every effort to keep abreast of the work going on in the various working and drafting groups.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I want to touch on a question that we regard as significant and to which you, Mr. Chairman, referred at the end of your statement, but only in passing.

At the 3rd meeting, on 17 June, the Soviet delegation made the following formal proposal:

(spoke in English)

"... that consultations be held with regard to the creation of a subsidiary body devoted to the question of the prevention of nuclear war, and that the Ad Hoc Committee return to that question at a subsequent meeting in the near future." (A/S-12/AC.1/PV.3, p. 4-5)

(continued in Russian)

At that meeting, the representative of India said:

(spoke in English)

"In the meeting of the Bureau yesterday, my delegation mentioned the importance of creating a subsidiary body for the consideration of measures for the prevention of nuclear war ... In that context, we feel that it would be very appropriate for the Ad Hoc Committee of the Twelfth Special Session to consider the setting up of a subsidiary body to discuss this very important and vital issue." (Ibid.)
(continued in Russian)

The representative of Brazil said the following at the same meeting:

(spoke in English)

"At this stage I should also like to support the proposal just made by the representative of the Soviet Union for us to find a way to deal very specifically with the question of the prevention of nuclear war." (A/S-12/AC.1/PV.3, p. 6)

(continued in Russian)

At the same meeting, the representative of Argentina stated:

(spoke in English)

"... we listened with great interest to the suggestion made by the representative of the Soviet Union and supported by the representatives of India and Brazil that consultations be held with a view to the possible setting up of a subsidiary body which would consider the question of the prevention of nuclear war." (Ibid.)

(continued in Russian)

At the same meeting, the representative of Mexico supported that proposal thus:

(spoke in English)

"I simply wish to add a few words with respect to the suggestion or the proposal made by the representative of the Soviet Union and supported by a number of other delegations. I believe that later on it would be appropriate for us to consider what would be the best way to deal with this question, the importance of which can hardly be overestimated - that is, the prevention of nuclear war..." (Ibid., p. 8-10)

(continued in Russian)

At the same meeting, the representatives of Indonesia and of Hungary also gave support to that proposal.

I should like to have a reply to the following question: why has this matter not been dealt with to date?

From our point of view, the discussion of the matter of the prevention of nuclear war definitely deserves the closest attention; it should be the central question to be discussed at this session.
Today three draft resolutions have been submitted, and I am convinced that others will be submitted in future. All of them deal with this subject-matter: the questions and problems related to the prevention of nuclear war. That confirms what was said at the meeting of 17 June.

A group of delegations from various regions of the world have spoken out in favour of the establishment of a special working body that would very seriously study this matter - not in passing during a week-end. That is why we must express great dissatisfaction, since there was a proposal put forward and supported by a large group of countries. And I want to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that not a single delegation at the meeting held on 17 June raised any objection to that proposal. Therefore we simply fail to understand why today we hear that tomorrow, on the very last day for the Working Groups' work, Working Group III will, among a multitude of other proposals, somehow deal with the question of the prevention of nuclear war.

Of course, we are not objecting to having these matters discussed and considered by Working Group III. No matter what decisions we take there, these questions will be studied by all the groups so long as effective measures have not been adopted to prevent war. I have no doubt about the fact that next week the plenary Assembly will also have to deal with this same subject-matter.

But I wanted merely to say that the Soviet delegation did not have in mind the proposal which you, Mr. Chairman, just made. We take note of it, but we must express our dissatisfaction in view of the fact that the special session of the General Assembly specifically devoted to disarmament has indeed somehow dealt in a very cursory manner with a question which is of vital importance.

Mr. ADELNAH (United States of America): I just want to say that I think the second special session devoted to disarmament should in general be seized of the question of ways of preventing nuclear war. I think it is our overriding business here at this session. I think that all delegations realize that the prevention of war is what the special session is all about.
I would say that relegating it to a special working group is just downplaying it too much, and that the issue is so important and vital that it should be in all our main groups. It should not now be isolated in a small working group, but should be in our various groups, as it has been throughout the session.

