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The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS FORTY-FIRST SESSION (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: Members will now consider the outstanding portions of our report. I propose we deal with the three sections that we still have to consider, after which I will ask our Rapporteur to present the report in its entirety before we proceed to its adoption.

I would recall that when we adjourned this morning, we had arrived at paragraph 22 of the report. Members now have before them in mimeographed form the relevant text. Section III B is set out in the form in which it would appear in the report.

I have been asked to spell out, to be the best of my knowledge, what the last sentence of paragraph 22 ter would mean. It is my impression that it means that by virtue of the paragraph all the documents referred to in there would be officially recognized by the General Assembly, but it should be spelled out quite clearly that they need no additional distribution and thus no additional expense is incurred.

May I take it that section III B, which comprises paragraphs 22-22 ter is acceptable to the Commission?

That being the case, I should like to say a word on paragraph 23. I had already invited comments on this paragraph at an earlier stage. There were no objections, but it was pointed out to me that the paragraph was somewhat ambiguous, in that subsidiary bodies have not been created for all the agenda items in question. Therefore we should refer in paragraph 23 only to those agenda items for which formal subsidiary bodies were in existence, which means that agenda items 8 and 9 following 4 (a) and (b), 5, 6 and 7 should be eliminated from that paragraph because while they have not benefited from consideration in a special subsidiary body they were otherwise considered. As I say, we should delete agenda items 8
and 9 from paragraph 23, since the Commission has considered those agenda items by other means.

May I therefore take it that paragraph 23, as amended, is also acceptable to our Commission?

Mr. Konstantinov (Bulgaria): I should like only to know if items 8 and 9 will be included in the same paragraph in a new formulation.

The Chairman: Paragraph 23 relates only to the former subsidiary body. As can be seen, the successive paragraphs make reference to the various reports and recommendations that we have adopted, and agenda items 8 and 9, no longer part of paragraph 23, are dealt with in separate paragraphs and are thus fully covered.

Turning now to paragraph 28 of our report, that too is reflected in the mimeographed paper made available to our Commission this afternoon. The text, as members are all aware, was the subject of consultations earlier today.

May I take it that this paragraph is equally acceptable to the Commission?

That being the case, I now call on our Rapporteur to present the report in its entirety, whereupon we shall proceed to its adoption.

Mr. Amoro (Uganda), Rapporteur of the Commission: I have the honour to introduce the draft report of the Disarmament Commission for its 1986 substantive session (A/CN.10/1986/CRP.1). It has been distributed to all members of the Commission.

As has been the case in previous years, this draft contains four chapters: I. Introduction; II. Organization and work of the 1986 session; III. Documentation; and IV. Conclusions and recommendations. It covers the mandate of the Commission, proceeding from the current session, as well as conclusions and recommendations which are contained in the reports of various subsidiary organs of the Commission and will be added into the basic structure as integral parts of the report,
starting with paragraph 24. As far as technical blanks are concerned, the
Secretariat will fill them as necessary when the final version of the report is
completed.

The Commission met against the background of 1986 being the International Year
of Peace. Hence in tackling the report on its work, the Commission was expected to
bear in mind the principal role of the United Nations in the maintenance of
international peace and security. Delegations stressed the importance of the
Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body. The lack of progress in disarmament
negotiations between the USSR and the United States and in other multilateral
forums was regretted. Many delegations also felt it regrettable that the
Commission had for several years failed to reach consensus on concrete proposals
concerning the nuclear capability of the racist régime of South Africa. The
continued promotion of the spirit of co-operation, interdependence and dialogue in
international relations was also stressed.
(Mr. Amoko, Rapporteur)

The central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament was restated. The present session of the Commission has been heavily loaded with six substantive items on its agenda. Despite the heavy workload and the curtailment of the Commission's duration by one week owing to the apparent financial crisis facing the United Nations, the Commission has exerted its efforts in a business-like manner in considering important disarmament issues. Although the Commission at the present session has encountered various kinds of difficulties in the course of considering different subjects, the efforts made at this session will certainly be a step towards further improving international relations and, one hopes, an early conclusion to disarmament negotiations on important issues.

With those brief remarks, I recommend this draft report to the Commission for adoption.

In conclusion, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Secretariat for its valuable assistance and co-operation in preparing this report; equally, I wish to reiterate how grateful I am for having worked with you, Mr. Chairman, and all the other officers of the Commission. I wish to assure you and your colleagues that the experience which you so kindly and generously imparted to me during the course of our work will not be in vain or thrown into the dustbin of history.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure I express the feelings of the Commission when I express our warm-hearted gratitude to our Rapporteur, Mr. Amoko, for the work he has done on the report. We are grateful to have the fruits of his labour now before us.

Since Mr. Amoko had indicated to us at an earlier point that the exercise of his important functions was one of his last obligations here and that he is scheduled to return home to assume other important functions, I am sure that I am also acting on behalf of the Commission when I extend to him, along with our warmest congratulations, our best wishes on his future appointment.
We have heard our Rapporteur. He has recommended that we adopt the report in its entirety. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to adopt the report by consensus.

The report of the Commission, as a whole, was adopted.

CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to state at this point that we have the benefit of verbatim records. Responding to the Bureau's appeal, Conference Services has provided us with that service and I think it fitting that we express our gratitude for this enhancement of our effectiveness during our meeting this afternoon.

Mr. CAMPORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): Before proceeding to my statement at this closing meeting, I want to refer to agenda item 8 on the naval arms race. I refrained from doing so earlier so as not to interrupt the adoption of our report.

Secretariat document A/CN.10/1986/CRP.1/Corr.1, dated 22 May 1986 - a compilation of proposed measures to promote disarmament in connection with the naval arms race - was of great interest to my delegation. We consider it a useful document that should be taken into consideration in future deliberations on this item.

I shall now deliver my concluding statement.

At this closing meeting, the Disarmament Commission, in which all Member States of the United Nations are participating, has adopted a report regarding the status of items entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

Our deliberations, as in the past, constitute a series of steps which, having been made with a sense of dedication and seriousness, are slowly nearing their desired destiny.
This task, which requires a spirit of perseverance and hope even in the midst of despair, benefited at this session from a significant degree of co-operation in order to advance in numerous technical aspects on the Disarmament Commission's agenda.

Un fortunately we must note that the major issues of nuclear disarmament remain unsolved. The nuclear-weapon States, which are also the major producers of conventional weapons, have not found suitable formulas to eliminate the nuclear arsenals that threaten the survival of mankind nor to control the production of conventional weapons. Both kinds necessitate the diversion of tremendous resources from the development and well-being of peoples.

This lack of progress on nuclear disarmament issues was once again noted in the course of our deliberations.

None the less, constant efforts are being made in our region to preserve it from the nuclear threat, and my delegation considers that the Disarmament Commission should study the recent proposal to prohibit the introduction of nuclear weapons into that region and to limit the use of nuclear energy there to exclusively peaceful purposes.

In a message sent to the Disarmament Commission on 1 August 1985 President Alfonsin of my country has stated that Argentina will be a civilian nuclear State - that its use of nuclear energy will be exclusively for peaceful purposes.

For his part, in a message dated 1 April, also sent to the Disarmament Commission, President Sarney of Brazil stated that his country had opted for the prohibition of atomic weapons in his own territory.

Both messages, which reflect a similar position regarding the peaceful utilization of nuclear energy, found expression in the joint declaration on nuclear policy signed on 30 November 1985 by the Presidents of Argentina and Brazil, distributed as General Assembly document A/41/111, dated 24 January 1986.
Against that backdrop, the Commission has repeatedly noted the serious concern caused by the spread of nuclear weapons through the deployment of naval units equipped with such weapons on the world's seas and oceans. The delegation of Argentina shares that concern and would like to take this opportunity, while reserving its right to return to the subject at a later time, to declare its agreement with the proposal of the President of Brazil at the fortieth session of the General Assembly on 23 September 1985, that the prohibition on nuclear weapons be extended to the South Atlantic.

In conclusion, I should like on behalf of my delegation to express our thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, for your work in guiding our proceedings. Results have been achieved with regard to various items on the Commission's agenda, thanks largely to the zeal, talents and dynamism you have brought to bear to ensure that such would be the case. We should also like to thank the Secretariat for its services and its efficiency.

Mr. NOWORYTA (Poland): As representative of Poland and Chairman of the Group of Eastern European States, I should like to state that the socialist countries came to this session with a firm desire to attain progress in the world-wide efforts at improving the international situation. That desire is motivated by the essence of their peaceful foreign policy and by the fact that the arms race and the development of military technology have reached a critical point which needs an entirely new way of thinking and an innovative approach if we are to save mankind from annihilation.

In recent months the States members of the Warsaw Treaty, in particular the Soviet Union, have put forward a large number of major disarmament initiatives, which are well known to this Commission.
(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

The greatest efforts have been concentrated on the necessity to find ways to avoid a nuclear catastrophe, starting with a total cessation of nuclear tests and prevention of an expansion of the nuclear-arms race into outer space.

It is from that perspective that we evaluate the results of this year's substantive session of the Disarmament Commission. We note with satisfaction that a constructive atmosphere has prevailed during the three weeks of our work, thus meeting our expectations for an improvement of the international situation that emerged from the summit meeting between General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan.

Of course, we would have preferred more substantive progress on the agenda item concerning the various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, and we would have liked to be able to finalize our recommendations to the General Assembly. However, based on the positive experience of this session, we hope to be able to make tangible progress at next year's session.

We have manifested a flexible approach to the formulation of recommendations on the reduction of military budgets, and we note with satisfaction that certain progress has also been made here. However, we would like to stress that consensus requires a flexible approach on the part of all the parties concerned. It is our expectation that such an approach will be followed during our next session.

We fully share the disappointment of the great majority of members of the Commission that, once again, no progress has been made on the question of South Africa's nuclear capability owing to the intransigent position of a few Western countries. In the context of the recent South African military aggression against Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe, we simply fail to understand the logic of that position, which reminds us of historically remote situations and behaviour.
For the second time the Commission has discussed the agenda item "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament". The United Nations certainly has a most important role to play in that regard. However, for it to be effective in that role we feel it absolutely necessary that all Member States display a constructive political will to do so. If that political will is present in our efforts, we can be sure that positive results will be produced by United Nations machinery which, in our considered opinion, is commensurate with the needs of the Organization in the crucially important field of disarmament.

