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The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (continued)

Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): Mr. Chairman, the Polish delegation is indeed pleased to see you in the Chair again. We are sure that under your able guidance the first substantive session of the Disarmament Commission will move forward the implementation of the tasks entrusted to it by the terms of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament.

We come to this session of the Commission aware of the complexity of the problems involved, conscious of the exultations and frustrations of disarmament efforts heretofore and also cognizant of the fact that the special session introduced a common denominator of greater realism to the international dialogue on disarmament, combining it as it did with a sense of the urgency of the need to arrive promptly at mutually acceptable international agreements.

Also, we bring to the Commission our own record of accomplishment in Poland's steadfast endeavours for the sake of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. As in the past, Poland will remain in the forefront of the disarmament struggle. In fact, as part and parcel of the over-all efforts of the States of the socialist community, disarmament and international security remain the guiding and inseparable components of the foreign policy of Poland.
Recent years have witnessed considerable expansion of disarmament forums, may they be deliberative or negotiating. It is no secret to anyone that the international community would certainly want to see their proliferation really matched by concrete effects of the discussions proceeding on different planes. For years now we have linked our great hopes with the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. They have been further raised by the task of exceptional magnitude assigned to it by the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which decided that

"... the Committee on Disarmament will undertake the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament encompassing all measures thought to be advisable in order to ensure that the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control becomes a reality." 

(Resolution 5-10/2, para. 109)

One could hardly think of a more important, far-reaching and, in fact, hope-inspiring objective to be accomplished by an international organ which takes its decisions - and rightly so - on the basis of consensus. We were glad to note that the agenda and programme of work adopted by the Committee last month did reflect the important mandate entrusted to it.

The role of this Commission in assisting, through the General Assembly, the work of the Committee on Disarmament can therefore be of great significance, particularly in considering the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament.

Hopeful as we remain with regard to meaningful progress in disarmament, we realize full well that our efforts, including the work of this Commission, are not suspended in an environment of a political or any other vacuum. Negotiating and achieving disarmament means facing hard realities in a world of complexities where at the same time progress in disarmament is the sine qua non condition of the vitality, consolidation and effectiveness of détente.

Based on a feedback relationship of political action, the interdependence between détente and disarmament derives from a historical necessity of making these two processes lastingly irreversible. An imperative like this
is dictated by the transcendent good of world peace, by the requirements of international security and unimpaired socio-economic progress of States, including the implementation of the New International Economic Order.

Political détente is the first and opening step to effective disarmament. We are aware of some shades of opinion in approaching the processes of détente as conditioners of global progress, notably in the fields of disarmament and development. Far from neglecting these views, the indisputable fact remains - reaffirmed as it was in the historic United Nations Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente - that there is

"... the need for all States, in the supreme interest of peace and the future of mankind, to continue their efforts towards further reduction of tension, the promotion of better relations among themselves and the strengthening and widening of détente ..." (General Assembly resolution 32/155)

It has been the objective law of contemporary international life that the crux of global détente rests upon the state of East-West relations - not because these two groups of States would enjoy any special rights, but rather because theirs is the responsibility for the priority of positive action. Also, United Nations experience of the last 30 years has shown that whenever East-West relations have been impeded by tensions, mistrust and prejudice, little meaningful progress could be expected in most areas of international endeavour, be it even in those which do not concern East or West directly. For those objective considerations, the same will be true of the developments in the years to come.

That, inter alia, is why Poland has welcomed as an important sign of political reason and statesmanship the announcement that the Soviet Union and the United States have reached basic agreement on the terms of the SALT II accord. The significance of this event can in no way be overestimated. Its consequences, we trust, will be beneficial both to the parties directly involved as well as to the world at large by injecting new force into the
processes of détente and affecting in a positive manner the course of disarmament discussions elsewhere. When signed and ratified, the new SALT treaty will mark a milestone in enhancing military détente, the main ingredient of the durability of its political counterpart.

Military détente is a multifaceted phenomenon. It is determined by such factors as political détente, specific measures aimed at the reduction and subsequent elimination of the instruments of warfare, as well as limitation of the chances of an outbreak of war. Consequently, it boils down to a series of parallel undertakings which, on the one hand, would lessen the importance of military potential as an instrument of foreign policy and, on the other hand, might reduce the role of military buildup as the main safeguard of the security of States by replacing it with non-military security guarantees.

