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At its 54th meeting, held on 5 June 1981, the Disarmament Commission discussed and approved recommendations on items 4 (a) and (b), 9 and 10, the latter item relating to the report of the Commission to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session. Subsequently, the Commission was unable to hear those delegations inscribed on the list of speakers wishing to make concluding statements. As the discussion and the adoption of the report of the Commission absorbed the best part of the meeting, and as the meeting could not be extended beyond 9.30 p.m., the Commission only had time to hear one statement and the concluding remarks by the Chairman. It was announced that the remaining statements would be reflected in an appropriate document.

Accordingly, the annex to this document contains the statements of delegations in the order in which they appeared on the list of speakers and is issued simultaneously with the verbatim record of the last meeting of the 1981 session. (A/CN.10/PV.54).
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/...
Mr. Chairman, first allow me to congratulate you on having brought the work of this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission to a successful conclusion.

My delegation particularly wishes to thank Mr. Mahmoud, Chairman of the Working Group on agenda item 5 – reduction of military budgets – and H.E. Ambassador Hepburn for their efforts in successfully completing the tasks entrusted to them. My thanks go also to all the members of the Secretariat.

At this stage of our work my delegation will confine its remarks to two of the items on the agenda of the 1981 session of the Commission: item 5 relating to the reduction of military budgets and item 6 on the drafting of the terms of reference of the study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and conventional disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the reduction of military budgets, my delegation notes that the work of this session has led to the preparation of a preliminary list of views and ideas expressed so far on the principles which might govern the activities of States in the light of the possible conclusion of agreements on the reduction of military expenditure. This list contains the clearly defined principles of "visibility", "comparability" and "ease of verification". Any future measures which States might envisage in this field must, in our view, be based on these principles. These same principles must also be applied in any agreements on the "freezing of military budgets".

With regard to item 6, my delegation deeply regrets that the Disarmament Commission has been unable to accomplish the clearly defined task entrusted to it by the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.

Over the past few weeks the Italian delegation, in a spirit of compromise, has made every effort to respond flexibly to the ideas and proposals of certain delegations with regard to the terms of reference of the study and, in particular, the definition of its structure and scope.

Although the working paper submitted by Denmark was quite acceptable to Italy, we have on two occasions agreed to the compromise proposals submitted by the Chairman of the Group, contained in documents CRP.2 and CRP.2/Rev.1.

Our desire to reach an agreed solution and to adopt terms of reference which would allow the study on a question of such importance to disarmament to be undertaken as soon as possible has manifestly failed to evoke any response from certain delegations. It is those delegations which must bear the political responsibility for the failure of efforts to achieve a better understanding of certain basic disarmament problems and hence that of the Commission itself. The development of our work and the lack of positive results on almost every point...
lead us to question the ability of the Disarmament Commission successfully to conclude its tasks, as well as its functions and the position it occupies with respect to other United Nations organs concerned with disarmament, particularly the First Committee of the General Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Chairman, the Brazilian delegation came to the 1961 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in the same spirit of co-operation and understanding that has always presided over our participation in multilateral organizations, particularly in the field of disarmament. We are glad that our views on priority matters are generally shared by the overwhelming majority of the world community, especially with regard to nuclear disarmament.

A few delegations have stated, at the start of this session, that nuclear disarmament questions had been "sufficiently discussed" in previous sessions of our Commission. My delegation feels, on the contrary, that a considerable amount of work on this priority question is necessary in the next substantive session of the Commission, particularly in view of the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly. This view is further supported by the available records of our general debate, which show that the delegations of States belonging to one of the two main military alliances chose not to discuss the nuclear aspects of disarmament, and did not offer any contribution on this item in the general debate. Likewise, during the debate on item 4 of our agenda, last Tuesday, those same delegations found it appropriate not to state their views on this question. For reasons still unclear to my delegation, the debate on item 4 was held in an informal character, with the end result that no records of that meeting are available for our reference. My delegation would hope that in the future more attention will be paid to the formal decisions of the Commission, so that no misunderstandings arise as to the conduct of business and as to the secretarial work involved, as unfortunately was the case, in more than one instance, in this session of the Disarmament Commission.

In any case, a large number of delegations did present their views on item 4. A substantial group of States supported the paper presented by Yugoslavia, and my delegation fails to understand the reasons why those that did not participate in the discussions should be surprised at the circulation of the Yugoslav paper. The final report adopted by the Commission on item 4 does not, obviously, reflect the debate but it leaves no doubt as to why progress in the field of nuclear disarmament has for so long eluded the efforts of the organization. In a spirit of compromise my delegation joined the consensus in spite of the short-comings of the text.

As my delegation has done with regard to item 4, so did we present our substantive views on the other items of the agenda, even though there were different priorities. At the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly, Brazil had voted against the resolution on the study on conventional weapons; nevertheless, we participated actively and constructively in the work of the Commission and its Working Group ably chaired by Ambassador Hepburn connected with item 6, and we hoped that progress could have been made on that item, provided the international community does not lose sight of the priorities it has set, and provided the proper relationships are clearly defined.
To sum up, Mr. Chairman, Brazil will continue to devote its best efforts to further progress in the field of disarmament. We still believe that the way to achieve that objective is the discussion and airing of our differences in the available multilateral fora.

My delegation is fully aware of the importance of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in the machinery set up four years ago to deal with questions of disarmament. We can only hope that the prestige and influence of the Commission will be enhanced by a similar disposition on the part of the totality of its membership, so that the effort of the vast majority of the international community will not be in vain.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Chairman, as we reach the conclusion of this session of the Disarmament Commission, my delegation is conscious both of the promise and the limitation of the tasks we have undertaken for ourselves. The general discussion and deliberations that have taken place in the Commission as well as the detailed work within the Working Groups and the drafting exercises have all pointed to the complexity as well as the urgency of the specific tasks which the General Assembly has called upon us to undertake. If we have achieved a modicum of agreement and consensus on some of the important items on our agenda, this is because of the flexibility shown by delegations and their common commitment to proceed forward in the Commission. If there have been difficulties in obtaining agreements clearly, this has stemmed from lack of sufficient time as well as the need for more systematic consultations between delegations on the important and sensitive issues that are involved.

2. We are firmly convinced, Mr. Chairman, that even on some of the items, where the positions of delegations are somewhat at odds with each other, it would have been possible as a result of further discussions within the Commission to arrive at a common denominator. To this extent we continue to hold that the forum of the Disarmament Commission has served as a unique sounding board for the expression of the collective concern of States on the various issues pertaining to disarmament and that this forum is indeed valuable to the international community and should be supported all around. We are, therefore, deeply concerned at the pessimism and I may even say cynicism on the part of some delegations about the future role and work of the Commission. It is all the more regrettable that these comments have emanated from precisely those delegations whose attitude has in fact hampered the progress within the Commission.