Despite the attempt to prevent the inclusion of the item on the agenda, as decided by General Assembly resolutions 40/94 F and 40/94 I of 12 December 1985, we would like to note with satisfaction that for the first time a substantive consideration of the question of the naval arms race and disarmament has taken place in the Commission. We consider the question of curbing the naval arms race as a very important part of over-all disarmament efforts, particularly in its nuclear aspect, in the aspect of endangering the security of other States and in the aspect of intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign States, especially the non-aligned States.

Finally - owing, Mr. Chairman, to your personal efforts and our common endeavour - we succeeded in making further progress on the agenda item on confidence-building measures. As a relatively new item, confidence-building measures, if account is taken of the equal security criteria of all States, may become an important factor in creating a comprehensive international security system in all important spheres: political, military, economic and humanitarian.
(Mr. Noworyta, Poland)

As our session comes to a close, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on the effective manner in which you have conducted this year's session of the Disarmament Commission. Your high competence and impartiality have contributed to the success of the work of the Commission at a very difficult time for the United Nations, which was moreover a constructive contribution to the fulfilment of the goals of the United Nations in this International Year of Peace. I should like also to congratulate the Chairmen of the various groups on their dedication and patience and on their tireless efforts to make our session a success.

The CHAIRMAN: I call next on the Chairman of Working Group III, the representative of the Bahamas.

Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas): First of all, Sir, I should like to commend you, for there is little doubt that your boundless energy and unique leadership incited delegations to be less passive in the expression of their views and better prepared to take decisions at the 1986 substantive session of this Commission. I should like also to express my gratitude to the other Commission officers and to the staff of the Department of Conference Services and other Secretariat members for their collaboration and contribution to the achievements made.

I read somewhere that plants respond to praise, encouragement and tenderness. Consequently for me to deny that the generous compliments made by my colleagues were heady would be unnatural. I must confess that, particularly since our efforts have once again proved unsuccessful, I feel very uncomfortable enjoying such praise.

While my statement will contain remarks on our work generally, members will agree that circumstances dictate that the bulk of my comments should centre around agenda item 6, entitled "South Africa's nuclear capability". I would wish at this juncture to commend the delegations which participated in Working Group III for the professional manner in which they employed their diplomatic skills. It was evident
that everyone was totally frustrated, for different reasons. As a result their comments demonstrated more clearly than before the parallel lines that have been drawn on this item.

It was rather disconcerting for me to have to begin this exercise anew. I was convinced that I knew exactly what would be said, but at the first session of the Working Group there was a glimmer of hope that an agreement could be reached on the lowest common denominator. It was not long before I came to grips with my own naïveté and with the concept of realism concerning the degree of importance Member States give to the idea of the United Nations.

My delegation is of the opinion that realism in an international context should embrace the concept of the survival of the fittest as well as that of interdependence. What seems to be developing in all United Nations forums is a dog-in-the-manger syndrome. There is an air of callousness, a desire to place national interests above the role of multilateral negotiation. What is so disheartening is that the majority of States, from the developing world in particular, become pinned under this bend-or-break strategy. For example, no one can disagree that the so-called squeeze, or belt-tightening, must be enforced if the United Nations is to continue as a viable, credible Organization. The crunch is upon us, and we must seek to employ those measures that would accommodate political, social and economic demands without creating a legal caste system. Certainly this is a monumental task, but it has to be done.

It was a bit esoteric to say that. It was not until we began to deal with the substance of the text contained in annex III of document A/40/42 (A/CN.10/WG.II/CRP.1) that I saw two unambiguous signals: that we could not carry out the mandate of the Commission contained in paragraph 7 of General Assembly resolution 40/89; and that there could be no collective message sent to South
Africa that would incorporate the abhorrence that all states hold for the system of apartheid coupled with the findings of the report of the Secretary-General on South Africa's nuclear capability.

On the other hand, all delegations agreed that the text needed surgery, but that the heart, or the core, should remain intact if it were to breathe. As the discussion proceeded one could hear, as it were, the life-blood draining from the body of that text. I use such vivid and melodramatic language on purpose, because in essence if there had been agreement to all the suggestions made to change the text, "a corpse" would still have been the only appropriate expression for the final result.

During my tenure at the United Nations I have observed that the Pretoria régime is equally oblivious to "constructive engagement" approaches, extreme language of condemnation, and silence. My delegation reiterates its strong conviction that contentious elements in any consensus endeavour are self-defeating. However, if intransigence is to be the order of the day then the condemnation would need to be as strong as possible as a matter of course. While there is some validity to the proverb that honey catches more flies, and while a mixture of commendation and condemnation makes for a more balanced text, my delegation is hard pressed to find much on which to commend the Pretoria Government.

My delegation is convinced that the acquisition by any state of the capability to manufacture nuclear weapons is a threat to international peace and security. This capability in South Africa is even more menacing, as there is universal condemnation of the Pretoria régime regarding its senseless policy of apartheid and its acts of aggression against neighbouring States. Further, given the well documented evidence of the irreversible damage that nuclear arms can cause, my delegation expected agreement on the nature of the message to be sent to South
Africa on this particular issue to be less confrontational. In other words, even if there were some reservations about the interpretation of the elements contained in the Secretary-General's report, this Commission would not be wrong in assuming that South Africa has the capability, particularly as there are countries much smaller and less developed which are known not only to have the capability but to have manufactured nuclear weapons.

Let me emphasize this: We should not appear to be condemning a country merely for acquiring a nuclear capability, but rather we should be taking steps to ensure that South Africa is not allowed to heighten its potential at the expense of its neighbours and for self-aggrandizement. It is along those lines that my delegation envisaged that a collective message should emerge, but the outcome of our deliberations tells a different story.

It is evident that a great deal more has to be done along the lines of political will, flexibility and compromise, if we are to enhance the spirit of interdependence. It may seem now that a solution to the thorny questions surrounding the nuclear capability of South Africa is elusive, but we are all aware of significant breakthroughs that the international community has made on some tougher problems. Public opinion is a powerful force, and there is no Government so omnipotent that it could not be forced to heed it.

Saint Paul said to his disciples, "If in this life only we have hope, then we are of all men to be most pitied." (Corinthians I, 15:19)
Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): As on the first day of our session, I have the pleasure to speak on this final day on behalf of the 12 Member States of the European Community.

The Twelve countries on whose behalf I speak think it appropriate briefly to evaluate the results of our work during these three weeks. As I do so it seems right to ask what we have really accomplished during these weeks.

The Twelve regret that it was not, strictly speaking, possible to fulfil our mandate on any item. We regret that the Commission could agree neither on recommendations for nuclear and conventional disarmament, nor on principles for the freezing and reduction of military budgets. The Commission considered the question of South Africa's nuclear capability - however, once again without success. Concrete recommendations and proposals on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament could not be elaborated. On the naval arms race, there was lack of consensus even on whether the subject should be dealt with at all. Nor has it been possible to reach complete agreement on guidelines for appropriate confidence-building measures.

This seems a bleak picture, but it is also an incomplete one, which does an injustice to the progress that was made in a number of areas. In fact, more was accomplished than last year, and in a shorter period of time. To a large extent that was due to your creative and energetic approach, Mr. Chairman.

Let me briefly review the different items on our agenda. Last year the Twelve, not satisfied with the then state of affairs suggested that it might be time for a new approach to agenda item 4 - nuclear and conventional disarmament. The consultations during these last weeks have convinced us that indeed a different approach is needed. We have serious doubts about the wisdom of continuing in the same manner next year, as it will most probably not be possible to overcome fundamental differences in points of view in the framework chosen thus far.
Some progress has been made, on the other hand, in the Working Group on the reduction of military budgets. The Twelve have taken an active stand in this regard and have tried to reach compromise formulations. It has been possible to agree on a formulation - albeit very general - on verification. Moreover, there has been wide acceptance of the need for a prior understanding on the exchange of relevant data and the comparability of military budgets. Nevertheless, much to the regret of the Twelve, complete agreement could not be reached. In our view, practical experience with standardized reporting on military budgets will enhance transparency in military matters and help to clarify what precisely is required for meaningful negotiations on the reduction of military budgets. In this context, the Twelve consider it of great importance that more countries complete the United Nations reporting instrument on military expenditures so as to ensure the broadest participation from different geographic regions, representing different budgetary systems.

The Twelve stressed at the beginning of our debate the need for flexibility in breaking the deadlock over South Africa's nuclear-weapons capability. We regret that that flexibility could not be demonstrated, despite initiatives to that end, and that hence it was not possible to send a strong message to the South African régime. That is all the more regrettable since the uncertainty surrounding South Africa's nuclear programme has given rise to wide international concern about that country's activities in this field. The Twelve fully share that concern. We therefore appeal to South Africa to place its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and to join others in declaring Africa a nuclear-weapon-free continent.

Regarding item 7 of our agenda, the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, the Twelve had advocated focusing on a few key questions. However,
the present suggestions and proposals in the Chairman's paper
(A/CN.10/1986/WG.II/CPR.1) cover a very wide range of ideas, and could not be
discussed in sufficient depth given the shortness of time. There are, however,
many suggestions in that paper that in our view merit further consideration. We
regret that the paper has not been incorporated in the report. The Twelve believe
that it should form the basis for the Commission's deliberations next year.

The Twelve have played an active role in discussing the study on the naval
arms race (A/40/535), because a comprehensive report is essential for an informed
consideration of the issues. The Twelve are satisfied that during this session it
was possible to find a way to explore these issues in a constructive manner.

Regarding confidence-building measures, the last but certainly not the least
substantial item on our agenda, more progress has been made than was hoped for some
days ago. Although the Twelve would have wished that complete agreement could be
reached, they are satisfied that the Commission was able to finalize its
deliberations, although for two problem areas alternative formulations have been
incorporated.

All in all, the Twelve remain convinced that the Commission can play an
effective, if modest, role in certain specific areas of disarmament. We remain
committed to constructive work in the Commission in a genuine desire to bring our
common objective of general and complete disarmament nearer.