It is through that framework of tangible actions that the States of the socialist community, including Poland, have always viewed general and complete disarmament and have advanced their own comprehensive programme for achieving it, the latest testimony of which has been the Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, adopted at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, held in Moscow last November, and reiterated and elaborated in a communiqué issued at the end of the meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of States members of the Warsaw Treaty in Budapest yesterday.
In fact, there has not been a single aspect of disarmament on which the socialist States would not submit their constructive proposals meant to lessen the chances of a military confrontation without diminishing the security of any State and pass on to effective disarmament. There is no type of weapon the stockpiles of which the socialist States would not be ready to reduce on the basis of equal security for all concerned. Never have the socialist States sought nor do they seek military superiority. Our defence effort is and will always be exclusively aimed at ensuring our defence capability.

Only the day before yesterday the Vienna talks were resumed on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe. Progress on their plane is also possible provided their Western participants are ready to meet half way the constructive proposals of the socialist States on the basis of full respect for the principle of undiminished security for all concerned.

Unless we manage to arrive soon at mutually binding agreements, historians and students of our times may have reason to wonder why, in the '70s of the twentieth century, a step was not put to the manufacture of nuclear weapons of all types and why their stockpiles were not gradually reduced until they were completely liquidated, why the use of nuclear weapons was not prohibited and the use of force not renounced by all; and why nuclear-weapon tests were not totally prohibited. They will keep asking questions concerning other proposals that are still pending - on the banning of the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction; on the elimination of chemical weapons; on the restriction of the sale and delivery of conventional weapons; on the reduction of armed forces and military budgets and on the adoption of important disarmament measures on a regional scale. They will also ask why the two military organizations - that of the Warsaw Treaty and that of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) - were not disbanded, despite repeated proposals to that effect from at least one of the parties directly concerned.

In the absence of positive replies to those questions, the world community cannot but conclude with regret that the main danger to peace and international security, to the relaxation of international tension and to the independence of peoples and their economic and social development is the continuation and build-up of the arms race and the increase in its rapidity and scale.

Therefore, as the General Assembly put it at its tenth special session:
"The ending of the arms race and the achievement of real disarmament are tasks of primary importance and urgency. To meet this historic challenge is in the political and economic interests of all the nations and peoples of the world as well as in the interests of ensuring their genuine security and peaceful future." (resolution S-10/2, para. 1)

Disarmament, both regional and global, in the nuclear as well as in the conventional field, applies directly to physical instruments for the conduct of war. Wars destroy peace, they jeopardize international security and they shatter trust among States. Plans for waging them and the methods of their conduct begin in the minds of men. The same is true of the origins of the arms race. To achieve disarmament and thereby to eliminate wars, one has to reach the minds of men with a lasting conviction of the irreversibility of peace.

Guided by that objective, Poland came out last year with a proposal for a United Nations declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace. As members of the Commission are aware, the Declaration was solemnly adopted by the General Assembly on 15 December last. Meant to create a moral, motivating and educational infrastructure of sound international relations and to help to condition anti-war attitudes, the document addresses itself also directly to the subject matter of our deliberations. Among its basic principles to guide the activities of States there is an unequivocal reaffirmation to the effect that a basic instrument of the maintenance of peace is the elimination of the threat inherent in the arms race, as well as efforts towards general and complete disarmament, under effective international control, including partial measures with that end in view, in accordance with the principles agreed upon within the United Nations and relevant international agreements.

For any comprehensive disarmament programme to be realistic and feasible, it cannot but proceed from the paramount consideration that all States, at all possible planes and levels, must embark upon an active implementation of the General Assembly Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. We welcome as a sign of the Declaration's lasting topicality the recent resolution on the right to peace adopted by the General Conference of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, held last month in Quito, Ecuador. The Polish delegation trusts that this Commission, too, will give due regard in its work to the important provisions of that Declaration.
Responding to the request contained in General Assembly resolution 33/91 A., the Government of Poland has recently submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations its views and suggestions on the comprehensive programme of disarmament. Their full text is available in document A/CN.10/1/Add.1. We are glad to note that our general framework for such a programme coincides with what the Committee on Disarmament decided on as its agenda and programme of work, adopted in Geneva on 11 April last. At this stage, we believe, the most important task in the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament is the adoption of the basic guidelines, along with a realistic plan for its implementation. At the same time, a programme like this has to take into account the main development trends in the world of today. One of them is the need for elimination of the sources of tension and international conflicts as well as the material preparations for the conduct of wars. That is actually what makes opposition to all forms of the arms race a particularly pressing task of our times. The central question, however, is how to attract through such a programme the main efforts of all Governments and peoples to eliminate the threat of a nuclear war by means of the effective limitation, gradual reduction and complete liquidation of all types and systems of nuclear weapons. That latter goal is to be served by the new proposal of the socialist States, submitted last February in the Committee on Disarmament, to start negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed.