Secondly, I would say that, in accordance with procedures and your decision, Mr. Chairman, Working Group III on new initiatives has been specially directed to deal with this under the chairmanship of our colleague from the German Democratic Republic. One would think that the Soviet Ambassador and the German Democratic Republic Ambassador could work on this together in this new initiatives Group. However, we really believe that to downplay it and restrict it to a small special group would just not be giving it the importance that we attach to this subject.
Mr. KORNEENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with what has just been said by the representative of the United States, I want to stress that in the plenary meetings and in the work of the Working Groups emphasis has always been placed on the question of the prevention of nuclear war, which is the main problem that must be faced by this special session. This fact was also stressed by most heads of delegations who spoke in the general debate. Therefore, if we establish working groups to deal with other questions, it is even more necessary and it is clearly our duty to establish a working group on the question of the prevention of nuclear war. Paragraphs 8 and 20 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, as is very well known, clearly stress that priority should be given to the question of preventing a nuclear war. Therefore, our delegation strongly supports the proposal that such a working group should be established. It is unfortunate that so far a group of that type has not been established, particularly since, as has been stressed today, many delegations have put forward such a proposal, as well as draft resolutions, to which there has been no objection.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): I cannot agree with the arguments that have just been put forward by the representative of the United States. The question of the prevention of nuclear war is certainly the major question discussed at this session. As many speakers in this Committee have already stated, that is a clear conclusion that may be drawn from the general debate. It is therefore only natural to request a follow-up to that conclusion by establishing a subsidiary body of the Ad Hoc Committee to deal with the question in a concrete, not an abstract, manner: namely, how to transform the question into the necessary documents for adoption by this session. A number of delegations have submitted proposals to this effect since the beginning of our debate and several other delegations have supported them. Until this afternoon there has been no objection to that idea. We regret to say, however, that so far a subsidiary body has not been established.

As this session enters its concluding stage, my delegation considers it high time finally to establish such a subsidiary body. Several specific proposals concerning the most important question of the prevention of nuclear war have already been presented, as we have seen this afternoon. There should be a
subsidiary body to consider those proposals promptly so that they may be duly reflected in the decisions of the special session. That is why my delegation would urge you, Mr. Chairman, to take immediate steps to establish the body in question.

Mr. Herder (German Democratic Republic): In statements made in the general debate and in other meetings virtually all representatives have stressed the necessity of adopting effective measures to prevent nuclear war. This central question for mankind has also been emphasized by the non-governmental organizations which have been following our work very closely. I very much welcome the statement made by the representative of the United States, which I interpret to mean that he shares the concern of the overwhelming majority of representatives of the peoples, and I hope that the conclusion to be drawn from that is that his delegation will receive instructions to take an active part in Working Group III in the elaboration of a document containing concrete measures on the prevention of the outbreak of a nuclear war. My Working Group will meet tomorrow morning and I am looking forward to a very constructive and active contribution on the part of the delegation of the United States so that a document can be produced for inclusion in the Final Document of our special session.

Mr. Adelman (United States of America): I feel it incumbent upon me to support the position of the Chairman, since he has been ganged up on by the Soviet Union, the Ukraine, Poland and the German Democratic Republic, and to clarify some points.

The first clarification is that, yes, our delegation is very concerned about measures for the prevention of nuclear war. President Reagan, in his 17 June statement, devoted considerable time and attention to arms control measures, real reductions in the interest of international stability and peace. We shall be more than willing to co-operate in any forum on that subject, and I think we have been very co-operative in that regard. Secondly, I should like to come to the aid of the Chairman with respect to his decision. I have always understood that when we have a large group, such as the machinery of the special session on
disarmament, the purpose of a working group or a subsidiary body - or whatever
we want to call it - is to concentrate on one question so that when the question
comes up in various areas it can be referred to that subsidiary body. My
point is quite simple. This is a question similar to the question of international
security or peace, a question which permeates the work of the special session
on disarmament. The representatives of the Soviet Union, the Ukraine
and the German Democratic Republic want to relegate it to a small
working group, but I think that just downplays the question. If we did that, when
it came up in other bodies than the working group the natural inclination
would be to say, "Let us not discuss that question here; let us
discuss it in the small working group, since that is the main purpose of the
working group setup". Therefore, basically I must support the wisdom of the
Chairman in considering this an issue of overriding importance in all of our
work and in all of our groups.
Mr. Komarovsky (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): It is my understanding of what you said before, Mr. Chairman, that tomorrow in Working Group III an appropriate body will be set up to deal with the question to which we referred. In connexion with the last statement made by the representative of the United States, I have a question which I want to put to him. Did I understand him correctly? Is it a fact that the United States opposes specific consideration of the question of the prevention of nuclear war?