In conclusion, the Twelve delegations on whose behalf I speak wish to express
their sincere appreciation for the excellent way in which you, Mr. Chairman,
together with the other officers of the Commission, have handled our work. We also
wish to convey our thanks to the Chairmen of the Working Groups and to your friend,
so to speak, Mr. Chairman, who dealt with agenda item 8, for the energy and
dedication with which they carried out their difficult tasks.
Mr. OTT (German Democratic Republic): Following on from the statement made by the Chairman of the Group of Eastern European socialist States, I wish to make the following statement.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic is satisfied that certain progress has been reached in the consideration of such decisive questions as nuclear and conventional disarmament - agenda item 4 - and principles for the reduction of military budgets. My delegation also appreciates the fact that substantive consideration of the question of curbing the naval arms race has started in a relevant body.

The Commission's work has reaffirmed that it is urgently necessary for all States to make increased efforts to avert a nuclear inferno, to end the arms race on earth and to prevent its spreading to outer space.

Together with all forces of common sense and realism, the German Democratic Republic will continue to take every opportunity, no matter how small, to oppose the tendency to the constant increase in the danger of war.

The debates in the Commission have illustrated the danger threatening all mankind, emanating from the policy of confrontation and arms build-up pursued by the most aggressive imperialist circles. The implementation of ever-new weapon projects - primarily, the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), the "Star Wars" plans, and the binary weapon programmes - speeds up the arms race to an ever greater pace.

Those Governments which, against the will of their own peoples, not only tolerate, but also actively support and promote such programmes make themselves equally guilty.
In the working paper submitted on agenda item 4, the German Democratic Republic, together with other socialist States, has explained its position on the fundamental question of nuclear and conventional disarmament.

First, it is quite clear today that there are no technical obstacles to a comprehensive test ban. Given the required political willingness, such a test ban could be agreed upon in a relatively short time. There is no doubt that a moratorium would be conducive to such an agreement. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic welcomed with great satisfaction the USSR decision to extend unilaterally its moratorium on nuclear explosions to 6 August of this year. We expect that the United States will reconsider its position and respond in a constructive way.

Secondly, concrete deeds are required in order to implement the agreement reached at the Geneva summit on the acceleration of bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States and, above all, on the prevention of nuclear war.

Thirdly, the German Democratic Republic supports the early conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons. However, the commencement of the production of binary weapons, as announced by the United States, would considerably jeopardize the negotiations on this matter. No doubt the decision on binary weapons taken yesterday by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) will have extremely negative consequences for security in Europe and the world at large. The implementation of these projects could spur a new round of the arms race in this field, with highly dangerous consequences for the entire complex of disarmament negotiations.

In view of that situation, the German Democratic Republic considers it even more urgent to start direct negotiations on the establishment in Central Europe of
a zone free of chemical weapons. In this connection, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic, Oskar Fischer, the day before yesterday, 21 May, handed over to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany a proposal on principles and main directions of future negotiations between the German Democratic Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, and the Federal Republic of Germany on the establishment of such a zone free of chemical weapons.

As to the future work of the Disarmament Commission, we support making better use of its potential for the dialogue on fundamental questions of arms limitation and disarmament. In our view, that means, in respect of agenda item 4, to discuss in a comprehensive manner the key questions of nuclear and conventional disarmament, to review the implementation of the Programme of Action of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and to prepare relevant recommendations to be submitted to the United Nations General Assembly. It means also to finalize the documents on the reduction of military budgets and South Africa's nuclear capability. We expect that the respective Western States will show the flexibility required to that end. The latest acts of aggression perpetrated by South Africa against neighbouring States - an expression of its policy of State terrorism - have illustrated again the urgency to abandon all patience vis-à-vis the racist régime and to agree on strict measures and sanctions by the international community against Pretoria. Not least, it means to intensify the consideration of such substantive and global disarmament questions as the curbing of the naval arms race.

It is along those lines that my delegation is prepared to co-operate with all States to increase this body's contribution to the world-wide efforts for disarmament.
Finally, I express my delegation's thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, to the other members of the Commission's Bureau, and to the representatives of the Secretariat.

Mr. BARTHELEMY (United States of America): Let me first congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, the entire Bureau and the Secretariat for the exceptionally vigorous and effective discharge of your responsibilities. Your accomplishments are even more significant when viewed in the light of our imposed time constraints. I believe that all delegations have been impressed by your determination and skill in attempting to report out long-standing items on the agenda of the United Nations Disarmament Commission which you rightly considered "mature".

In this respect I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on the successful outcome of consultations on guidelines for appropriate confidence-building measures over which you presided. Item 9 is of significance for all regions of the world; confidence-building measures can contribute to reducing international tensions and promoting stability among all States. For this reason confidence-building measures should come under periodic review in this and other bodies dealing with global security issues.

With regard to item 5, the reduction of military budgets, even though an understanding was reached on the matter of verification, my delegation regrets that two fundamental principles governing agreed reductions of military budgets, namely, transparency and comparability, still have not been accepted by a small group of delegations.

Unfortunately, agenda items 4 and 6, nuclear and conventional disarmament and the question of South Africa's nuclear capability, have not been resolved. These items have been the subject of protracted and inconclusive deliberations within
(Mr. Barthelemy, United States)

this body for many years now. My delegation believes that the time has clearly been reached to remove these two "evergreens" from the agenda of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. In the case of item 6 at least, my delegation appeals for a certain pause so that all can reflect on it for a time.

In addition, the Commission's review of the United Nations role in the field of disarmament under item 7 has shown modest progress. Further discussion of this important subject next year is surely justified.

As regards item 8, the so-called question of the naval arms race, my Government deeply believes that this spurious item should never have been included in the agenda of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in the first place. With all due respect to those who participated in the informal consultations on this item, the conference room paper describing them reveals, not a fertile, but a barren, field for arms control initiatives. We see no merit in considering the subject in any forum in the future.

In summary, we should look to making the United Nations Disarmament Commission a truly useful forum. To accomplish that we should refrain from contributing to existing criticism of the lack of fruitful work in the Commission and instead concentrate our efforts on the practical deliberations in the body that can contribute to meaningful progress in arms control and disarmament.
Mr. Konstantinov (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): The current session of the Disarmament Commission is drawing to a close. When we began our work three weeks ago we were all entering upon discussions that gave rise to certain hopes and expectations. Delegations emphasized in their statements that achieving positive results on the Commission's agenda items could not but give a powerful momentum to the international community's efforts to end the arms race and bring about disarmament, thus making a tangible contribution to improving the general political climate during the year that the United Nations has proclaimed as International Year of Peace.

Delegations can now take stock and evaluate the results that have been achieved. Our view is reflected in the statement made on behalf of the socialist countries by the representative of Poland, but the Bulgarian delegation wishes briefly to make some additional comments.

In our opinion the main feature of the current session was the clear awareness, confirmed by most delegations, of the danger to international peace posed by the continuing arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, and hence the need to take effective steps to prevent war, particularly nuclear war, and end the arms race and prevent its spread to outer space. That is why the Bulgarian delegation, like the delegations of most other States, regards the matters under agenda item 4 as being of particular importance.

However, we cannot help being disappointed that the Commission's work on the question is in the doldrums. That is particularly deplorable in the light of the possibilities of progress presented by the constructive proposals of the Soviet Union on the gradual elimination up to the end of the century of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, while banning space strike weapons and considerably reducing conventional weapons and armed forces. Our delegation warmly
welcomes the readiness of the Soviet Union to continue until 6 August the
moratorium on nuclear explosions, since we, like others, regard that decision as
further evidence of good will and political responsibility measuring up to the
needs of the times.

The positions of the socialist countries on the matter are set out in detail
in working paper A/CN.10/81. A number of non-aligned countries have submitted
proposals and expressed useful opinions. Therefore, although the discussion on
item 4 yielded no practical results, that is mainly owing to the few countries that
are still not prepared to translate into deeds their words about peaceful
intentions.

Like other delegations, the Bulgarian delegation attaches major importance to
the question of curbing the naval arms race, which is a part of the overall arms
race, although with its own peculiar features. Bulgaria believes that the final
goal - general and complete disarmament, and above all, nuclear disarmament - is
still one of the international community's priorities, as was indicated in the
Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, the first to
be devoted to disarmament. To achieve that aim there should be the gradual
implementation of various interconnected and complementary disarmament measures,
covering all types of weapons and all areas, ensuring at all times that the balance
is preserved and that the security of no State or group of States is breached.

At the same time, we believe that certain measures to restrict and reduce
naval activities and naval weapons and to build confidence on the world's seas and
oceans could be achieved earlier without in any way affecting the existing global
military balance.
(Mr. Konstantinov, Bulgaria)

We take that position because we believe that the tendency towards a military confrontation on the seas and oceans, the quantitative increase and sophistication of naval weapons and the increased naval presence and activity in many important parts of the world's oceans could have grave consequences for the security of certain States, the security of sea lanes and the exploitation of marine resources, as well as for world peace and security. We are pleased that that thinking is shared by most States. The statements of delegations in the General Assembly and in the Commission, Governments' responses to the Secretary-General in accordance with General Assembly resolutions and the expert study on the matter are all very significant in that connection.

We regard the substantive discussion of the question during the current session of how to limit the naval arms race, pursuant to the provisions of resolutions 40/94 F and 40/94 I, as an extremely important step towards concrete results in this complex and very important area. In this connection, we pay tribute to the considerable personal contribution of Ambassador Alatas, who handled the consultations on the matter.

Opinions and interesting ideas that make it possible to see clearly the position and approach of different States have been expressed and concrete proposals have been made on various aspects of the matter under discussion. Bulgaria's position is set out in its replies to the Secretary-General under resolutions 40/94 F and 40/94 I (A/CN.10/77 and A/CN.10/82), as well as in the working documents presented by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union submitted to the Commission at the previous and present sessions (A/CN.10/73 and A/CN.10/80).
Those documents include a number of measures concerning the presence and activities of naval forces in various parts of the world's oceans. Particular stress is laid on the fact that the measures should be elaborated and implemented in accordance with the principle that no one's security should be jeopardized, while there should be strict respect for all those factors that determine the interrelationship of naval forces. In that connection, we are quite flexible on the possible form of consultations and negotiations between States - whether bilateral, regional or multilateral, including consultations within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

We believe that the fruitful discussion within the Commission has given further weight to the idea that, if the political will exists, the complexity of matters related to curbing the naval arms race is no obstacle to achieving a common approach.
(Mr. Konstantinov, Bulgaria)

It is quite natural that there should be differing views about the nature and context of possible steps to be taken in this field, including the organizational framework to be established. However, such differences should be overcome in a constructive spirit through discussion and negotiation, and not by blocking the decision-making process. The attempts by the United States delegation to prejudge the matter by requesting its exclusion from the Commission's agenda at this session, its refusal to participate in the consideration of that vital matter and its opposition to inclusion of the results of the discussion in the Commission's report are not only not constructive but represent a violation of the fundamental democratic procedures of the United Nations. That indeed sets a very serious precedent for the Commission's future work.