3. Coming to item 4 (a) and (b), Mr. Chairman, we are concerned there seems to have been difficulty in arriving at even formulations that are comparable to the ones which the Commission had adopted by consensus last year. The reasons for this are very difficult for my delegation to understand. On the whole, however, the text which has been approved by this Commission under CRP.17 appears to my delegation to be quite positive.

4. On item 5 (a) and (b), the differences within the Working Group were to an extent thrashed out and only a few basic points remain on which further harmonization will be necessary. My own delegation hopes to be able to contribute constructively to further consideration of the background paper in the future.

5. As regards CRP.15 on item 6 which has been adopted, we do not propose to repeat the arguments made during the general exchange of views or, for that matter, those put forward by us during the Working Group meetings. We feel that, as in the case of item 5, the Working Paper on item 6 should also be the subject of further consideration, along with the various papers on the subject presented by the delegations of Denmark, China, the German Democratic Republic and my own, at the next meeting of the Disarmament Commission.
6. The recommendation that we have accepted and adopted clearly states, Mr. Chairman, that the Commission has not been able "at this stage" to complete the task assigned to it with respect to item 6. In the light of the need for further time and the divergent views expressed, the Commission has rightly decided and I quote:

"to recommend member States to give the matter further consideration in the light of all the papers presented to the Working Group, with the aim of reconciling the difference of views".

Any attempt to proceed with undue haste in the matter will, we believe, be contrary to the spirit of the Commission's recommendation, and will only be counter-productive and divisive. Indeed, if the matter were to be pressed in any overtly partisan manner at the next session of the General Assembly, we foresee that many delegations will view such a move as detracting from the balanced and well-rounded approach which the Commission has been able to provide. The further progress of this exercise would thus be seriously hampered.

7. It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that my delegation has called for the consideration of this item by the Disarmament Commission itself at a later date.

8. On item 9, it is a source of distress to my delegation that, despite the considerable and painstaking effort on the part of the non-aligned countries, the Commission has been unable to agree on a consensus paper which was itself the result of compromise on the part of several delegations. This failure to achieve a consensus has been due to strong opposition by two delegations for reasons that have not been explained and remain a mystery to my delegation.

9. In conclusion, we would like, Mr. Chairman, to record our genuine and heartfelt appreciation to you for your patience, single-minded dedication and even-handed approach to what has, by any account, been a trying session. If the various delegations have sought to make their points at times a little strongly, it has only been with a view to achieving a final result with which all of us can be proud. Your contribution to the successful work of the Commission, Mr. Chairman, is therefore deeply appreciated and will remain memorable.

Thank you.
Mr. Chairman, we are approaching the end of our work for the third substantive session of the Disarmament Commission. Despite the lateness of the hour, I should like to make a few comments on the results of our work.

Since this organ was restructured at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the problem of its identity, although not debated as such, has always clouded our work. In the light of the report which we have just adopted and which we shall submit to the General Assembly, we cannot avoid a feeling of perplexity and, to some extent, of frustration.

The report contains no indication that the Commission has fulfilled the hopes which we all placed in it when we supported its incorporation - as a second deliberative organ - in the machinery entrusted with disarmament within the framework of the United Nations. We have always thought that the Commission, unlike the First Committee, should concentrate on the consideration and elaboration of proposals on a limited, specific and precise number of questions, and that the adoption of decisions by concensus would allow positive results to be achieved. I hasten to add our conviction that these results will never be spectacular, but in the field of disarmament any progress, however slight, is of great importance.

In contrast with these expectations, which now appear overoptimistic, the report which we have adopted demonstrates that the Disarmament Commission has become a mere sounding board: all that happens is that positions, well known to all, are repeated time and time again. We recognize the advantages of all States being able to express their points of view and thus address themselves to world public opinion. But that is already possible in the General Assembly and its First Committee, and repetition in the Disarmament Commission of what is stated annually in the general debate in the First Committee is of limited, if any, value.

I have referred to the question of the identity of our Commission. The development of our work at this session leads me to think that the Commission is indeed suffering from an identity crisis and that, in the near future, we shall have seriously to consider and discuss what we want this organ to be, that is, what function we wish it to perform within the United Nations machinery concerned with disarmament. We are convinced that in a task of such importance as disarmament any organ can do useful work, but for that to transpire my delegation wishes to stress the need for greater clarity in our ideas, in order to avoid, in particular, the duplication of activities. We must proceed on the basis of the deliberative nature of the Commission, shared with the First Committee of the General Assembly, which makes it essential for the activities of both organs to be clearly differentiated.

Turning now to the contents of the report, my delegation regrets the emphasis on mere general declarations at the expense of recommendations on specific questions (reduction of military budgets and study on conventional disarmament) on which our attention should have been focused. It has not even been possible to reach agreement on a very general document on the principles and ideas which should determine the activities of States in the field of freezing and reducing military expenditure. Furthermore, there has been a completely negative result with regard
to the drafting of the terms of reference of the expert group which was to have prepared a study on all aspects of conventional disarmament.

In the light of the poor results of this session of the Commission, it would be as well to keep in mind what I have termed its identity crisis when, in the spring of 1962, the General Assembly meets for its second special session devoted to disarmament. It will therefore be necessary carefully to review at that time the mandate of the Disarmament Commission, in the light of its work since it was revamped in 1978. If we do not wish the Commission to suffer the same fate as its predecessor of the same name, there will have to be a more specific definition of what the international community expects of it. We believe it is vital to keep world public opinion informed of the dangers of the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, but we do not believe that a proliferation of United Nations organs dealing with such topics will in the long run be necessarily positive.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ARGENTINA

[Original: Spanish]

Mr. Chairman, as this difficult session of the Disarmament Commission draws to a close, my delegation would like to make, in the briefest possible manner, a few comments on the proceedings and outcome of the session.

Most of the work, Mr. Chairman, was done in working groups for which there are, unfortunately, no adequate records.

My delegation, for example, wished to make statements in the working groups that dealt with items 4, 6, 7 and 9 of the agenda, while submitting its views on item 5 in writing. In addition to that, wherever possible intensive consultations took place, as participating delegations will testify. These contributions reflected my Government's views on each of the items considered.