The Government of Poland is equally committed to achieving progress in all other areas of disarmament, including in particular chemical weapons, all other weapons of mass destruction, conventional armaments, the reduction of military budgets and armed forces as well as a wide range of collateral measures. Indeed, specific agreements on all those important issues could be finalized at a world disarmament conference, the idea of which has not lost anything of its validity.

It is along those lines and in the spirit of constructive co-operation that the delegation of Poland intends to make its contribution to the work of the Disarmament Commission.
Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the Romanian delegation I should like to present certain ideas in connexion with the problems which are the subject of our present discussions here in the Disarmament Commission.

May I first of all, Mr. Chairman, express my delegation's approval concerning the guidelines you advocated for the proper progress of our work in accordance with the priority task assigned to the Commission by the General Assembly, namely, to consider the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

The time available to us to accomplish the mandate entrusted to this Commission is, undoubtedly, rather short in view of the importance and complexity of the agenda.

Aware as we are of your great skill and the organizing powers which you have displayed also on other occasions, the Romanian delegation is convinced that if our activities are well organized and if constructive efforts are made by all the participants, we shall be able to achieve fully the objective envisaged. Of course, the Romanian delegation would like the other problems on the agenda to be taken up also in the course of the realization in due time of the objective to which I have referred.

The suggestions and proposals made by the Romanian Government regarding the elements which go to make up a comprehensive disarmament programme were communicated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in a letter addressed to him which appears in document A/CN.10/1 of 29 March 1979.

What we should like to do now is to highlight some of the ideas which, as we see it, should guide this action, perhaps one of the most important undertaken in the history of the United Nations. The imperative need to consider a comprehensive disarmament programme as a fundamental prerequisite for the effective organization of efforts aimed at general and complete disarmament derives from the serious danger which the continual escalation of the arms race represents for the existence of mankind and from the lack of real progress towards disarmament.
In the opinion of the Romanian Government it is hardly possible to promote a genuine peace policy and to consolidate and develop international détente if a halt is not put to the arms race and if military troops and bases are maintained on the territories of other States, and if a vigorous process of disarmament, and primarily nuclear disarmament, is not begun. The adoption of resolute steps to put an end to these negative phenomena in international relations is an essential condition for ensuring the climate of trust necessary if the process of détente is to be continued and if relations among States are to be firmly based on the principles of independence and national sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, full equality of rights, the non-use of force or threat of the use of force and the right of each people freely to decide its own fate.

A hindsight evaluation of disarmament negotiations in the post-war period demonstrates that the measures to be taken have been tackled in a fragmentary and piecemeal fashion which has had a very negative impact on the results which were expected by the peoples. Even more serious is the fact that in the same period, and particularly in recent years, the armaments spiral, especially that of nuclear weapons, has been growing at an ever-greater rate. The treaties and the agreements which have been concluded in the disarmament field, despite their political importance, have not really affected the arms race nor led to its cessation or the reversal of its thrust. Furthermore, the idea of negotiating a treaty on general and complete disarmament was abandoned at the beginning of the last decade, which, to a large extent, contributed to the lack of real progress in this field.

As the Romanian Government sees it, the present situation as far as disarmament is concerned requires a better organization of disarmament efforts and negotiations, and the drawing up of a single, comprehensive programme of action which should reaffirm the political will of States to make progress towards disarmament and spell out the immediate and long-term objectives of disarmament and the most appropriate ways of bringing them about.

Undoubtedly, partial and collateral measures have their political significance, but in order to slow the arms race it is essential that these measures should be conceived as part and parcel of a broader programme in which the various measures
must be regarded as being directly interdependent so as to provide support each for the other and must be organically subjugated to the final goal.

If drawn up in this way the comprehensive disarmament programme should, as we see it, first, provide a unified conception of how to organize disarmament negotiations; secondly, advocate a system of disarmament steps which would be organically subordinate to the final goal - the bringing about of general disarmament, and primarily nuclear disarmament; and, thirdly, take into account all the aspects of disarmament. Thus the negotiating programme should incorporate and stimulate all efforts made by States to bring about disarmament both at the universal and regional levels, and on bilateral and unilateral lines. Negotiations should be so conceived that they can take place at a number of levels at the same time, so that the efforts thus being organized will interact on each other in order to help better to identify new disarmament measures. Also, all this action should be based on the premise that a lack of results in one field should not be a pretext for inactivity in other areas.