The Bulgarian delegation considers that the Disarmament Commission should in the future have every opportunity to discuss ways and means of constructively evaluating matters dealt with under agenda item 8.

In conclusion, I should like to express the Bulgarian delegation's thanks to the Chairman for the expertise and energy he has brought to his leadership of the work of the Commission. Our thanks go also to the other officers of the Commission, to the Chairmen of the Working Groups and to all the members of the Secretariat who, through their efforts, have helped to ensure the smooth functioning of the session.

Mr. Fan Guoxiang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): This year is the International Year of Peace. In response to the call of the United Nations the peoples of the world are engaged in all kinds of activities to express their fervent opposition to the arms race and their aspirations to world peace. The two military Powers - the United States and the Soviet Union - have resumed their bilateral disarmament talks, and last year their leaders held a summit meeting. It was against such a backdrop of improved atmosphere that the United Nations
Disarmament Commission has held its present session. For reasons known to all, no great results have been achieved on substantive issues at this session. However, we should also note that, although the meeting time was reduced by one fourth, the work of the session did register some progress.

Consensus was reached on some controversial issues and brackets have been removed. On other issues, although differences persist their nature and essence have been further clarified. With regard to some inconclusive items, preliminary documents have been formulated to serve as a basis for future work. All that is naturally directly linked to the spirit of co-operation among all delegations.

Deserving of special mention is the outstanding the dynamic leadership of the Chairman, Ambassador Wegener, who gave great impetus to the work of this session. On behalf of the Chinese delegation I should like to express to him and to the other officers of the Commission, as well as to the Chairmen of the various Working Groups and Contact Groups, our heartfelt gratitude for the work they have put in and the valuable contribution they have made. We also thank the Secretariat staff for their effective support.

Regrettably, at this session no progress was made on the agenda item on South Africa's nuclear capability. The South African authorities still persist in their system of apartheid and in defying the international community, blatantly invading neighbouring States and grossly trampling upon the United Nations Charter. In such circumstances, the flexible attitude of the African States on this issue has not been met with a response by certain countries. The rigid positions taken by those countries give rise to serious misgivings and prevent the condemnation and isolation of South Africa. Such positions are actually harmful to international efforts aimed at preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

This session has made it clear that the central role and task of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament can and must be strengthened. The Chinese
delegation is in favour of upgrading the work of the competent United Nations organs, the enhancing of their efficiency and the intensifying of consultations to promote the solution of practical issues without compromising the equal rights of all States Members of the United Nations to participate in the discussion and solution of disarmament issues.

That differences - even major differences - exist among States with regard to certain agenda items is no surprise to anyone. Different opinions can be maintained. We do, however, object to any one State's being allowed wilfully to spoil the fruit of the common endeavours, reached through consultations, of the majority of Member States. Once established, such a precedent will create for us immense difficulties in our future work. The Chinese delegation earnestly hopes that, with the best efforts of all sides, the United Nations will play a greater role in the field of disarmament.

In conclusion, I should like to quote the words of the Premier of the State Council, Zhao Ziyang, who, in his report to the fourth National People's Congress of China on 25 March 1986, stated:

"The present international situation remains turbulent and disturbing. The maintenance of peace and economic development are matters of primary concern to the peoples of the whole world. The arms race and regional rivalry between the two super-Powers are a major threat to world peace and the security of all countries. The resumption of dialogue and negotiations on disarmament between the United States and the Soviet Union is a welcome development. However, what the people of the world expect from the United States and the Soviet Union is not rhetoric about peace and disarmament, but concrete actions in the interests of peace and disarmament."
Mr. LUPINACCI (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): The Disarmament Commission has concluded another session, one that has left us once again with mixed feelings. Some steps, and important steps, have been taken that enable us to have hope, but the achievements have been too slow, partial and conditional. It is thus difficult for us to overcome a feeling of frustration, because the progress we have made falls far short of the demands of peoples for concrete and urgent solutions to the problem of curbing the insanity of the arms race and reversing the trend that can lead mankind to the brink and that, in any event, implies the total reversal of the values of civilization.

Of course the Commission is but a deliberative body, it is not a decision-making body. But there can be no doubt that the international community expects this forum to be the seed-bed of productive agreements from which will emerge the bases for negotiated agreements in which irrationality will yield to wisdom.

We do not wish to paint a pessimistic picture. First, we should like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and the Chairmen of the Groups among which the Commission has distributed its work, for the efforts that have helped achieve some positive results.

We recognize with satisfaction the fact that progress has been made, but we should like at the same time to express our concern about what we have failed to accomplish and the great deal that remains to be accomplished. We are aware that because of the dizzying speed of events in the world today any delay is a backward step, any absence of result forestalls and diminishes the possibilities of future progress, any lack of agreements add bricks to the wall of distrust.
We also express our thanks for the reports provided on our work and endorse the recommendations and proposals which they contain. Significant progress has been made regarding principles for future measures by States to freeze and reduce military budgets. An agreement was reached on 14 of the 15 recommendations. Similarly, we are pleased to note the preparation of draft guidelines for confidence-building measures and for their regional and universal implementation. Our position, in this connection, is based upon the following criteria and principles:

First, the right of all States to participate in multilateral disarmament negotiations in view of the vital interest of all peoples in the success of those negotiations, and hence the duty to contribute to their successful results;

Second, the most general and complete disarmament possible which would encompass nuclear and conventional weapons without prejudice to the setting of priorities;

Third, the tremendous importance of nuclear disarmament because the survival of mankind depends upon it;

Fourth, the overriding responsibility of the nuclear Powers, in particular the United States and the Soviet Union, in the disarmament process;

Fifth, the gradual reduction of conventional weapons, together with drastic limitations on their production and marketing;

Sixth, the adoption of proper verification measures as an essential guarantee in the disarmament process;

Seventh, the importance of unilateral, subregional and regional disarmament initiatives, and of such agreements as effective partial stages towards general and complete disarmament.
(Mr. Lupinacci, Uruguay)

In this connection, Uruguay, as a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco on the
denuclearization of Latin America and a consultative party to the Antarctic Treaty,
which sets forth the principles for the demilitarization and denuclearization of
the entire continent, firmly supports the Brazilian proposal to extend the ban on
the use of nuclear weapons to the entire south Atlantic, thereby preserving it as a
zone of peace, free from any such weapons, free from the arms race and free from
extraregional confrontation.

It has frequently been said, but it deserves repetition, that the United
Nations is the natural forum for the discussion and negotiation of disarmament.
This is true politically because the United Nations affords the opportunity for all
countries, large or small, to participate on an equal footing. It is also true
juridically, under the Charter. Hence we must reinforce the Charter principle of
collective security; in this the Security Council plays the major role.

Before concluding, I would emphasize another dimension, and it relates to the
work of this Commission: the close relationship between disarmament and
development. If we advance the disarmament process, we shall be able to rechannel
to the development of peoples resources which are today absorbed by the arms race.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): Mr. Chairman, I shall attempt to adhere to your
admonition to us all to be brief in these concluding remarks.

I should like first to address three of the agenda items which have been
considered during the course of this session. The first is the reduction of
military budgets, item 5 of our agenda. My delegation is extremely satisfied with
the progress that has been made on the item at this session. In that connection,
we are grateful for the leadership shown us by Mr. Tinca of Romania. We deeply
regret that consensus has not been possible on all aspects, in particular on those
relating to transparency and comparability. But we do believe that progress can
be made on those two aspects in the near future, and we ourselves shall certainly be doing whatever we can to ensure that that progress is made and that this important issue is brought to its proper conclusion.

I should like now to discuss very briefly item 9 of our agenda, which relates to confidence-building measures. In this context, too, my delegation is satisfied with the extremely positive results that have been achieved during this session. Mr. Chairman, I trust you will forgive me if I make it clear that we feel very strongly that no sharp distinction can be drawn between the achievement of those results and the very considerable effort and expertise that you personally brought to our work on that subject. We hope that the results achieved in this Commission may, among other things, have a positive effect on the process taking place in Stockholm at the Conference on Disarmament in Europe. That would be a good example of the way in which this multilateral disarmament system and the work in other bodies could have a positive interrelationship.

As to item 8 of our agenda, the question of a naval arms race, we are satisfied with the results that have been made at this stage in the consideration of this subject, one which, of course, has not been without its difficulties. We do think that the results that we have achieved in this preliminary consideration, together with the United Nations naval arms race study, can form a good basis for future consideration of this issue, that is, provided that the issue is addressed in serious terms and is freed from a somewhat propagandist use or interpretation, which, we regret, was at times given to this issue by some delegations during the course of our work.

On item 6 of the agenda, the question of South Africa's nuclear capability, I would recall that in my delegation's opening remarks at the beginning of the session we stated our belief that this item was extremely important and, to use the
Chairman's words, ripe for conclusion and positive consideration. How many times must we listen to statements to the effect that the apartheid régime is abhorrent and that it should never be armed with nuclear weapons - views entirely shared by my Government and professed repeatedly by so many delegations in the United Nations? How many times must we listen to such statements and yet see ourselves fail, as we have failed again on this occasion, to come to a sensible set of recommendations on this truly important issue? How many times must we be condemned to the Shakespearian concept of sound and fury signifying nothing? How many times must we traverse this issue of the abhorrent régime in South Africa and the serious question of its nuclear capability without coming to a conclusion? My delegation sincerely hopes that this sound and fury will stop and that at an early occasion, at the next time that we take up this subject, we shall be able to bring it to a conclusion so as to ensure that the apartheid régime is never armed with a military nuclear capability.
(Mr. Butler, Australia)

There were two other items on our agenda which were very important and seemed to my delegation to have a relationship on a level that was quite fundamental to the conduct of disarmament negotiations within the multilateral system: item 4, nuclear and conventional disarmament; and item 7, review of the United Nations disarmament system.