In a spirit of compromise, we have not stood in the way of a consensus which, with regard to various items dealt with in the report, is not exactly what we would have wished. We regret that a few delegations did not emulate that willingness. I refer mainly, Mr. Chairman, to the negative attitude that some countries with serious and primary responsibility for the nuclear and conventional arms race have shown in the course of our deliberations, with the result that our report can only reflect a situation hard for us to describe.

We would prefer, Mr. Chairman, that the United Nations Disarmament Commission enjoy the necessary and indispensable support of all members in order to be able to carry out the tasks entrusted to it by the consensus achieved in 1978. To do that, the rules of the game of negotiation must be observed, as the surest way of consolidating the credibility of institutions. It would be unfair to blame the majority that distinguished itself by the constructive spirit in which it dealt with all agenda items, despite the small size of its delegations, for the lack of results caused by the persistent obstruction of the minority.

/...
My delegation therefore cannot but express its surprise at the discriminatory manner in which delegations were invited to speak at the concluding meeting and the disorderly manner in which the list of speakers was drawn up, causing my delegation to raise a point of order to which the Chair failed to give adequate satisfaction.

Notwithstanding these serious inconveniences, which we deeply deplore in order to avoid their repetition, we are more than ever convinced of the need to strengthen the role of this Organization created to preserve international peace and security, particularly in the field of disarmament which must be general and comprehensive, under effective international control.

Thank you.
I should like to take this opportunity to thank you, Sir, and the other officers of the session for your work during this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. It is nevertheless a matter of regret to my delegation that the course of our work has been diverted from its main substantive tasks. It was the expectation of my delegation that we would devote the major effort of the session to the concrete tasks remitted to the Commission under items 5 and 6 of our agenda. There may have been a misunderstanding on this point. But the fact is that we have not made the progress that we might have made on items 5 and 6 and that this is in large measure the result of the way in which our energies have been spent.

In the light of our experience no doubt many Governments represented here will be asking themselves in the coming months whether the Disarmament Commission is fulfilling a worthwhile role. On this point I should like to offer one or two immediate thoughts which occur to my delegation.

The Disarmament Commission is supposed to be a deliberative body. It is questionable whether its primary function should be to produce statements or declarations. If there is a subject upon which the Commission has a common view it may of course be desirable that it should express that view. But I think we should be more realistic in recognizing when there is common ground and when there is not. On several of the items which have been on the agenda for this session we all know that there are wide divergences of opinion in this Assembly. It does not follow that because a large number of delegations share a particular opinion that it can be converted into a common view.

Specifically, it is unfortunate that some delegations introduced at very short notice documents on items 4 and 9 of the agenda which they must have known could not possibly have been, as they stood, the basis of general agreement. This method of doing business seems particularly inappropriate if we recall that in the First Committee of the General Assembly it is the invariable practice for delegations which wish to secure wide agreement on resolutions to prepare the ground by broad consultations, usually over a period of several weeks.

In saying this, Sir, I have particularly in mind the proposed statement on item 4 of our agenda which appeared as document A/CN.10/29. My delegation has accepted the language on this item now circulated as CRP.17 which was finally agreed after laborious negotiations under pressure of time. But I should like to record – on instructions – that we have done so with considerable misgivings. I have already referred to the way the item was handled. Our more important concern is that, as a result, the text is a rather uneven assemblage of ideas, most of them hardly new, instead of a clear, balanced statement. We do not think that the time spent on this text was well spent. We fear that it will reflect little if any credit on this Commission. And as a result of the acceptance of this
document we have finished up in the unsatisfactory situation in which the only material of substance to come out of this session of the Commission does not concern the two items on which we were specifically requested to produce results.

I think we should all bear this point in mind when we consider the value of the contribution which the Disarmament Commission is making to the cause of disarmament.

In conclusion, I should like to comment briefly on the items upon which this session of the Commission was requested to take action. As regards item 5 my delegation thinks that the matter was taken as far as was feasible at this juncture. Item 6 is another matter. It now seems unlikely that the study group on the subject of conventional weapons can start work in time for the Secretary-General to submit an interim report of any substance to the General Assembly at its second special session. This would mean that the decision in resolution 35/156 A, adopted by an overwhelming vote of the General Assembly, would not be fulfilled.

Proposals on this subject were submitted by a number of delegations. The Chairman of the working group concerned - whose contribution to our meeting I should like to commend here - made two successive attempts to produce a paper incorporating the views of members of the Commission on the draft guidelines for the study. It is a matter of regret to my delegation that some participants felt unable to accept either of these documents, particularly after the second one had been considerably expanded in an effort to take account of their views. In the interests of obtaining an agreement, my delegation would have accepted the second paper as it stood, although it contained a number of points which we thought could usefully have been improved.

The members of the Commission will not have failed to notice from what directions has come the brunt of the resistance to this proposal - which is, after all, only for a study. It is a pity, and also I think rather ironical, that certain Governments which over the years have insisted that disarmament was a matter of global concern, should have discovered that this principle did not apply to a proposal which might have involved the scrutiny of their own activities. It is as if some countries are in favour of measures of disarmament provided they are carried out by other States, preferably those a long way away. This does not seem to harmonize very well with the concept set out in the Final Document that all States have the right - and the duty, Sir - to contribute to efforts in the field of disarmament.

FRANCE

[Original: French]

Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that the French delegation notes the negative outcome of our session. Yet the Commission's mandate this year has not been particularly ambitious. It comprised two specific issues both arising out of the recommendations of the 1978 Final Document:
Reduction of military budgets – a collateral disarmament measure for which the Commission was required to formulate principles.

Study of conventional armaments, for which the General Assembly requested the Commission to draw up terms of reference for an expert group.

The French delegation was prepared to endorse the documents respectively proposed as the basis of a compromise by the Chairmen of the two competent working groups.

We regret the failure of these efforts and the reasons for it continue to give us cause for serious concern.

In the case of military budgets, the objections raised to two conditions essential to any commitment – comparability and verification – arouse serious doubts as to whether progress can be made in future.

In the case of the terms of reference to be drawn up for the study on conventional weapons, the attempts to change its purpose and the opposition encountered over the compromise formula reflect intentions that seem to us incompatible with an objective and balanced approach to the problem of disarmament.

It would be serious for the Commission if this failure were construed as an outright refusal of the international community to give serious consideration to a fundamental aspect of disarmament that directly affects a very large number of States.

The French delegation stated during the general debate the importance which it attached to consideration of the problem of disarmament in a comprehensive manner; that is why it made it a point to assist in the preparation of the document submitted under agenda item 4. We appreciate the spirit of constructive compromise which produced the document adopted this evening.

