

or not the bilateral negotiations are complete. It is obvious that there will be considerable work to be done before we begin the negotiation of a multilateral treaty on chemical weapons. We believe that the Committee on Disarmament could usefully begin this task by establishing a working group that, for example, could deal with the definition of chemical agents.

I have commented briefly on some of the items listed on our agenda. Each of them deserves more time than it is possible to give in this debate, even though some have been the subject of intense scrutiny for many years. We know that oratory will not bring agreement. We also know that very real differences of view are the cause of stalemate or of slow progress. But, in the absence of genuine negotiation on a multilateral basis, there is little alternative to the making of speeches. We express at the United Nations our collective sense of urgency. As Dag Hammarskjöld put it over 20 years ago, "people might rightly feel that it is not in keeping with their reasonable rights to life to have to live under the kind of threat that ... emerges from the total situation as it develops while the discussions are going on". That threat is greater now, and we therefore welcome the fact that prospects of agreement on further measures to restrain the strategic-arms race appear to be good. Arms-control measures are clearly vital. But we must move on, and move soon, to real disarmament if we are to keep control of the human future itself.

---

S/C