At one stage during our deliberations on item 7, review of the United Nations disarmament system, I thought I saw emerging the almost terrifying possibility that in the review of the system we would see proposals or a document exactly the same as that dealt with under item 4, the kind of document which is precisely the reason why the system needs to be reviewed, as has been proposed by the delegation of Cameroon. Of course, I am talking about a document which is notable more for its disagreements than for its areas of agreement. I am talking about the awful pieces of paper that we sometimes submit, in good faith but in self-delusion; documents characterized more by square brackets than areas of agreement that we put forward and call "disarmament". In my delegation's view, such products are not "disarmament"; they demonstrate - as was the case this year, in spite of the splendid efforts by our colleague from Ecuador, under item 4 - that the United Nations disarmament system is not being operated effectively and requires review, precisely the kind of review that is being called for under item 7.

What my delegation hopes for is that under an item such as item 4 we will stop behaving like a bunch of crusty old theologians asking ourselves how many angels can fit on the head of a pin, and in fact make the United Nations disarmament system work effectively to reach agreement on issues where we can do so and to stop clogging up the system with things that are not ripe for agreement - in other words, to use the approach that the Chairman has used to report out things that are
ready for that, agree where we can, not permit the system to be clogged up any longer with things that are not ripe for agreement, but instead to move forward where we can.

In that context, my delegation continues to believe that the item that calls upon us to review the operation of this system, the item suggested by the delegation of Cameroon, is one under which we obtained a good result. Thank heavens, in the end it was not plagued with the kind of square-bracketed solution that sometimes passes for "disarmament" but is nothing of the kind. We obtained a result which keeps that important item alive, and it is our firm hope that it will stay alive and we will be able to make further progress on it in the future.

I have spoken in these direct terms in order to underline our belief that there has been some good progress at this session of the Commission. There have been instances where our system has worked well, but others have been disappointing and on which I hope on the next occasion we will be able to take a new approach especially, for example, under item 4 where it is clear to my delegation a conceptually new approach is required; and under item 7 where we can continue actually to upgrade and improve the operation of the system itself so that when we face an agenda, such as we did this time, we will not report progress on only half the items but will report good progress on all the agenda items.

We in Australia believe that the United Nations has a central role to play in disarmament. We deeply regret that the Charter provisions with regard to the role of disarmament in the maintenance of international peace and security are too often overlooked. We are very conscious of the fact that both the General Assembly and the Security Council are called upon to keep disarmament in a central place in the pursuit of the fundamental objective of this Organization - the maintenance of peace and security - and we want to see it occupy that place, for which purpose
this machinery must be made better. This Commission is a part of that machinery, an important part. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that the deliberative function is important and must be played.

I want to say quite frankly that the result we achieved procedurally on the naval arms race issue was, in our view, the correct one. It was the correct one because it preserved the rule of consensus and kept alive the effective deliberative function of this body and we were very, very satisfied that we were able to do so.

Mr. Chairman, it remains now for me simply to express my delegation's deep gratitude to you for the role that you have played: you have been an extraordinarily effective Chairman and demonstrated that there is no substitute for personal integrity and professional competence.

Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Today, as this regular session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission is concluding its work, I should like briefly to share some thoughts about what we have accomplished and, to be quite blunt, about what we have failed to accomplish.

As we see it, the plenary meetings and discussions in the Commission's various working groups have highlighted the desire of most States to do something to get disarmament out of its present deadlock. For that reason the Commission has made some progress in reaching a community of views on a number of agenda items and for the first time proceeded to carry out a rather thorough discussion of the important question of naval forces and how to limit them.

However, it must be recognized that the bulk of our work is still before us: that as yet no steps have been taken to find timely and urgent solutions to the problems of disarmament, to prevent a nuclear holocaust, and to put an end to the
arms race, particularly in the nuclear field. One may wonder why this need has been only partially translated by the Commission into the sphere of recommendations designed to serve as a starting-point for specific, concrete action.

If we mentally return to the material emerging from the discussions we have just had, it is easy to conclude that the main obstacle to achieving mutually acceptable agreements primarily on questions of nuclear disarmament has been the unwillingness of certain Western countries, first and foremost the United States, to discuss and agree upon practical steps in the field of disarmament. Despite the assurances sometimes given about their devotion to the cause of disarmament, the delegations of those countries essentially have set off in the opposite direction. All their talk about verification, transparency and so on has not changed anything, particularly when we attempt to talk about specific problems relating to the limitation of the arms race which are ripe for solution.

The question of a nuclear-test ban is a case in point. Regrettably, we have been unable at this session to agree on any recommendations on the subject. The fact is, ending tests is the most realistic way to proceed to slow down the nuclear arms race. If there are no such explosions it will be impossible to perfect or create new forms of nuclear weapons, and for that very reason the cessation of explosions can serve as the thread, if we tug on it, that will help us to unravel the whole knot of problems connected with the limitation of nuclear armaments and make some progress in the whole process of nuclear disarmament.
For those reasons the Soviet Union last year took upon itself an extremely important initiative: on 6 August it decided unilaterally to halt all nuclear explosions up to 1 January 1986. The Soviet Union expressed its readiness to undertake the most far-reaching and effective steps for verification and control, including on-site inspection. We appealed to the United States Government to follow our example and we stated that our moratorium would remain in effect provided that the United States for its part refrained from carrying out nuclear explosions. However, there was no ensuing positive response from the United States.

In an attempt to make further progress and in the hope of a positive reaction from the United States of America, on three occasions the Soviet Union extended the scope of its unilateral moratorium and, most recently, in a statement made by Mr. Gorbachev on 14 May, the moratorium was protracted for a considerable length of time until 6 August of this year, but without effect. The United States position has not changed.

Of course a moratorium is only the first, albeit the most important, step towards full and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. However, we do not propose to stop at that. We favour an immediate initiation of talks on the full prohibition of nuclear tests. The Soviet Union is prepared to undertake these talks in any form - whether bilateral, multilateral or multilateral - provided that an earnest attempt is made to arrive at agreements.

But the only response has been a series of nuclear explosions from the Nevada testing grounds. Recently, despite the demands of world public opinion for an end to the nuclear-arms race which is so lethal to mankind, yet another explosion took place under the title of "Panamint". Indeed, this was the fourth explosion officially announced by the United States this year and the eleventh since the Soviet Union on 6 August 1985 imposed its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions.
Although the United States proclaims its readiness, together with the Soviet Union, to bring about the reduction and complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the most recent explosion in Nevada has shown that these assurances are mere verbiage and that it is a question not of defective machinery but of political will.

The Soviet delegation believes that the Disarmament Commission can effectively and fruitfully continue its work. It has excellent potential for agreement on useful recommendations on various disarmament problems, but this can be done only if all States have a genuine desire, on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security, to achieve concrete agreement towards ceasing and reversing the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, and removing the nuclear threat.

As far as the delegation of the Soviet Union is concerned, we will continue to demonstrate the necessary flexibility and constructiveness to this end and a readiness to co-operate with the delegations of other States.

In conclusion, on behalf of my delegation I wish, like many other delegations, to express our deep thanks to you, Sir, for your very active chairmanship and desire to see our work well organized. To a large extent what we have been able to do is due to you, the other officers of the Commission and the chairmen of the working groups, whom we should like to thank also.

As is known, during this session, apart from the traditional working groups and/or committees of the whole, there was the so-called consultative group which considered the question of the restriction of naval forces and naval armaments. It worked intensively, but as it turned out, in the final analysis this was an auxiliary body's work. It was, however, as I said, very intensive and we should like to express our thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, and to our friend who was in charge of the working group, Ambassador Alatas.
I should like also to thank all the United Nations Secretariat staff who managed under very difficult conditions to service our work.

Mr. GONSALVES (India): As we arrive at the conclusion of our work I should like to state briefly my delegation's views on our proceedings.

The core issues on the Commission's agenda are items 4 (a) and (b) dealing with the critical questions of the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, a nuclear-weapon-test ban, the prevention of nuclear war and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. There has not only been no noteworthy progress in these critical matters, but brackets have been introduced around what were previously agreed formulations. The responsibility for this disappointing situation is clear for all to see. It is alarming that there is no consensus even on the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. States disavowing this goal are reneging on their earlier solemn commitments. Equally disturbing is the tendency to suggest that we let the nuclear-arms race remain as it is and that we concentrate on peripheral issues on the ground that these constitute practical work. We firmly reject this exhortation that we live with our nuclear predicament.

In all aspects of our deliberations, we note with the utmost concern the concerted effort which is taking place to erode, dilute and undermine consensus on the Final Document. We see in the exercise to review the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament a sinister attempt by a group of States, anxious to avoid the pressure of world public opinion to show some readiness to countenance concrete disarmament measures, to maim and emasculate the perfectly excellent existing multilateral machinery for disarmament. We are, of course, confident that such an approach is unacceptable to the great majority of Member States and that it has no chance of becoming reality.
Our views are elaborated in some detail in the document on the subject which we have submitted to this Commission and we are confident that that document will receive due attention when we resume consideration of this subject. Our central thesis is that the fault lies not with the machinery but with the absence of political will on the part of certain States to honour their solemn international commitments in the field of disarmament contained in the Final Document and in other international instruments. In our view, we have not only the right to demand scrupulous implementation of the Programme of Action outlined in the Final Document, but also a solemn duty to advance the disarmament process beyond the terms envisaged in the Final Document. The refusal on the part of certain States to undertake any meaningful consideration in the multilateral arena of such vital issues as the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament, the nuclear-weapons-test ban, prevention of nuclear war and prevention of an arms race in outer space is the best evidence of the lack of political will and the scant respect that exists for multilateral machinery established with the common consent of all and with the knowledge that there is no doubt about its functionality. It is from these angles that, in the view of my delegation, we should approach the round issue.