As to agenda item 9, concerning South Africa, the French delegation, in a spirit of compromise, raised no objection to the draft presented to the Commission. None the less, it had reservations on certain phrases, particularly in view of their possible implications for the spheres of competence of the principal organs of the United Nations and of French institutions.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the results of this session provide a serious warning and should make us think seriously: in 1979 and 1980, the Commission proved itself capable of preparing documents of such distinctive scope as those on the elements of the comprehensive programme and the declaration on the Second Disarmament Decade. This year, we have not been able to contribute to the specific and substantive but more limited agenda items. We would think it serious if the Commission were to devote itself exclusively to the preparation of general and declaratory documents. While we do not deny the importance of such documents, we feel that the Commission should not shirk one essential aspect of its work: the substantive consideration of disarmament issues. The Commission's credibility, authority and future depend on it. We should learn from this year's lesson.
Mr. Chairman, in my concluding remarks I would like to briefly comment on the two agenda items which are of particular importance to the Swedish delegation, namely, item 5 on military expenditures and item 6 on conventional disarmament. It was from the outset the understanding of my delegation that these two questions were the main subject for this session of the Disarmament Commission.

As regards to the military expenditures the task of the Commission was clearly defined in the relevant resolution of the General Assembly. The Commission was requested "in particular, to identify and elaborate on the principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of the freezing and reduction of military expenditures". The resolution was adopted by consensus so we had all agreed to entrust the Commission with this task.

In order to stimulate the discussion in the matter the Swedish delegation together with Romania submitted a working paper containing a number of principles. In the course of the discussion in the plenary and in the working group on item 5, we were pleased to note the positive interest many delegations expressed on my paper and the wide support the proposed principles did receive.

During our deliberations a very interesting discussion took place in which delegations explained their opinion as on how we most effectively can promote measures to freeze and reduce military expenditures. Some delegations expressed the views that it would be premature to elaborate principles for future efforts in this field before certain additional States have made use of the reporting instrument in compliance with General Assembly resolution 35/142 B and that problems related to comparability and verification have been solved.

As reflected in the working paper submitted by Romania and Sweden it is our view that efforts to promote progress in the field of freezing and reduction of military expenditures should be pursued on both the political and technical level. We regard these efforts as complementary and not as contradictory.

We agree with those who argue that without accepted solutions regarding standardized reporting, comparability and verification it will not be possible to arrive at effective agreements to freeze and to reduce military expenditures. Considerable progress has in fact been achieved in this regard. The reporting instrument exists, it has been tested and consequently the technical aspect of reporting has a solution, what is needed now is the political will to make full use of the instrument.

At the same time and complementary to the efforts I just mentioned, we consider it important to promote the political will and to try to contribute to the more favourable atmosphere which is needed for further progress in the matter. We believe that a document containing agreed principles on freezing and reduction of military expenditures should be regarded as a political commitment to take part in future international agreements in this field.
With respect to the results of our efforts on military expenditures, we had hoped that it would have been possible to agree on a number of principles during this session. On many issues there exists a general convergence of views and it seemed to us that agreement was within reach. We regret that it was not possible to conduct a substantive discussion on all the proposed principles and ideas. In spite of the commendable efforts of the Chairman of the working group, time restraint and certain other factors prevented an adequate examination of all relevant aspects of the matter.

Under these circumstances, my delegation attaches great importance to the fact that all proposed principles and ideas are reflected in the annex to the report of the Commission. We believe that the principles listed there constitute a very useful basis for the future work in the Commission regarding the freezing and reduction of military expenditures.

As regards the conventional arms race, it is the view of the Swedish Government that this question must be given greater attention than it has received in the past. No one denies that nuclear disarmament has the highest priority, but it cannot be disregarded that the bulk of the world's military expenditures is devoted to conventional armaments. A particularly alarming aspect of the conventional arms race is that its pace is being greatly increased by the rapid advancement of military technology. It was therefore, a matter of great satisfaction to my delegation that the Commission also this year continued the consideration of the question. We gave our support to the Danish working paper on the subject which we considered to be an excellent basis for our efforts to elaborate guidelines for the United Nations study on the conventional arms race.

The Swedish delegation regrets that it was not possible at this stage for the Commission to agree on such guidelines. We would however like to express the hope that in the course of further consideration of the matter an agreement would be reached on the mandate for the study which in principle has been approved by the General Assembly.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Original: English

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of our session, my delegation expressed the conviction that this third substantive session would be able to conclude agenda items 5 and 6, to our understanding, the main items this session had to deal with.

Today we have to state that we did not succeed. Maybe our task was too ambitious and our efforts were diverted. The main disappointment of my delegation follows from our failure to follow the mandate given by the General Assembly. On items 5 and 6, consensus seemed possible at various points of our discussions in the respective working groups. My delegation was prepared - in a spirit of co-operation and compromise - to accept formulations despite their shortcomings. We are disappointed that we have to say that this same spirit did not seem to be widespread. At the same time, new burdens were added by the extensive discussions on items 4.
and 9, items which members of this Commission did not address specifically when adopting the agenda.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation participated in the various discussions in a positive spirit and with the will for a compromise. This compromise we were not able to bring about except in the case of item 4. The third substantive session of the Disarmament Commission did not agree on a report containing only consensus recommendations as mentioned in paragraph 118 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament. To my delegation's understanding this is a serious deficiency which ought to be reflected in future tasks we might want to transmit to this deliberative body. We might see fit to reconsider the involvement of this body in the multilateral disarmament process.

We might state that the tasks submitted were too many and too demanding.

Mr. Chairman, in your initial statement you rightly mentioned the difficulties that this session might encounter and, as we know now, has encountered. Your efforts, Mr. Chairman, to bring about positive results were not to succeed. My delegation would like to thank you and the Chairmen of the working groups for their endeavours up to the last minute.

CHINA

[Original: English]

Mr. Chairman, the third session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission is coming to a close. You, Mr. Chairman, have made a great and valuable effort to make our work proceed smoothly. I would like to take this opportunity to express our deep-felt thanks to you.