In the programme, nuclear disarmament problems should be given priority in view of the serious danger which nuclear weapons represent for mankind and the direct influence they have in accelerating the arms race in other areas.

Apart from measures which are aimed at the final goal - general and complete disarmament - the programme should also comprise intermediate steps in order to increase trust among States - both partial and collateral measures which, viewed in the context of other political measures, could lead to a general improvement in the international climate and also increase the security of all States.

As a plan of action which is part and parcel of a disarmament strategy, the programme should also comprise short-term and long-term objectives, and involve actions which would make it possible to open up broad prospects for disarmament negotiations. The yardstick should be essentially the extent to which each of these elements contributes to bringing the international community closer to the final goal of general and complete disarmament and, first and foremost, nuclear disarmament.
Of course, the programme which the Commission is called upon to consider should not be regarded as a static immutable plan. It should be a dynamic and flexible document, approved and given concrete form on the basis of developments in the field of disarmament taken in the context of the over-all international situation, on the basis of ideas and proposals put forward by States. It should provide assurances that disarmament negotiations will take place at a sufficiently brisk pace to overtake the process of technological developments in the military field and to ensure that the thorny problem of disarmament, like the question of the elimination of underdevelopment, is placed among the primary concerns of the international community.
In connexion with the security of States and peace and international co-operation, it is necessary in the adoption of the global disarmament programme for all States to be involved on an equal footing and for the same attention and receptiveness to be displayed regarding all positions, points of view and proposals made by other States.

In view of the particular roles and responsibilities incumbent upon the big Powers in international life, the fact that they possess the greatest number of troops and the largest arsenals and that theirs is the heaviest percentage in military expenditure, the disarmament measures to be incorporated in the programme should take into account the need for the disarmament process to start with precisely those States and should ensure that they are the ones that carry out the most substantial reductions of military and armaments budgets, both conventional and nuclear. In this connexion my country has emphasized the particular importance of the SALT II talks. It considers that the recent agreement of principle between the Soviet Union and the United States represents an important first step that will make possible new progress and encourage further efforts to reduce and bring about the effective cessation of the arms race in both nuclear and conventional weapons.

In the opinion of the Romanian delegation, the comprehensive disarmament programme must in the field of military disengagement and disarmament necessarily provide for steps that will help to build on the continent of Europe a lasting system of security and co-operation.

Specific measures for military disengagement and disarmament at the European level are particularly necessary if we are mindful of the fact that in that area there exist the largest possible military concentrations equipped with sophisticated weapons, including nuclear weapons, and that Europe is the arena in which the most powerful military blocs face each other. Among the suggestions and proposals of the Romanian Government there are also those for steps which Romania considers appropriate for the creation of an atmosphere of security and co-operation in Europe and for the consolidation of a climate of international détente.

We believe that if the measures advocated in the programme were carried out, that would provide a rational military equilibrium by the gradual lowering of the armaments ceiling and not by raising it, and that therefore a correlation of
forces would be established that would give no military advantages and would
guarantee respect for the principle of equal security for all parties during the
entire process of negotiations. At the same time, it would be necessary for the
measures incorporated in the programme to provide appropriate guarantees to ensure
that the agreed treaties and arrangements were respected.

In the view of the Romanian Government the comprehensive disarmament programme
should be based on the following principles:

The participation of all States in disarmament negotiations on a perfectly
equal footing as independent States, in accordance with the principle of sovereign
equality;

The freezing of military expenditures, of military manpower and armaments, to
be followed by a gradual reduction thereof;

Renunciation of the emplacement of new troops or new weapons on the territories
of other States, followed by the gradual reduction thereof and, eventually, the
total withdrawal of all foreign troops within the confines of their national
frontiers;

The initiation of the process of disarmament by the most heavily armed States;
Arrangements for appropriate monitoring of every step to provide a sure
guarantee that the obligations undertaken will be fulfilled by all parties;

Guarantees for equal security for all States at each stage of the disarmament
process, not by continuing with the arms race, which would have precisely the
opposite effect, but by ending and reversing that process;

The adoption of a number of political and legal measures to render more
effective the principle of the non-use of force or the threat of force in relations
among States;

The provision, through the United Nations, of broad information on the
situation prevailing in the armaments field;

The organic correlation of the process of disarmament with measures adopted at
the world level in order to bring about a New International Economic Order.