Mr. Erdem-Bileg (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): The Mongolian delegation has listened carefully to the last statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union and we understand that important proposal in this way: it seeks the establishment of a working body which would consider and discuss in detail a question which is of vital significance for the whole of mankind, namely, the question of preventing nuclear war. I listened carefully to the statement by the representative of the Soviet Union and I did not hear him say anything about the creation of a small working body. Indeed, the creation of a working body which would consider in detail the important matter of preventing nuclear war is certainly aimed at having the matter considered thoroughly and specifically. This does not mean that anyone doubts the importance of this subject.

Having said this, we would like to add that we fully support the proposal which was put forward by the Soviet delegation and which was supported by several members of the Committee to set up a working body for the consideration of this important and urgent matter.

Mr. Staykov (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): My delegation has always been deeply interested in the fundamental and vital question of the prevention of nuclear war. That is why my delegation supported and welcomed the proposal which was made a few days ago by the Soviet delegation: that is, the establishment of a subsidiary body to study concrete proposals concerning the question of the prevention of nuclear war.
My delegation expected that the Chairman would take a decision which would follow up this proposal, which was supported by a number of delegations. We were thus very surprised to learn that this proposal was not being given the further action that the delegations present here expected.

Secondly, I should like to express my surprise at the position of the delegation of the United States which, on the pretext that this is a question which affects the activity of all the subsidiary bodies, considers that it should not be examined in detail by a particular subsidiary body. I believe that we find ourselves here with a number of concrete proposals concerning this particular question and that we should examine them and follow them up, and these proposals and our common will should be reflected in the final document of our special session. That is why I firmly support the proposal to establish a subsidiary body to examine in a concrete and fruitful manner all the proposals that have been made to date.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation considers that all the points which have formed the subject of proposals by States with a view to their examination under item 11 should be examined. In this connexion we believe that the proposal presented by the USSR concerning examination of the crucial question of the prevention of nuclear war should, of course, by virtue of its importance and within this context be the subject of appropriate discussion, and we will be quite happy to participate in the most active manner in such a discussion.

However, it appears to us that, in view of the principle of the equality of States and of our equality with respect to our rules and with respect to the arrangements which we adopt regarding the treatment of initiatives by delegations, such questions should be examined and discussed on a basis of equality. We therefore do not feel that any special treatment should be reserved at the procedural level for this question of the prevention of nuclear war.
It so happens that, in the list of questions which was distributed yesterday -
questions submitted by various delegations under item 11 of the agenda - this
question appears at the top of the list. My delegation therefore sees no
objection to having the topic relating to the prevention of nuclear war
discussed first perhaps. We find this quite normal. We would, however, have
a very serious objection to having a special procedural decision confer,
at the formal level of our discussion, a special status on the proposal made
by one State in relation to proposals made by other States. We believe that
there should be equal treatment for all.

Consequently, the French delegation wishes very firmly to support your
position, Mr. Chairman, and the proposal which you made earlier regarding the
organization of our work. We think that it is really in the Working Group
itself that such questions could be examined if the Committee considers that
all the questions under item 11 should be discussed in this context.
If a proposal were made by other States to set up a drafting group to study
the questions under item 11, we would see no objection to that either. What
we do seriously object to is, I repeat, related to the principle of equality
of all delegations in the organization of this discussion, for we believe
that each must be dealt with in the same way. That does not, of course, affect
in any way the very real importance that we attach to the discussion on
the proposal of which we are speaking - that is, the discussion on the prevention
of nuclear war, on which we wish to express ourselves very clearly and very
completely.
Mr. GAJDÁ (Hungary): As will be recalled, on 17 June the representative of the Soviet Union put forward a formal suggestion on the establishment of a subsidiary body that should devote its attention to the question of the prevention of nuclear war, and strong support for that suggestion was formally expressed. There was an understanding here in this Ad Hoc Committee, as reflected in the record, that at a subsequent meeting in the near future a decision would be taken on that formal proposal.

I fully realize that for reasons beyond our control that decision could not be taken on time, but we expected that at today's meeting the proper kind of suggestion would be put forward and a relevant decision would be taken. Unfortunately, that has not happened so far.

The initial statement made by the representative of the United States tended to encourage some of us to believe that a compromise was emerging on the proper handling of this most urgent and most important question. I am sure those representatives who, at the meeting on 17 June, formally supported the proposal would have spoken again today had they not been concerned about unnecessarily prolonging the debate, because I am sure that at that meeting they spoke not for the record but out of their continuing conviction that the prevention of nuclear war is really the most important subject before this special session.