2. During this session, we have had a broad exchange of views on many issues surrounding the question of disarmament. Many delegations expressed serious concern and disquiet at the intensification of the rivalry and arms race between the two super-Powers and the ever-increasing threat to the security of small and medium-sized countries and to world peace. They correctly pointed out that the question of disarmament should be considered in the context of the over-all international relation, and that the Disarmament Commission cannot ignore the military intervention and occupation that are now taking place. It must unequivocally oppose the use of force, under whatever pretext, against the freedom, independence and territorial integrity of any country, thereby creating conditions for the realization of genuine disarmament. Quite a number of delegations also pointed out that those countries with the largest nuclear arsenals also have the major stockpiles of conventional weapons, that they are the ones who set the tempo of the arms race, and that disarmament measures should begin with them. In our opinion, these views reflected the voice of justice of the peace-loving countries and peoples and would doubtless have a positive influence in mobilizing world opinion and identifying the real source of the threat of war, thereby contributing to the realization of genuine disarmament and giving impetus to the struggle against hegemonism and for the defence of world peace.

/.../
3. Our discussion at the present session has been focusing on the question of conventional disarmament. Although we have failed to formulate guidelines acceptable to all on the halting of the conventional arms race and on the studies related to conventional disarmament, the fact that the item on conventional disarmament was included in the agenda is in itself a positive development. We believe that in order to ensure the security of small and medium-sized countries and to defend world peace, nuclear disarmament alone is not enough; it must be accompanied by parallel advances in conventional disarmament. Therefore, we support the view shared by many delegations and hope that this item will be further discussed at the appropriate forum.

4. Of course, to emphasize the importance and relevance of conventional disarmament does not imply a negation of the importance and priority given to nuclear disarmament. We support the efforts made by the small and medium-sized countries in the promotion of genuine disarmament. Proceeding precisely from such a position, we went along with the idea of allowing the necessary time at the present session for discussion specifically the question of nuclear disarmament and how to prevent South Africa from acquiring nuclear weapons. We also actively participated in those discussions. At the current session, the non-aligned countries have made renewed efforts on nuclear disarmament. For this, we wish to extend our appreciation to them. In our view, as long as the two countries with the largest nuclear arsenals are willing to undertake special obligations, be the first to drastically reduce and destroy their own nuclear weapons and accept supervision and verification, the other nuclear countries of course should then join them in negotiating the question of further reduction and complete destruction of nuclear weapons. This totally practical, fair and reasonable principle should be taken as the major guiding principle for future discussions on nuclear disarmament.

5. Mr. Chairman, we must however point out with regret that no substantive progress has been made on any subject at this session in spite of our long discussions and the great effort of many delegations. Many representatives are justifiably disappointed. The crux of the matter remains to be the lack of political will on the part of the two super-Powers to proceed with genuine disarmament. They stubbornly reject not only nuclear but also conventional disarmament. That super-Power with the greatest momentum in arms expansion, in particular, while being the loudest when it comes to such empty slogans as "peace" and "disarmament", is doing its utmost to obstruct our meeting from taking any concrete action conducive to genuine disarmament. By repeating ad nauseam such worn-out tunes as the so-called "freezing of conventional forces and armaments by all the permanent members of the Security Council" and "reduction of military budget by 10 per cent" by these same members, this super-Power has revealed that it does not have the least intention to assume its share of the obligation in the field of disarmament. The only thing it is interested in is to maintain its military superiority and to weaken the defence capabilities of other countries. Such behaviour can only be extremely detrimental to our disarmament effort. We hope that the super-Powers would heed the views of the third world, non-aligned and other small and medium-sized countries, effectively shoulder their unshirkable duty in the field of disarmament and contribute to the achievement of genuine disarmament.
6. In this spirit, the Chinese delegation wishes to point out that there are certain inadequacies in the Commission's report (relevant annex) to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session although it has managed to reflect a good number of valuable views and ideas. In particular, the report has not made it sufficiently explicit that the root cause for either the nuclear or conventional arms race is the fierce rivalry between the two super-Powers, or that the two super-Powers should bear special responsibility for achieving genuine disarmament. We hope that our views expressed in the course of discussing specific topics will be duly reflected in the records.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
The delegation of Finland recognizes that the Disarmament Commission has established itself as an integral part of the United Nations disarmament machinery. The three substantive sessions it has had between 1979-1981 testify to this effect. However, the work conducted at the plenary meetings of the Commission and its working groups as well as the report just adopted lead us to believe that the Commission, by virtue of its nature as a deliberative body that aims at adopting decisions by consensus, can function most effectively if it adopts a more comprehensive approach in its deliberations than was the case at the current session.

With regard to specific agenda items, the delegation of Finland regrets that the Commission was unable to fulfil the mandate given to it by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/156 A, which Finland supported. We hope, nevertheless, that the thorough exchange of views undertaken on item 6 on the proposed study on all aspects of conventional weapons will facilitate any future consideration of the question.
Mr. Chairman, we have come to the end of three weeks of deliberations on matters regarding the very survival of the human race. We commend you for your patience and tactful way in which you have handled issues that by their very nature are delicate.

In my early intervention given on Tuesday, 2 June, I had indicated that issues concerning the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and nuclear disarmament, were the most urgent on our agenda; at the end of the deliberations we are not anywhere near a final commitment to finding a permanent solution to this serious threat to the future of human civilization.

Agenda item 9 has given us the opportunity to know, once again, that many Western countries are keen to continue to strengthen the economic links with the racist Government of South Africa. It is these economic links that help that country to arm itself and acquire the technical know-how and the capability of manufacturing nuclear weapons.

Mr. Chairman, after an arduous three days of negotiations in the small working group, we agreed on the draft document as an appropriate response of this Disarmament Commission to item 9. My delegation was very surprised when one of the participating delegations disowned that document. It became clear we had not been sharing the deliberations in the working group on item 9 in good faith. Let me point out that we will return to this subject. The challenge the apartheid system poses is one that Africa must stand up to as one man and destroy. The system must be destroyed because it denies the natural growth and liberty to the majority of its own citizens. No one can sweep this problem under the carpet.

It is ironic that while 450 million people are starving in the world most militarily significant countries, including most of the developed countries, are spending $500 billion per annum on the manufacture of weapons. Mr. Chairman, we should move quickly to reduce military budgets, releasing the money thus saved to deal with the most urgent priority facing the world, namely, food for all.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

[Original: Russian]

Our delegation was bewildered by the statement by the United States representative a few minutes before the close of the session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. The United States representative attempted to blame other delegations for the lack of proper progress in the Commission's work. His statement was totally unfounded, however. In our opinion, the United States representative should have been engaged not in criticizing others or attempting to place the blame in innocent quarters, but in more soberly taking a critical look at his own position.