As was emphasized in the Romanian reply to the Secretary-General's letter, we
feel that, in the consideration of the global disarmament programme, the steps to
be taken should proceed from the simpler to the more complex. We must necessarily
bear in mind a set of measures that could immediately be applied, that would be
transitional, and that would lead to the gradual development of the process of
reducing the arms race and help to promote military disengagement and strengthen trust among States.

My Government considers that the elements of the comprehensive disarmament programme should be established bearing in mind the desirability of pursuing the following objectives, which are described in detail in the document to which I have referred: first, measures leading to disarmament and military disengagement that can be applied immediately; secondly, measures aimed at bringing about nuclear disarmament; and, thirdly, measures aimed at prohibiting weapons of mass destruction.

As we see it, the programme should start with the devising of steps that will ensure that the arms race is ended and that States, and primarily the most heavily armed ones, will cease allocating fresh funds to increase their military potential.

May I remind the Commission that, in the spirit of ideas that have been expressed by other States also, Romania has proposed the freezing of military budgets, troop levels and weapons in order subsequently to proceed to their gradual reduction, initially by 10 to 15 per cent. The Romanian Government considers that the adoption of such steps would have a very positive impact. It would make possible a more detailed consideration of the problems of disarmament and would create conditions in which it would be possible to bring about general disarmament, and it would strengthen international peace and security.

At the same time, Romania sees this as a problem that is closely interrelated with actions undertaken on a world scale to eliminate underdevelopment and also with the efforts that are being made to create a New International Economic Order.

In the message addressed to the fifth session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in Manila, the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Mr. Nicolae Ceausescu, proposed, inter alia, the reduction of the military expenditures of all States by 10 to 15 per cent, half of the funds thus released being channelled towards helping underdeveloped countries. Those funds should be provided as a matter of priority to those developing countries that have an annual income per capita of $500 to $600 and should be effectively used in order to carry out development programmes to aid the national economy. This assistance should first be granted to those countries which themselves devote at least 20 per cent of their national incomes to their own development and which do not spend more than 4 or 5 per cent of their national revenues on arms. Of course, the message went on to
emphasize that that implied that nations must give up the use of force and the threat of force in international life. It also implied the provision of firm guarantees, including, in the context of the United Nations, guarantees to the effect that those countries that are devoting their efforts to economic and social development and that refrain from increasing their military expenditures will not subsequently fall victims to any foreign aggression or interference and that their sovereignty and national independence will be strictly respected.
Strong action in the field of disarmament cannot be regarded in isolation from a desire to improve world political relations, to strengthen trust among States and to consolidate international détente.

Trust like mistrust, feeds itself. While the intensification of the arms race is generated by mistrust, and while it in turn increases mistrust, disarmament measures are, on the contrary, greatly stimulated by a climate of trust and stability on the international scene. It is necessary that the actions undertaken in the field of disarmament be accompanied by actions aimed at strengthening the capability of the United Nations to facilitate, through appropriate international machinery and instruments, the settlement by purely political means, through negotiations between the parties concerned, disputes which arise in relations among States. In this connexion I should like to recall that Romania has proposed the conclusion of an international treaty under which all States would pledge to resolve any dispute by peaceful means. We also consider that the United Nations should assume increased responsibility in efforts aimed at preventing conflicts among States by creating for this purpose a permanent body which would help countries to solve disputes by means of negotiations.

As I said, in order to arrive at lasting, equitable and generally acceptable solutions, it is absolutely essential for all States to be involved in settling the problems of disarmament on a footing of complete equality.

Every people is entitled to peace and security, and this fully justifies the right of all States to participate in efforts made by mankind to resolve the burning problems of disarmament.

In our opinion, the United Nations, because of its universality, provides the most appropriate framework to this end. It is essential for the United Nations to be more actively and effectively involved in the promotion and meaningful implementation of disarmament measures through the study of those measures, the formulation of recommendations and the identification of solutions which will lead to concrete achievements, and also through the co-ordination and mobilization of the general efforts being made in the field of disarmament.
In the light of these considerations of principle, the Romanian delegation will be fully prepared to participate actively and constructively in the efforts of the Disarmament Commission successfully to discharge the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

Mr. FRANCIS (New Zealand): New Zealand welcomes the opportunity provided by the first substantive session of the Disarmament Commission to discuss the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The special session on disarmament last year achieved a great deal in drawing up a specific programme of action. There was no time, however, on that occasion for a reflective discussion of the constituent elements of a comprehensive programme. We now have that opportunity, and it is certainly my delegation's hope that we shall use it well. I know that we shall, Mr. Chairman, under your skilled and far-sighted leadership.