We are extremely disappointed that for the third successive year the Commission has made no progress on the issue of South Africa's nuclear capability. Shifting criteria of so-called objectivity have been applied to seek to exonerate South Africa from the charges concerning its nuclear capability, and sinister and unsuccessful attempts have been made to equate the racist apartheid régime of Pretoria with any and all other States in the world. We deplore this cynical approach on a matter of utmost concern to African and non-aligned States.

It is gratifying to note that the Commission's exercise to prepare guidelines for confidence-building measures has concluded for the time being. In the report
of the Commission to the General Assembly this year we will have at least one element of completed work, no matter how tenuous the consensus on that report is. In any case, since there is a clear understanding that confidence-building measures cannot be a substitute nor a precondition for disarmament measures and since the original concept of confidence-building measures as collateral measures in the context of disarmament remains largely overtaken by the report of the Commission, it will be best to let other forums follow up the project on confidence-building measures. We continue firmly to believe that confidence-building measures cannot in any way supplant the urgent need for and profound impact of disarmament measures in general, and nuclear disarmament in particular. If, outside the ambit of disarmament, confidence-building measures can indeed make their contribution to international peace and security, that should be a very welcome development indeed.
With regard to the naval arms race, the position of my Government is well known. We do not agree with organically separate consideration of what constitutes only one element of the totality of the arms race, and we accordingly view this exercise as diversionary in character. In addition, we believe that the approach under way can obfuscate the distinction between nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament and undermine the priority accorded by the international community to nuclear disarmament.

In conclusion, despite my somewhat sombre assessment of our achievements I have no hesitation in paying due and very generous tribute to you, Mr. Chairman, for the energetic and knowledgeable manner in which you have guided our deliberations and brought them to a very successful conclusion.

Mr. WIJEWARDANE (Sri Lanka): I am speaking both in my capacity as Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka and as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference and of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

I should like to compliment you, Mr. Chairman, on the exemplary manner in which you have conducted the work of the Commission - crisply, precisely and, I would add, skilfully. Our thanks also go to the Chairmen of the various Working and Contact Groups, Ambassadors Albornoz, Engo, Tinca, Hepburn and Alatas. We extend to the Bureau and to the Secretariat our appreciation for their dedication application and service.

Owing to time constraints, I shall be brief and confine myself to comments on agenda item 7, and particularly on document A/CN.10/1986/WG.II/CRP.1, which was circulated as the Chairman's draft. That paper was prepared by the Chairman and circulated to convey his findings, recommendations and proposals on the various topics within the Group's programme of work for the consideration of its members.
Individual members and groups of members of Working Group II have submitted 20 other papers which are to have equal status with the Chairman's, as agreed at yesterday's meeting of the Committee of the Whole and this morning's plenary meeting. In accordance with the decision taken there, the Chairman's paper would not take precedence over them. From that, it follows that the Chairman's paper is not in its entirety a consensus document of the Committee reflecting the views of its members. Nevertheless, Chairman Engo deserves our thanks for his efforts.

The Ad Hoc Committees on, respectively, the World Disarmament Conference and the Indian Ocean hold specific mandates from the General Assembly, and those were renewed at the Assembly's fortieth session. Their status as organs of the General Assembly and their continued operation were also accepted at the Assembly's resumed fortieth session when it considered and accepted the specific recommendations of the Secretary-General in document A/40/1102.

In respect of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, the Secretary-General made proposals on the activities of that Ad Hoc Committee only in respect of budgetary considerations, and that position has been accepted by the General Assembly. Ambassador Engo has proposed in a single paragraph that the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, as well as the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, "should be adjourned", in his words, until what he calls "the climate for substantive progress in the work of those two organs has improved".

Here I must confess that it was with considerable surprise that I saw that blanket recommendation on those two Ad Hoc Committees by the Chairman of Working Group II. The two Ad Hoc Committees cannot be linked in a single paragraph with a single recommendation serving them both. They are two separate entities concerned with entirely different matters, with different mandates and based on different concepts. The only connection, if any, is that they both happen to share the same
Chairman and do not have two respective Chairmen, as Chairman Engo's Conference Room Paper states.

I shall now deal with the Indian Ocean Peace Zone and the mandate. The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean was renewed at the fortieth session of the United Nations General Assembly by consensus in resolution 40/153. Operative paragraph 4 of that resolution

"Requests the Ad Hoc Committee, taking into account the political and security climate in the region, to complete preparatory work relating to the Conference on the Indian Ocean during 1986 in order to enable the opening of the Conference at Colombo at an early date soon thereafter, but not later than 1988, to be decided by the Committee in consultation with the host country".

That paragraph takes into account the factor of the climate mentioned in Chairman Engo's proposals, but the injunction in the resolution - which, I stress, was adopted by consensus - is not to adjourn the Ad Hoc Committee, but "to intensify its work" with regard to the implementation of its mandate. If there has been a change in the climate or other circumstances since the adoption of resolution 40/153, that has been only to make the work of the Committee more important. The Secretary-General's proposal in A/40/1102 merely makes recommendations on financial aspects which, from all the explanations we have received on them, does not in any way constitute a political judgement calling for the winding up of the work of the Committee.

There have been views expressed in the Ad Hoc Committee - and it is my duty as Chairman to mention this - that the political and security climate is not propitious for the holding of a Conference on the Indian Ocean. Even those holding that view have not, in the Committee, called for its adjournment. The holding of a Conference on the Indian Ocean is, of course, one objective for which the Ad Hoc Committee must prepare. I must stress, however, that there is another view, held by
virtually all States of the Indian Ocean, that the climate in the area is
deteriorating, and it is their view that the strongest and most urgent reason for
holding the Conference is to arrest that deterioration in the situation.

Much work remains to be completed, and one of the tasks before the Ad Hoc
Committee is to continue working, inter alia, to harmonize views on remaining
relevant issues. In the circumstances it is hardly logical to adjourn the Ad Hoc
Committee unless the Committee decides to do so by consensus.

The proposals in section IV, paragraph 18 (l)(d) of Chairman Engo's paper
relating to the Ad Hoc Committee may indeed reflect an opinion held by some members
of the Ad Hoc Committee. However, as Chairman of that Ad Hoc Committee it is my
duty to place very clearly on record that, by a consensus decision of the Ad Hoc
Committee as well as of the General Assembly, a very clear mandate for the future
work of the Ad Hoc Committee is contained in the relevant paragraphs of
resolution 40/153, which hardly constitutes a recommendation to adjourn the Ad Hoc
Committee. I submit that Chairman Engo's paper does not reflect the thinking of
the 48 States that hold membership in the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean and
whose consensus view was further endorsed by the General Assembly when it adopted
resolution 40/153 by consensus.

With regard to the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, it is
to be noted that the Secretary-General's recommendation in document A/40/1102 does
not even mention the need to adjourn or curtail that Ad Hoc Committee's work, even
on financial grounds. Here too, I must state that the proposal made by the
Chairman does not seem to take into account the views of the members of the Ad Hoc
Committee.

I did not submit a Conference Room Paper on the Chairman's paper placing
before the Commission the views I have just expressed owing partly to time
constraints, since Chairman Engo's paper was not issued until 21 May 1986. However,
since I understand that Chairman Engo's paper is now to be part of the
documentation of the Disarmament Commission, I thought it best to place on record
at this plenary meeting the comments on the Ad Hoc Committee on the World
Disarmament Conference and on the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. That is
the least I could do as Chairman of those two Ad Hoc Committees that have come
under the review and scrutiny of the Chairman of Working Group II. I wish,
however, to assure him that my remarks in this statement do not diminish in any way
the high regard and esteem in which I hold him.

In conclusion, please accept my salutations, Mr. Chairman, for the counsel,
guidance and leadership you have given these discussions.
Mr. ROCHE (Canada): My delegation entered this session of the Disarmament Commission with modest hopes for some achievement and progress. I am glad to say that our expectations in that respect have been fulfilled, thanks in no small measure to the energetic, skilled and firm way in which you, Mr. Chairman, have presided. Acceptable working arrangements for all our agenda items were agreed and put into operation during the first week of this session. This both reflected and reinforced what seemed a widely shared readiness on the part of delegations from all groups and regions to approach our work in a constructive, accommodation-seeking spirit.

Perhaps the most notable achievement of this session has been our success in reporting out on agenda item 9. This was a subject with which we had been attempting to come to grips for some years. Difficult issues upon which there are markedly differing perspectives and views were involved. The fact that we are now able to convey to the General Assembly as a draft a single text setting out a substantive set of guidelines on confidence-building measures, albeit one still containing a few alternative formulations, is a major accomplishment. It is a product of several years of arduous labour - not least, Sir, on your own part - as well as of the positive way in which the subject was addressed by delegations during this session. My delegation also trusts and hopes that it reflects a genuine convergence of view about the nature and importance of confidence-building measures, both in themselves and as collateral measures directly supportive of specific arms-control and disarmament agreements and of the arms-control and disarmament process as a whole.

On agenda item 5, "Reduction of military budgets," there was also some notable, not entirely expected, progress. In particular, there was success in agreeing on a formulation for registering the importance and relevance of adequate verification provisions in relation to agreements on the freezing and reduction of
military budgets as well as on matters relating to the phasing of such agreements. This reflects well on the work of that Group, under the able guidance of Mr. Tinca of Romania. My delegation hopes that when discussion of this agenda item is resumed there can be agreement on a formulation that will clearly and unambiguously register that the negotiation and conclusion of such agreements require firm understanding among parties on the need for agreed methods of ensuring comparability and transparency in the measurement of military budgets.

My delegation also considers that some useful progress was made, under the guidance of Ambassador Engo, in our consideration of agenda item 7, the role of the United Nations in disarmament. We believe we need to avoid falling into a sterile debate on the relative importance for the arms-control and disarmament process of political will as compared to the adequacy of institutional machinery. No one would deny the elemental and basic need for political will if the arms build-up is to be brought under more effective control. Equally, however, if a political will to that end is to be realized, adequate institutional machinery must be available. To urge attention to the potential need to refurbish and keep in good repair our institutional wares in no way derogates from the importance of political will. My delegation believes that our institutional arrangements indeed warrant re-examination and improvement. We therefore regard ongoing consideration of this agenda item as a matter of some considerable priority, and we believe we can build constructively on the foundations which have begun to be laid in these early days of discussion, particularly the very useful paper prepared by the Chairman of the Working Group.