Looking at any of the items on the Commission's agenda, the United States delegation not only made no constructive contribution on any single item, but even sabotaged the adoption of agreed decisions. From the very start it spoke out against the discussion of agenda item 4, concerning nuclear disarmament, and refused to associate itself with the conclusions on that issue which had been worked out by other delegations over nearly two weeks of discussion. With certain other Western delegations, the United States delegation blocked the adoption of the agreed section of the Commission's report in which, on the basis of well-known United Nations decisions, the nuclear armaments of South Africa were condemned. We did not succeed in agreeing on the general approach to the study on conventional armaments only because the delegations of the United States and of some other Western countries in essence refused to take into account the views of other delegations and insisted on the unconditional adoption of their proposals in this area. With far-fetched demands for control over the reduction of military expenditures, the United States delegation and those which supported it prevented agreement on a draft declaration on the general principles of such reduction.

The United States delegation's negative position is no more than the logical extension of the currently proclaimed and internationally recognized aim of the United States to achieve military superiority, step up military preparations and increase military spending. In following that course, as the current session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission again demonstrated, the United States has made not even one proposal aimed at slackening the arms race and achieving military détente.

The statement by the United States representative concerning the Soviet Union's expansion of its military potential is unsubstantiated from start to finish. The Soviet Union is doing nothing exceeding the limits of defence needs - its own, and those of its allies and friends. Firmly adhering to the principle of equal security, it considers that approximate equality and parity are sufficient for those needs. We do not aim for military superiority. We are proposing a broad programme of practical measures to contain the arms race and, as was stressed in the statement by the Soviet delegation in the general discussion on 21 May, we are prepared to sit down for serious negotiations on each of them. The Soviet Union has often stated - and this was reaffirmed at the meetings of the United Nations Disarmament Commission - that especially now, in the face of the current complex international situation, it is necessary to multiply efforts aimed at the preservation and strengthening of détente and the prevention of war.

/...
Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to offer a few comments on the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission during this current session. Before I do so, let me pay our warm tribute to you for the remarkable patience and commitment with which you guided the difficult tasks facing us in the Commission.

We are disappointed that the Commission has not been able to discharge its mandate in respect of the agenda items 5, 6 and 9 which deal respectively with freezing and reduction of military budgets, elaboration of a general approach to a study on all aspects of conventional arms race and the letter, dated 8 March 1979, from Chairman of the Special Committee against Apartheid addressed to the Secretary-General.

As we had stated in the general debate, Pakistan views with deep concern the intensification of the arms race both in its nuclear as well as conventional aspects. We believe that the conventional arms race and its manifest consequences in military interventions and use of force in international relations, if allowed to continue unchecked, would inevitably push the world closer to a nuclear conflict. Moreover, the conventional arms race, particularly in its regional aspect, is a principal drain on the scarce resources of a large number of developing countries situated in areas of political tension.

In the view of my delegation, a comprehensive study on the conventional arms race, like the one prepared on nuclear weapons, is highly desirable. This study will be particularly useful in informing the world public opinion of the dangers arising from the conventional arms race to international peace and specifically peace in various regions of the world. It will also provide authentic information on how some of the nations are spending their resources on acquisition of armaments over and above their legitimate need for self-defence and how sales of conventional weapons are enriching a few at the cost of developing nations. We had, therefore, desired to see the Disarmament Commission fulfil its mandate on agenda item 6 to enable an expeditious commissioning of the study. In any case, we believe that the Chairman’s working papers in documents A/CN.10/81/WG.II/CRP.2 and CRP.2/Rev.1 contain valuable ideas which must be taken into account in articulating a general approach for the proposed study. Similarly, we wish to commend the recommendations contained in CRP.14 on freezing and reduction of military budgets. We hope that this work will not be lost and will become the basis of our future consideration on the subject.

My delegation would like to express its gratitude to Ambassador Hepburn of Bahamas and Mr. Karem Mahmoud of Egypt, who had chaired the two Working Groups on agenda items 6 and 5, respectively. The useful ideas which are now annex to the report of the Commission largely owe to their untiring efforts.

It is regrettable that the Commission has not been able to reach a consensus on document CRP.18 which was negotiated in an informal group set up on agenda item 9. CRP.18 encompasses the concerns of the international community over the
capability of South Africa to produce nuclear weapons which poses a grave danger to the security of African States. We hope that the positive recommendations in CPR.18 will be translated into effective decisions by the United Nations General Assembly.

The apparent failure of the Disarmament Commission to fulfil the important mandate assigned to it is, however, no reflection on the usefulness of the Commission itself. Instead, it demonstrates a failing or a lack of political will on the part of the member States to take positive consensus decisions on these urgent matters. The result would have been the same if any other disarmament forum were required to carry out the same task in the given limited time. The issues outlined in agenda items 5, 6 and 9 are, however, a continuing concern of the United Nations. These must be reconsidered at the General Assembly and if required once again at the next substantive session of the Disarmament Commission.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CANADA

[Original: English]

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the dangers posed by nuclear weapons. Because of this danger, efforts related to nuclear arms limitation are being carried out in many different fora. One of these efforts, recently completed, was the study on nuclear weapons.

With regard to conventional weapons, it is widely known that 80 per cent of the world's spending on arms is directed toward this category of weapons. Since World War II, some 25 million people have been killed in over 133 wars with conventional weapons. We therefore regret and are somewhat saddened that certain countries are not prepared to see a study on conventional disarmament get under way without delay.

Mr. Chairman, as we all know, there was a delicate balance struck, in the wording of the Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations on disarmament regarding the relative emphasis to be given to nuclear and conventional disarmament. My delegation sees, in what has occurred at this session of the Commission, the first concrete sign that this delicate balance is beginning to break down. We would hope that the consensus of 1978 could somehow be maintained.

Mr. Chairman, this session of the Commission has attempted to deal with some of the broadest and most important disarmament problems faced by the world community. We have seen at this session the practice of presenting documents on some of these problems with very little notice, with the expectation that they will form the basis for serious deliberations. My delegation questions whether this practice is one which permits the Commission to fulfil a useful role.
TURKEY

Mr. Chairman, the United Nations Disarmament Commission completes the work of its third session this evening. It is therefore not premature to make a preliminary and very brief assessment, attempting to identify the lessons taught by this recent experience.

In the past, the Turkish delegation expressed its satisfaction with regard to the establishment of the Disarmament Commission by the General Assembly at its first special session as an institutional means of going beyond the often controversial resolutions of the First Committee through the application of the golden rule of consensus, and thereby making it possible gradually to identify common denominators among all nations, with the goal of promoting the process of arms control on our planet. The Commission's first two sessions in earlier years were certainly satisfactory in this regard, since the political will of all participating States was obvious and all delegations were motivated by the desire for the common interest to prevail over some of their own individual concerns.