It will be recalled from the record that Hungary was one of those States that gave formal support to the proposal. I do not want to repeat the statement from the record: it is clear, and it remains the same.

The continuation of the discussion was misleading, in a way, and I was somewhat surprised by the second statement of the representative of the United States. I cannot help pointing out, however, my delegation's agreement with his reasoning concerning the importance of this question and his desire not to see a situation in which this very important question is relegated to a second-line sub-drafting group, or whatever.
I assume that there is agreement in this Ad Hoc Committee that the question of the prevention of nuclear war -- the most important question, as was fully reflected by the great majority of those who took part in the general debate and by the overwhelming majority of the representatives of non-governmental organizations who spoke in the plenary Assembly and in the Committee -- will receive the proper attention that it truly deserves.

I would submit that an opportunity for that sort of treatment should be provided here in the Ad Hoc Committee in the coming days; otherwise, if for various reasons that should not be possible, this Committee might possibly establish a kind of contact group such as the one very wisely established for yesterday's discussion of another question, which, of course, is also of great importance.

I could not help agreeing with the representative of France when he spoke about the equality of States. He was certainly right. Unfortunately, the equality of questions is something else. The question we are now discussing - the prevention of nuclear war - supersedes any question either formally on the agenda of the special session or implicitly included in one of the items. This question is not just one of the new proposals to be treated on the same footing as a few dozen other proposals; this is the question of our time; this is the question before the special session and the question to be given the proper treatment and attention which it truly deserves.
Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): When the Chairman of Working Group II submitted his report there was a silence in this hall which you, Mr. Chairman, described as one of shock. Without a doubt it was shock at the state of our work - not only in Working Group II but in the other groups as well - in other words, shock at the scanty progress made in carrying out the tasks which were entrusted to us.

With regard to the subject of the prevention of nuclear war, most States have referred to the high priority they have been giving this subject as part of the problem of general and complete disarmament, and basically that of nuclear disarmament. In other words, until we achieve nuclear disarmament, our first step now is to prevent nuclear war.

In that connexion, Cuba and a number of other countries have expressed themselves in favour of creating a subsidiary body in which the matter would be given the high priority it deserves. Yet, with the end of our session virtually one week away, we find that Working Group III has only one day - tomorrow - in which to present its work.

The establishment of a subsidiary body would not, in our view, detract from the importance of the subject in any way, because there is reason to believe that we have not paid due attention to the remainder of the items for which working groups were set up. But since we speak of the great importance of this subject - and no one has denied it - why should we not submit it to the Ad Hoc Committee and set up a specific contact group to deal with this subject, as was done with the question of machinery?

With regard to the sovereign equality of States, we do not have the slightest doubt about it; we are clear on the matter. But that does not mean that the establishment of groups or of subsidiary bodies should lessen or eliminate the sovereign equality of all States. All States participate in the groups on the basis of their interest in them or depending on the size of their delegations.
Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): We have now heard essentially the same remarks from the Soviet Union, the Ukraine, Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Bulgaria, Hungary and Cuba. I hope that we can have the remaining countries, Czechoslovakia, Byelorussia, Viet Nam, submit the statement for the record while we move on to the more important and more substantive issues before the special session.

I think that having all countries make the same speech time and time again only delays the work of the second special session, although I, for one, am quite willing to hear the Czechs, Byelorussians and Vietnamese if they wish to proceed along these same lines.

Mr. van DONGEN (Netherlands): Once again we seem to be drifting off into a procedural debate, a not unusual phenomenon, but all the more regrettable since, as you, Mr. Chairman, very rightly pointed out earlier, time is getting very short. I find it even more regrettable since there seems to be consensus on the importance of the subject about which we are talking, namely, the prevention of nuclear war. I would rather have that subject read "Prevention of war" since nuclear war is fortunately not yet with us but war, alas, is. However, let that stand.

You have, I think, Mr. Chairman, made an entirely appropriate proposal. Since we are talking about new initiatives, the subject has been assigned to Working Group III, where it belongs. I would propose that we leave it at that. In the view of the Netherlands delegation, it is immaterial whether this important subject is discussed in this Committee, in Working Group III, in a subsidiary organ or wherever, provided it gets the attention that the importance of the subject demands. I would propose that we not lose any more time on it but leave things where they stood when you made your proposal — that is, assign it to Working Group III and leave it to the experienced and capable Chairman of that Working Group to organize that debate as he sees fit.