My delegation does not believe that we must necessarily complete our work on agenda item 3 at this session; nor do we think that we have to discuss every aspect exhaustively. We do not think it desirable to go into a great amount of detail on the elements of a comprehensive programme at this stage. What we should do is draw up a framework of headings comprising the major areas of disarmament activities and endeavour within these fields to identify the specific objectives towards which a disarmament programme should aim. Some ordering of these objectives in terms of their priority would clearly be of great value. It would give realism and rationality to the programme and provide a guide on the Commission's thinking for the Committee on Disarmament to bear in mind when it comes to elaborate a comprehensive programme as agreed by the special session.

If we can agree on a framework of headings, on the identification of specific objectives within particular fields and on some ordering of these objectives according to priority, the Commission will have achieved a very useful outline of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. At later sessions it can supplement this outline if necessary. Beyond that, however, we see a very useful role for the Commission at future sessions in taking particular
elements of the comprehensive programme and subjecting them to detailed examination and discussion. In this way we can identify new approaches which may help to move disarmament objectives forward.

I should now like to turn to some of the headings and specific objectives which my delegation would wish to see included as elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We are, of course, proposing specific language here; it is the task of the working group to find language to which consensus agreement can be given by the Commission in due course.

To devise an agreed list of general headings will probably cause no great difficulty. A comprehensive programme needs to embrace disarmament and arms control measures in the fields of: first, nuclear armaments; secondly, other weapons of mass destruction; and, thirdly, conventional weapons. Then there is a need for a heading under which other measures would fall, including confidence-building, the reduction of military budgets, the role of the United Nations, studies of various aspects of disarmament, and so on. An indication of the kind of framework of headings which we have in mind can be found, for example, in the very thoughtful reply of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, in document A/CH.10/I. In addition to the substantive headings there needs to be an introduction in which the goal of the comprehensive programme is set out, and a section devoted to the principles of and mechanisms for disarmament negotiations.

That such a framework of headings will parallel rather closely the format of Sections II to IV of the Final Document of the special session is not surprising. We are, after all, only at the beginning of the long road towards the negotiation of real disarmament measures which will have a substantial and cumulative effect on the arms race and on the huge expenditure on armaments that we witness today. There is, as yet, nothing that was the focus of attention at the special session that we can drop from our list and say: "That has been achieved." We are, a year later, talking about the same things, though we are doing it in the context of that broader vision which the special session was able to achieve. I should, however, make one exception, for, although it has yet to be signed, a SALT II agreement has been concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union. My Government welcomes that achievement as an important step towards limiting the arms race.
I do not at this stage wish to go into listing priorities within the various framework headings. That can best be left for the working group's examination of this agenda item. I would merely take an example or two to illustrate the importance which New Zealand places on the setting of priorities. We do not deny that a linkage between two or more different disarmament objectives is sometimes necessary - indeed, sometimes the linkage itself is a priority - but we need to be aware that insistence on simultaneous progress in two or more areas may sometimes serve only to prevent or delay progress in either.

In the nuclear disarmament field, it seems to my delegation self-evident that for there to be real progress in halting vertical, and preventing horizontal, proliferation of nuclear weapons there must be an effective comprehensive test ban treaty. We regard that as the highest priority. Continued efforts to strengthen and widen the present non-proliferation régime, both through the Non-Proliferation Treaty and through other means, comes a close second.
To take another example, it also seems to us self-evident that it is unrealistic to expect that measures to control and eliminate the conventional arms race can be taken by recipient countries without watching self-restraint and responsibility on the part of supplier countries. Priority should therefore be given to agreements between supplier and recipient States rather than to calls for unilateral action on the part of the latter group only.

I know the time is short and I have therefore deliberately avoided a detailed presentation of our position. In any case, it is our feeling that the work of this session will be better served if we keep the larger view and the need for general outlines before us and avoid the temptation to enter into too much detail at this stage. Otherwise I fear we shall miss seeing the forest for the trees.

The CHAIRMAN: I appeal to representatives, first, to try and assemble here so that we can commence our work punctually at 10.30 a.m. and 3 p.m. tomorrow and the day after; and, secondly, perhaps if three or four of the representatives listed to speak on Friday could find it possible to speak tomorrow that would, I believe, help us in completing the exchange of views, as we had decided, by Friday evening. I am a little concerned about the very large number of speakers listed for Friday.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.