It would be fairly difficult, Mr. Chairman, to draw a similar conclusion regarding the Commission's current third session. In a world of extreme complexities we are certainly not going to give in to pessimism. We know very well that in the global disarmament process many contradictory factors are simultaneously involved, either at the national or international level.

Nevertheless, being profoundly convinced that the process of arms control is a requirement sine qua non for mankind's survival, we deem it extremely regrettable that not even a very small step forward could be made on a single item, for instance through joint and primarily academic thinking.

In our view, the process of arms control is the common responsibility of all without exception, a responsibility which cannot be delegated or divided according to our individual desires and petty concerns. The Turkish delegation will remain optimistic, in the hope that in the near future some of the partners present here will comprehend the inescapable need for this concept of indivisibility.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

AUSTRALIA

Mr. Chairman, thank you for chairing this difficult session of the Disarmament Commission. We would also like to thank the distinguished chairmen of the two working groups for undertaking the arduous tasks conferred upon them. Their well known diplomatic skills have been much appreciated.

/...
We are disappointed that the outcome of this session of the Commission achieved less than we had hoped and expected. We were allocated only a limited time in which to carry out our work and believe that had we been permitted to concentrate on the two main items referred to the Commission, reduction of military budgets and conventional weapons, a more successful result could have been achieved. It is unfortunate that our agenda became so crowded.

The Australian delegation is surprised at the inability of the Commission to reach agreement on guidelines for a study on conventional weapons. We see the problem of conventional disarmament as a global one affecting all States and regions whether developed or developing. While the major military Powers may have the highest military expenditure in absolute terms there are others whose percentage of gross national product spent on weaponry is also reason for serious concern. It is surprising that this fact is so often ignored.

We are disappointed that it did not prove possible to reach agreement on principles to guide a study. The Australian delegation hopes that this issue can be satisfactorily resolved at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly.

Australia has participated in the test of the military budget reporting instrument provided for in General Assembly resolution 34/83 F and sees the development and refinement of such an instrument as being the key to the future success of any international moves towards reduction of military budgets. This requires universal participation and we urge those States which have not participated in the test of the reporting instrument to give consideration to their future involvement - particularly those with different socio-economic systems from those which have submitted responses so far. We had hoped that at this session the Commission would have been able to reach agreement on principles governing actions of States in the field of reduction of military budgets. It is regrettable that this has not proved possible.

In view of the fact that the Commission at its 1980 session considered in detail nuclear disarmament issues we had thought it inappropriate for this session to again take up the item. We regret that our small delegation, as was the case for so many other delegations, made it impossible for us to participate in the work of the drafting group on this item. Broader participation and more time to consider the issue would, we are sure, have enabled the production of a more balanced document. We believe that it was a mistake to attempt to do this at this session of the Commission.

Similarly to give the degree of consideration necessary on an item as important as item 9 more time was needed. The text which appears in CRP.18 reflects the rushed nature of this document which contains a number of elements with which the Australian delegation has difficulties. We accept the document, however, because of our abhorrence of apartheid as well as our continued support for the concept of the principles contained in previous General Assembly resolutions on denuclearization of Africa. We are disturbed, however, that the document fails to mention the vital role played by the non-proliferation Treaty to the containment of nuclear weapons and its consequential contribution to nuclear disarmament.
In concluding, the Australian delegation wishes to again repeat its regret at the insistence of some delegations to so crowd the Commission's agenda that no item was able to receive the attention necessary for a successful outcome. We believe that if the Commission is to function as an effective body greater consideration should be given in the future to a more realistic work programme.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ALGERIA

[Original: French]

The Algerian delegation, which did not endorse the decision taken on agenda item 9 concerning South Africa's nuclear capability, wishes to make some brief comments at the close of the Commission's work.

Its reservations arise from two groups of reasons which relate not only to the content of the decision itself but also, and above all, to the situation which led to the decision.

With regard to the content of the decision, my delegation believes that it cannot adequately conclude our Commission's work on agenda item 9. First, it does not reflect the intensity and richness of the discussion or the seminal ideas which were expressed and supported by most delegations, both on the nature of apartheid and the aggressive policy of the South African racist régime, and on the danger which that régime's nuclear capability represents for Africa and the entire world. It is also inadequate in that it does not indicate the reasons which forced the Commission to conclude that there was no consensus.

My delegation felt that the decision should have specified that one delegation alone had opposed the inclusion of the recommendations of the informal working group in the body of the report, and that that position was supported by only two delegations.

Finally, it is inadequate in that it makes absolutely no comment on the follow-up which the Commission will give this item at a future session or sessions.

Even in the absence of a consensus on the recommendations of the informal working group, the Commission's conclusion should have explicitly retained the question of South Africa's nuclear capability on its agenda.

Aside from these matters relating to the content of the decision, the attitude of the Algerian delegation is connected with the situation which forced the Commission to reach such a conclusion.

The Disarmament Commission works on the basis of consensus.

Essentially, this means taking into account the concerns of all its member States. Above all, this requires a tenacious search for solutions which could
reduce, insofar as possible, the differences of approach to the substance of the questions discussed and thus basically reconcile various positions. This effort is aimed at transcending the concepts of majority and minority and, by creating a basis for agreement acceptable to all delegations, enabling the Commission properly to perform its mission by formulating recommendations.

Consensus thus achieved does not mean unanimity. Delegations retain the right to express reservations or put forward interpretations concerning one or more aspects of the consensus text. Nor does it mean unanimity. This is why the Commission's general will cannot be thwarted by the intransigent attitude of one delegation which, declaring its position to be non-negotiable, undermines a consensus which is acceptable, although to differing degrees, to nearly all the members of the Commission.

Indeed, it is a question of the unilateral will of one delegation, for the two delegations which supported this position have not formally put forward the same demand. One single delegation, in announcing that it had received instructions to oppose the inclusion in the report of the informal working group's recommendations on agenda item 9, forced the Commission to conclude on a note of failure.