With regard to agenda item 4, my delegation was disappointed in the results of our work. Despite industrious effort, we did not really get beyond making minor changes in a long, convoluted text, itself the result of many past accretions and modifications. My delegation considers that it is necessary to give consideration
to a completely fresh approach, and we particularly invite those delegations which have expressed a priority interest in this topic to consider how the item might be addressed in a more focused way.

It is a matter of regret to my delegation that, despite the commendable efforts of both Ambassador Hepburn and the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission, agenda item 6, dealing with South Africa's nuclear capability, was not effectively addressed during this session. Failure even to agree on a chairman for the Working Group several of the most-interested delegations insisted should be established cannot but have an eroding effect on the reputation of this deliberative body.

My delegation was pleased that an acceptable procedure was put in place to enable a beginning on substantive consideration of agenda item 8 on the naval arms race. This enabled us to comply with the near-unanimous request of the General Assembly in resolution 40/94 F that that subject be taken up here. We hope that in our future consideration of this item all delegations will be in a position to participate fully in the discussions.

Finally, our work record and achievements this year, while they are not a cause for boasting, provide grounds for a certain satisfaction. My delegation nevertheless continues to harbour a concern that we may not be fully meeting the objectives for which the United Nations Disarmament Commission was created. Among them was the provision of a forum for those countries not members of the Conference on Disarmament to register their concerns and views on matters relating to arms control and disarmament. Yet it is our distinct impression that, for the most part, the most active participants in our deliberations here have been delegations from those countries that are also members of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. We hope that that pattern will not persist at our future sessions and that the United Nations Disarmament Commission, through a greater global effort, will achieve its true potential.
Miss SENCION (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, for the very proper way in which you have presided over our work. We would also like to congratulate the Chairmen of the Working Groups for their work.

I shall refer briefly to some of my delegation's opinions with regard to agenda item 7, "Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament". If we do not curb the arms race and begin to move firmly towards disarmament, the credibility and very raison d'être of the United Nations may be strongly questioned, thereby imperilling international stability and security. The arms race is a negation of the characteristics that make mankind the sole rational beings inhabiting Earth. It is the negation of reason, prudence and goodwill to live together in peace. The dangers this entails for the survival of mankind demonstrates that we have taken a wrong turn and that, by failing to implement the proper measures as a matter of urgency, we will be doomed to an unprecedented catastrophe.

My delegation hopes that any commitments entered into by the international community will be implemented and that any commitments into which we may enter in light of deliberations and negotiations on disarmament currently under way will be implemented. It is that course that represents the most realistic way to strengthen the United Nations role in the field of disarmament.
It is obvious from the deliberations in Working Group II that the task of reconsidering the United Nations role in the field of disarmament is unique, for, in our view, it has two clear-cut aspects. The first is made up of commitments on disarmament entered into by the international community. In our view, it is evident that the strengthening of our Organization in this area depends on compliance with and observance of those commitments. The other is the determination to find a realistic solution to the problem of disarmament. This is the most difficult part of our work, because such a search demands a great deal of knowledge, patience, understanding and goodwill.

In conclusion, my delegation extends warm congratulations to the delegation of Cameroon and its Ambassador Paul Bamela Engo for their efforts to reach a successful conclusion in Working Group II. In this connection, we appreciate also the working paper he has submitted in his capacity as Chairman of that Group, which we consider as a point of departure that could become a consensus document when we next consider this item. We avail ourselves of this opportunity to express thanks for all the working papers submitted by delegations.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I shall try to abide by the time-limit for all statements suggested by the Chairman, although that means I shall be compelled to make a somewhat drastic selection of topics among the many that could be taken up in my statement.

First, I shall refer to the need for us in our deliberations, particularly when we deal with matters such as those pertaining to agenda item 4, to try and take into account the various goals and purposes we have fully supported in other organs, especially in the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament. I say that because, in so far as the recommendations appearing in the annex to document A/CN.10/1986/CRP.2 are concerned, several of them were adopted by
consensus and in some cases have been submitted and approved at the highest levels by States which have later tried here to erode what was enshrined elsewhere and called for brackets around paragraphs that were exactly the same as those they had already approved. I shall give a specific example to illustrate what I have just said.

In Recommendation No. 4, which appears on page 3 of that document, reference is made to the Joint Soviet-American agreement of 8 January 1985, in which the following objectives are set out:

"... to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability [with the ultimate aim of achieving the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere]."

(A/CN.10/1986/CRP.2, p. 3)

The last phrase of the sentence just quoted was taken verbatim from the final communiqué approved by the United States Secretary of State and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union on 8 January 1985 and published on 9 January 1985. That phrase, "with the ultimate aim of achieving the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere", still remains in parentheses less than one and a half years since January 1985 because one of these two delegations insisted on it. Hence it has been impossible to adopt Recommendation No. 4.

My delegation is not prepared to accept that Disarmament Commission documents should be used to erode prior agreements on aims and purposes that have already been approved in other forums of greater import than the Disarmament Commission. I say "greater import", not because that is the case with the joint communiqué, but rather because what I have just quoted appeared later in the New Delhi Declaration, in which six Heads of State or Government of countries from various continents have endorsed them.
The second point to which I wish to refer concerns a procedure which, in my delegation's view, would be most suitable when there exist difficulties that seem insoluble and result in wasting two or three days before a conclusion can be reached. There seemed to be such a difficulty this morning with regard to the question of naval arms. Thanks to your fertile imagination and constructive efforts, Mr. Chairman, it was possible to reach a solution on that matter. But I should like to repeat that my delegation considers that when a question of that nature arises it must be recalled that the Disarmament Commission is a subsidiary body of the General Assembly. That is why all the working papers submitted to Working Group II became official documents on request of members of the Commission that sponsored them. As you read out this morning, Mr. Chairman, they will form part of paragraph 5 of the report of Working Group II.

The second of those documents was submitted by Mexico, which I think it would be a very good idea to keep in mind at all times. I should like to read out the first three paragraphs of that document of which I have only the English text:

(spoke in English)

"The aim of strengthening the deliberative and negotiating functions of the relevant multilateral organs requires a review of the rules of procedure under which they work. In this regard, it is important to recall that the subsidiary organs of the General Assembly which are governed by the same rules of procedure should be able to discuss on an equal footing any subject that is brought to their attention by a General Assembly resolution."
"By paragraph 118 of the Final Document of the special session on disarmament, the General Assembly established the Disarmament Commission as a subsidiary organ 'to consider and make recommendations on various problems in the field of disarmament'. Subparagraph (b) reads as follows:

"The Disarmament Commission shall function under the rules of procedure relating to the committees of the General Assembly with such modifications as the Commission may deem necessary and shall make every effort to ensure that, in so far as possible, decisions on substantive issues be adopted by consensus.'"

(continued in Spanish)

That was the second point I wish to make.

The third and last point relates to document A/CN.10/1986/CRP.7/Rev.1 we approved this morning. Its title is: "Elaboration of guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level".

Mr. Chairman, I think you should feel quite satisfied by the fact that you have not only presided so skilfully over the Commission's proceedings in plenary meetings but also known how to conduct successfully proceedings in the Group on confidence-building measures. The adoption of this document concerning agenda item 9 will, I hope, make it possible next year for our Commission to have an agenda that will, at the very least, have one fewer item than this year's. In passing I should like to say that six items for a Commission that works for three weeks are really too many, in particular if one takes into consideration the number of delegations participating in the Commission's work.
A few moments ago I was curious enough to count them. There were 53 delegations present here, that is, one third of the total membership of the United Nations. We must also recall that, unfortunately, many of these delegations are composed of two members, and in some cases only one member. How can two members, let alone a single member, deal with six items?

If I could revert to what I was saying a few moments ago, thanks to the encouraging results achieved in that Group, next year there will be at least one fewer item, and I am not alarmed by the fact that in the second paragraph of the annex to the document it is stated that

"The text of the guidelines - as a draft - has been accepted by the Commission by consensus on all counts, except that alternative formulations are offered on two issues, on which it appeared that a further rapprochement of views could not be accomplished at this juncture." (A/CN.10/1986/CRP.7/Rev.1, p. 4)

In this connection I think that we should bear in mind the fact that the mandate for our work is resolution 39/63 E, in which the General Assembly "requests the Disarmament Commission, at its 1986 session, to continue and conclude its consideration of the item entitled ..." and

"4. Further requests the Disarmament Commission to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-first session a report containing such guidelines".

I think that it would be a very good idea for the General Assembly, when considering this item, to issue an appeal that agreement be reached on those two outstanding issues. I do not think that that is impossible at all. Hence we would then have concluded our consideration of the entire item.

Moreover, with regard to this item I shall conclude by saying that the fifth paragraph of the annex to that same document, reads as follows - and this is
something with which I entirely concur and which we should all bear very much in mind:

"In elaborating the guidelines, all delegations were aware, notwithstanding the high significance and role of confidence-building measures, of the primary importance of disarmament measures and the singular contribution only disarmament can make to the prevention of war, in particular nuclear war. Some delegations would have wished to see the criteria and characteristics of a regional approach to confidence-building measures spelt out in greater detail." (A/CN.10/1986/CRP.7/Rev.1, p. 4)

I think that that conclusion is something we must always bear in mind: "the primary importance of disarmament measures and the singular contribution that only disarmament can make to the prevention of war, in particular nuclear war".

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The Disarmament Commission is of course a deliberative body and its function is to consider and make recommendations in the field of disarmament and follow up the relevant decisions and recommendations of the special session devoted to disarmament.

An important aspect of the disarmament effort is that that effort should follow the Charter. We cannot ignore the Charter. The Charter speaks of the Security Council having an obligation to deal with the question of disarmament. This has been completely ignored, and disarmament is dealt with only by the Conference on Disarmament or the Disarmament Commission. But the Conference on Disarmament has to operate by consensus. So, in effect, does the Disarmament Commission. But the Charter says that the Security Council has to deal with disarmament. It does not mention any other body of the United Nations. It says the General Assembly may deal with the question of disarmament, but it places an obligation on the Security Council to deal with disarmament.
(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Now what is the difference? Why do I want the Security Council to deal with disarmament? Because the Security Council does not operate by consensus. It operates by vote, and there is, of course, the veto. The countries against disarmament efforts would have to veto draft resolutions to be adopted by the Security Council, in which case those major countries that opposed disarmament measures would be exposed by their use of the veto. Therefore, it would be very difficult to veto draft resolutions each time.
So why do we ignore the Charter, which says that the Security Council shall deal with disarmament, and that the General Assembly may also deal with it? We deal with it in the General Assembly and in this Commission and in the Conference on Disarmament, but not in the Security Council.