Once again, how and where this is done is immaterial to my delegation, provided it is done properly and with sufficient time for the subject to be discussed as delegations wish.
Mr. IBSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First, I should like to clarify something in response to my colleagues from France and the Netherlands. My delegation did not propose to discuss any new initiative advanced by the Soviet Union, India or the Netherlands. What we said was that the question of the prevention of nuclear war was one that was touched upon by almost every delegation during the course of the general debate in the General Assembly. We were not proposing discussing an initiative put forward by any one specific delegation.

In the light of the general debate and bearing in mind the statements made by heads of delegations - of the Soviet Union, of India, of France, of the Netherlands and of other countries - our proposal was that we should consider setting up a special working body that would attempt to draw up proposals for the prevention of nuclear war. That is the first clarification I wish to make.

The second is that the proposal to set up a special group to consider the agreed position of all Member States on the question of the prevention of nuclear war was one that was advanced by a large number of countries. Today, in Mr. Adelman's presence, I made direct reference to statements made by India, Brazil, Argentina and Indonesia. That proposal was supported again today in statements by representatives of the socialist countries and the non-aligned countries.

In conclusion, I should like to thank those delegations that understand the importance of this question and are prepared to give it the attention it merits. Had it been given that attention, we believe it would have contributed to the over-all success of the work of the special session. I believe that the attempts now being made to turn this important question into a matter for frivolous and humorous discussion are out of place, and I would therefore propose that this discussion be concluded and that we should, in the time remaining to us, try other ways, including the method that you, Mr. Chairman, have suggested. We only regret that your proposal was made at such a late date. However, we favour any method that will ensure that the question is included in the final document of this special session when it is prepared.
The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has had the last word on this subject. He has said that, belated though the proposal I have made is, he believes we can handle this question in accordance with that suggestion.

I suggested that this question be dealt with by Working Group III, and this is not the first time I have told the Chairman of that Working Group that I hoped he would deal with it. In making that suggestion, I was quite conscious of the proposal the representative of the Soviet Union had made at our meeting of 17 June. The fact that I made the proposal without prompting should reassure him that his proposal of that date had not just been consigned to the wastepaper basket. As Chairman, I have been conscious of the fact that in the past, in certain subsidiary bodies, we have held extensive informal consultations and have reached consensus, not only on the number and working of sub-organs, but also on their specific mandates. The Soviet representative's suggestion on 17 June was that consultations should be carried out with a view to setting up a subsidiary body devoted to the question of the prevention of nuclear war. I would assure him that I did try to hold such consultations and that I did encounter the kind of problem we have witnessed in the open debate we have had this afternoon.
(The Chairman)

I would also assure him that the Chairman of Working Group III, who was present at the consultations I had with the chairmen of the various regional groups three or four days ago, was himself there to listen to some of the objections raised on the question of creating a brand new suborgan to undertake consideration of the specific issue referred to.

It was at that point, actually, that we felt that it might be a good compromise to emphasize that Working Group III should specifically undertake a consideration of this subject - specifically because, to judge from the consultations I had had and the report I was given by the Chairman of Working Group III himself, he was not unaware that this is a proper subject for his Working Group but had run into difficulty in getting delegations even to discuss it within that Working Group. That is why we thought that a specific decision to that effect by the Ad Hoc Committee would strengthen his hand in taking up the subject, would make delegations aware that this subject is to be focused on in that Group, and when, and enable them to prepare to contribute effectively to the discussion of this very important question.

I hope that after the extensive procedural discussion we have had this afternoon we can now adjourn with the understanding that Working Group III will tomorrow - in fact I had thought that that discussion would begin today, in view of my indication to the Chairman of that Group just two days ago - take up this question and discuss it thoroughly. When, at the appropriate time, we receive the report of Working Group III, if it is necessary for the subject to be taken up by the Contact Group, certainly that Group will be open to receiving reports from Working Groups and undertaking discussions, negotiations and consultations on matters which cannot be resolved in the various Working Groups. Thus the option is not closed and this matter may still be discussed by the Contact Group.

I hope, of course, that the discussion in the Working Group will be conclusive so that we do not have to reopen it in the Contact Group. But, if it is not conclusive, there is, of course, nothing to prevent us from undertaking the discussion there.
It is an important subject: there is no doubt about that. But its importance will not be diminished by its first being discussed in a Working Group.

In any case, the initial proposal was that a subgroup should be created, and I do not think that any subgroup can be heard in any of the Working Groups which we have established to discuss the specific items we have assigned to them.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.