The Algerian delegation could not then endorse a conclusion dictated by one delegation. Such a situation undoubtedly seriously undermines the spirit of consensus by turning it into a veritable right of veto.
Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to make a few comments, which will be brief because of the short time available, on the results of this third substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, which ends today.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you again on the conclusion of our work. I also wish to congratulate all the Vice-Chairmen, in particular Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas on his intensive and discerning work at the helm of the second working group. Similar praise is also due to the Rapporteur, Mr. Karem Mahmoud, who skilfully chaired the meetings of the first working group. Finally, we cannot fail to mention the efficiency of the Secretariat throughout the complex meetings of this third substantive session of the Disarmament Commission.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the practical results of the session which is today drawing to a close, my delegation welcomes the consensus on the wording of the text that will summarize, in the report to the General Assembly, the discussion of item 4 of our agenda. Any efforts we make to expedite negotiations aimed at effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war will remain inadequate until that objective is attained. The importance of promoting disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, can never be over-emphasized. My delegation finds especially pertinent the conclusions of the Commission on this item, specifically its call for the continuation and intensification of the search for a common approach that would lead to progress in the field of disarmament. This becomes a most urgent task in the light of today's complex international situation, so well described in the early part of the conclusions. Although our individual positions were reflected in greater detail in the document initially introduced by the distinguished delegation of Yugoslavia, with the general support of the non-aligned countries, my delegation has joined in the consensus on the final wording of the conclusions regarding the discussion of item 4 of our agenda. We are satisfied with the amount of attention paid by the Commission to the item this year and feel optimistic about the second special session devoted to disarmament, to be held in 1982.

Unfortunately, my delegation was unable to follow very closely the progress of the working group established to deal with item 5 of our agenda, concerning military budgets. My country did, however, have the opportunity to place its views clearly on record in its reply to the Secretary-General's note and in its statements before the Commission. While we note that the lack of consensus made it impossible to have a coherent reflection of generally accepted views about the principles that must govern initiatives regarding the freezing and reduction of military budgets, we are confident that the exchange which has taken place will help to give impetus, in the future, to work on this major aspect of disarmament.

As to item 6 ("Elaboration of the general approach to the study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces, as well as its structure and scope"), the Commission's
conclusions reflect what my delegation anticipated from the time it first addressed itself to the question: there are differences of opinion that make agreement at this stage impossible. We are pleased, however, that the mandate of the working group established to deal with this item approaches the question in a way which my delegation, together with many other delegations - of the non-aligned group in particular - feels is the only proper way to approach it.

My delegation attached special importance to item 9, which concerns the very grave problem of South Africa's nuclear capability and on which there had been no conclusive discussion at the Commission's first two substantive sessions. We are happy that very many delegations, belonging to various groups, gave their unconditional support to the working paper which my delegation had the honour to introduce on behalf of the non-aligned countries. We are grateful to delegations which participated constructively and in good faith in the serious business of negotiating the final text of the Commission's conclusions on this item. Perhaps somewhat naively, out of our eagerness to see long-overdue justice done, we had felt at one time that the text had been arrived at by consensus.

Nevertheless, we are pleased that the Commission, in giving special emphasis to the discussion of items 4 and 9, in carefully delimiting the mandate of the working group on item 6 and in stressing the importance of the nuclear element in item 5, has actually reiterated an important principle recognized by the General Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament. We shall not be discouraged by the repetition in our Commission of the veto which, in the Security Council, covers the apartheid régime with a protective umbrella. What is at stake here is obviously a question of security for Africa and the world; we must therefore persistently denounce the situation as long as the threat continues to exist, and the Disarmament Commission is, to our mind, a suitable forum for this.

All things considered, it is obvious that those who vetoed the proposed conclusions on item 9 were also those who did not want the nuclear element in items 5 and 6 to continue to enjoy the priority agreed on at the first special session; they saw no real need to discuss in depth item 4, and are not very happy either with the conclusions of that discussion. In the final analysis, it becomes clear that those are the same forces which have applied the brakes to the process of détente, have virtually paralysed all disarmament forums and talk solely in terms of increasing their military budgets, manufacturing and putting in place new weapons and new installations throughout the world and intervening anywhere without even the slightest provocation.

With regard to item 7, concerning the report of the Commission to the Assembly at its second special session, the fact is that no disarmament forum can be better than the world itself, especially if the only rule in effect in the forum is the difficult consensus rule. Some use this rule for purposes of politicking and blackmail, coming to a meeting with preconceptions about its results. No one can be accused of changing rules which have not been accepted and exist only in the minds of some. Meetings cannot be conducted under pressure and under the repeatedly implied threat that if what is dictated is not accepted, there will be no conclusions, and if there are no conclusions, there will be no more Commission.

/...
Mr. Chairman, my delegation believes that, when our Commission meets again and is preparing to draft its report for the second special session, it should bear in mind that, despite the conditions making our work extremely difficult, which are clearly reflected in the conclusions on item 4, there have been notable achievements at the first two substantive sessions, and even at this third session. We have already referred to some of the achievements and trust that the point will be reflected in our report. In conclusion, we are optimistic that good sense will prevail and that this body will be able to continue fulfilling the important mandate entrusted to it by the international community.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Mr. Chairman, as already stated during the general exchange of views, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic participated in this session to contribute to advances in arms control and disarmament despite international tensions.

The session has given our delegation satisfaction, because it showed once again that this is also the opinion of the majority of States. Unfortunately, it cannot be said that all States participated in the session with such a constructive view. Nobody can fail to see the fact that the United States has neither during the general exchange of views nor during the debate of item 4 (a) and (b) clearly expressed its view on nuclear disarmament. This is not accidental, if we think of the speeches on the possibility of "waging" and "winning" a nuclear war made in this country by leading statesmen.

It is regrettable that also the other members of this State group were not ready to voice their concrete opinion on items 4 and 9 of the agenda.

Also in the two working groups most States did not strive for constructive results but made efforts both in questions of budget reduction and also in preparing the study on conventional weapons to separate these questions from the major issues and to concentrate on questions which do not intensify but complicate the negotiations and which do not promote results but delay or even prevent them.

Mr. Chairman, we proposed that negotiations on the reduction of military budgets should start with a clear statement of all States on their willingness to freeze and reduce their budgets combined with the cessation of all schemes and long-term programmes for increasing the budgets from year to year. We regret that this view has found no reflection in the background paper prepared by working group I. For my delegation every negotiation on the reduction of the military budgets needs in advance the declared willingness to take such steps. How shall negotiations lead to results, if this willingness does not exist? What is in that case the use of reporting systems? My delegation which thinks that the reduction of military budgets is possible, appreciates the continuation of the discussion in the Commission.

/.../
As far as the problems of the study on conventional disarmament are concerned, my delegation has stated clearly under what conditions we think such a study would be useful. First of all it must be directed at promoting the negotiations and abstain from everything that might complicate or aggravate the negotiations. For that my delegation has submitted concrete ideas in a conference room paper. These ideas should also be considered in the further discussion of the study.

Mr. Chairman, all in all the results of our session are not satisfactory. We have made it clear where in our opinion the causes for these unsatisfactory results have to be sought.