Cyprus submitted a draft resolution that was overwhelmingly adopted, by 138 votes, and the Secretary-General was called upon to report upon the implementation of that resolution. I have seen no report on the need for the Security Council to act on disarmament. I say this because I think it is very important to go to the roots of the problem. We come here and we discuss and discuss and discuss, and then we go away and come back again, and not one single weapon has been reduced. There has been no disarmament at all.

Another important aspect is that there cannot be disarmament without international security. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament clearly states that genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter. What has been done for international security? Nothing. Every effort is devoted directly to disarmament, ignoring the question of international security. I have said this before, I know, but I cannot stop saying it. If I did so, it would mean that I was satisfied it had been done, and it has not been done. I shall stop arguing this matter when it is done, when paragraph 13 of the Final Document is respected. That paragraph states clearly that genuine and lasting peace can come only through international security. If we want disarmament, therefore, we must have international security. We cannot get away from that. That is one of the important things I wanted to stress once more.

The other thing is that under Article 26 of the Charter the Security Council must deal with disarmament. I submitted a draft resolution that was overwhelmingly adopted, by 138 votes, but the Security Council did nothing. I submitted a second
draft resolution the following year mentioning that a resolution had already been adopted that required the Security Council to act, and again, nothing was done. As long as those things are not done, I do not think it is serves any purpose for me to go on discussing how the Disarmament Commission can help bring about disarmament when the essential elements are ignored and nothing is done about them, while in the Disarmament Commission we asked to decide to disarm.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: We are about to conclude our work. Our harvest has been brought in. We had to reap it after three weeks instead of four. By virtue of the decision taken by the General Assembly on 9 May this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission was curtailed by a full week, after we had already attempted voluntarily to shorten it to three and half weeks.

There was no question but that the Commission would abide by the ruling of the Assembly, attempting to squeeze the quest for comparable working results into a shorter working period. It is my impression, having observed much of the work that has been conducted, that the Commission has worked exceptionally well during this session. The working atmosphere was tense; there was an almost-unprecedented readiness to work in a hard and concentrated manner. I am impressed with the seriousness and responsibility of all delegations and with the sense of sacrifice that has prompted them to work, day in, day out, from early morning to late evening.

Our records show that this endeavour has borne fruit in the number and quality of working documents and in the elaborate and focused discussions that are now reflected in our records. It should also be noted that the atmosphere has been harmonious throughout. No polemics or unnecessary verbal harshness have marred the proceedings of the subsidiary bodies and consultations, but were limited to a few statements in plenary meetings.
(The Chairman)

For me as Chairman this is an occasion to express my gratitude to all delegations for their diligence and co-operation. In particular, I should highlight the heavy burden the officers of the Commission and chairmen of the various working organs have assumed. My gratitude, on behalf of all delegations, also goes to the members of the Secretariat, the interpreters, the translators and the technical staff.

The 1986 annual session of the Disarmament Commission has confirmed, as clearly as one would wish, that the formula adopted in 1978, when the terms of reference of the Commission were redefined, is a good one. The potential of the Commission in terms of its contributions to the disarmament process is immense. I tried to describe that potential in my opening statement. That potential has perhaps not been exhausted at the present session, but we have reached a degree of approximation which should fill all delegations with some limited satisfaction. I would note, in particular, our ability to preserve intact the rule of consensus and the beneficial effect that has ensued from the early commencement of the work process. The fact that the general exchange of views, with the co-operation of all delegations, was kept short and most working organs could initiate their work as of the third day of our proceedings gave the Commission a good start.

Many of the subsidiary bodies have worked up to the very last day, making good use of every single session assigned them. Yet, and in spite of the present financial predicament of the United Nations, the question could well be asked whether the Commission would, in future, not be better served if the full, normal working period of four weeks were to be restored so that the excellent spirit that had prevailed during the present session could prevail in future years, with enhanced results during a fourth week.

I would strongly suggest that, planning ahead for next year, all delegations soon examine the question of what the future length of the Commission's annual
meeting period should be. Thrift will surely be an overriding necessity for years to come, but the question could well be asked whether the necessary economies, instead of shortening the established duration of the Commission's substantive session, could not better be attained by appropriate arrangements in the spheres of documentation, interpretation services and the structuring of meetings.

At the present session there has been an overriding willingness to succeed with regard to many of the subjects at hand. Ambitions spur us on. It is rare that they are entirely fulfilled. In that sense, the deficiencies of our present session are obvious, and many delegations have alluded to them in their concluding statements. But there are also encouraging results to be noted.

I would have wished that the Contact Group on the overriding topic of nuclear and conventional disarmament would be able to agree on even more recommendations, especially recommendations of higher strategic relevance, allowing a carefully balanced packaged of recommendations to go forward to the General Assembly now. Still, the partial success, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Albornoz, has been encouraging and should prepare the Commission to do even better at its meetings next year.

In the area of naval armaments and the disarmament measures called for in that domain, a hopeful beginning has been made, with most delegations participating in a stimulating, meaningful exchange of views that has also given additional perspective to the comprehensive study on naval armament and disarmament the Secretary-General put before us. I would like at this juncture to pay a special tribute to Ambassador Alatas, who has conducted, in his by-now expected masterful manner, the consultations on the subject, under the responsibility of the Chairman of the Commission. We are all aware of the difficulties that have beset this work and the misgivings one major naval Power has had with regard to the subject, and I fully respect that delegation's substantive views and serious concerns. Yet we
should note that once it was agreed that work should start on the subject, it was fruitful and purposeful, however difficult the circumstances under which it was taken in hand and terminated.

Important groundwork has been laid and many decisions have been foreshadowed on agenda item 7, the review of the United Nations disarmament machinery. The Working Group established on the item had the benefit of Ambassador Engo's powerful and determined input as Chairman. In my view, the contribution that the work conducted under his guidance has made to the proceedings of the forthcoming third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament can hardly be overestimated. It is true that many of the very original ideas that have emerged from the Working Group still need further consultation. There is, however, a good prospect that the subject can be completed in a manner satisfactory to all at the next annual session.
(The Chairman)

I am particularly encouraged by the work of Working Group I, which has remained in skilful Romanian hands. The progress achieved on this difficult subject is undisputable. A few years ago - and I note that the subject has been on the agenda of the Commission for some considerable time - the degree of consensus on many of the key provisions of the principles for the reduction of military budgets, including the principles regulating verification, would not have been conceivable. All delegations should take these encouraging results to heart and feel the urge, in this area where disarmament philosophy is evolving quickly, also to take a more mature view of the important principles relating to military information and comparability of military budgets, logically intertwined with the acknowledged principle of verification. As a result of the Working Group's accomplishment, the agenda item has now largely been disposed of, and it will be returned to the Commission with this narrower focus only.

I am sure to meet with the understanding of all delegations if I state that, in my personal view, the results achieved by the Commission in the field of confidence-building measures have to be placed highest on our ledger of successes. The fact that the Commission has been able to agree on the draft guidelines for confidence-building measures does constitute an important breakthrough. For me personally, and for the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, for which I have handled the subject for several years, it is particularly encouraging that the groundwork on confidence-building measures that had been accomplished by a limited group of European countries is now acknowledged by the international community as a worthwhile and even indispensable contribution to the enhancement of security, globally and in the various world regions. The carpet the Commission has woven in this field has some seams that are still open, some knots still to be tied. I am confident that a positive momentum will issue from the work we have done. At its forty-first session the General Assembly should provide a further forceful impulse
towards the conclusion of work on the guidelines and towards the implementation of confidence-building measures in all regional contexts where they can be of use. In any case, the Commission has now accomplished its work on confidence-building measures entrusted to it by the General Assembly, and the item has thus been successfully removed from our agenda.

I have given a positive and hopeful tinge to all agenda items I have so far mentioned. It would be difficult to speak in the same spirit of optimism of the remaining item, agenda item 6, relating to the question of South Africa's nuclear capability. Let me be frank about it. I am disheartened about the way in which the subject has been treated during the current session. The Commission is indeed back to square one. No progress has been achieved. The Commission is stuck with a document that has been inherited from former sessions and has by now demonstrated that it is well-nigh non-negotiable. As Chairman, I suggested a new approach to the problem. Unfortunately, the helping hand I have attempted to stretch out has not been seized, and it is particularly disheartening that this rejection, in the last analysis, is not due to colleagues from the African Group, who must have a solution to the burning problems of South Africa most immediately at heart, but from delegations who defend interests of a different kind.

The failure of the Commission to move forward forcefully on this item harbours the risk that few will be encouraged to promote the concerns underlying this issue at the next annual session. At the very moment when the aggressive policies of South Africa have become manifest to an unprecedented extent, the Commission has lost a singular opportunity to consider agenda item 6 in a purposeful and determined manner. I have observed at this session that those who most frequently have the word "flexibility" on their lips display the least of it when it comes to actual negotiations on this item. Next year's deliberations on the issue will have to fight, in the first instance, against a wall of self-righteousness and supposed
moral superiority. I formulate the wish that a stronger determination to act, along with a firm commitment to policies of non-proliferation and renunciation of the military-nuclear option on the part of all, may govern our proceedings on the subject during the next session.

In conclusion, I would like to address to all representatives a word of a more personal nature. Having spent approximately five years in Geneva as the representative of my country to the Conference on Disarmament and in New York as a delegate to the various multilateral disarmament bodies, I will shortly be sent to a different, although related, post in the service of my country. This is an occasion to look back. I look back with gratitude and a sustained sense of dedication to the cause of disarmament. I believe in the potential of the multilateral disarmament process. It is destined to grow in importance. The time I have spent negotiating on behalf of my country in these bodies has been a particularly meaningful period in my life. I am grateful to all those who have given me their warm co-operation and comradeship. This session of the Disarmament Commission has given me another opportunity to experience it. I thank you all.

I declare the 1986 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission closed.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.