

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



UNITED NATIONS  
CENTRE FOR DISARMAMENT  
DEPARTMENT OF  
POLITICAL AND SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS  
Reference Library  
Distr.  
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.17  
21 May 1979

ENGLISH

---

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 18 May 1979, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. VELLODI

(India)

- General exchange of views (continued)

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (continued)

Mr. DOLGUCHITS (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, may I on behalf of the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic express my satisfaction on your being elected to the responsible post of Chairman of the Commission and wish you every success in performing the tasks which are entrusted to the Commission. Of course, we share your view that in order to consider the various elements which go to make up a comprehensive programme of disarmament, the Commission has an excellent foundation: first of all we have the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, devoted to disarmament, and then also other relevant documentation including, in particular, document A/CN.10/1 and its addendum. That document contains the reply of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to the questionnaire of the Secretary-General of the United Nations dated 16 January 1979. These documents, and the very useful exchange of opinions which we are having now, will make it possible for the Commission to present to the General Assembly some useful recommendations on the component parts of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, our delegation also shares your view that, if I may quote you

"... the initiation and development of confidence-building measures and the link between disarmament and development must find a legitimate and prominent place in the comprehensive programme of disarmament."

(A/CN.10/PV.10, pp. 4-5)

Mankind has entered the thirty-fifth year of the period that separates us from the Second World War and the present day. We must never forget the cost at which we won peace on our planet. In the Soviet Union alone, 20 million perished, every fourth person in the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic. We have all witnessed the constant struggle of peace-loving forces to solve urgent problems which are of tremendous significance for all of mankind; to turn from the confrontation of the cold war, which was fraught with the threat of a thermo-nuclear catastrophe, to the constructing of normal relations between

(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

States with differing social systems. Through that activity détente these days has become a reality.

The norms of peaceful co-existence among States with differing social systems have become more firmly entrenched in international affairs as representing the only reasonable way of proceeding. In conditions of political détente, which has now become the principal trend in contemporary international relations, we cannot but be alarmed by the fact that the arms race continues to increase. There has been a growth in military preparations and the further sophistication of the means of waging war. The negative effects of the arms race are felt today in all fields of international relations. They have a profound impact on the development of peoples and States. They do not serve to consolidate international security: on the contrary, they tend to weaken it.

The arms race runs counter to the aims and tasks which the international community has set itself in order to establish a new international economic order. For example, as was pointed out at the fifth session of UNCTAD now being held in Manila, in the last two decades alone mankind has spent \$5.5 trillion on the arms race.

The meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, which has already been referred to by other speakers and which was held in Moscow in November last year, carried out a fair analysis of the situation in the world and clearly pointed out what specific steps should be taken under present conditions in order to consolidate détente. The Declaration which was adopted at that meeting once again strongly stressed the desire of the socialist States for durable peace, broad international co-operation, disarmament and military détente. The Declaration went on to emphasize the resolve of the States belonging to the socialist community to give a fresh impetus to the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act as a single whole and to seek agreement on concrete ways and means to develop co-operation in order to achieve genuine security on the European continent and throughout the world.

(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

The new Soviet proposals which were put forward in a statement made by Mr. Brezhnev on 2 March have been greatly appreciated throughout the world, particularly in connexion with the expansion of the existing practices of notification regarding military manoeuvres and the conclusion of a treaty among the participants at the European meeting on not being the first to use nuclear weapons and conventional weapons against each other. That the arms race should be ended is an essential point in the programme for the further struggle for peace and international co-operation and for the freedom and independence of peoples which was adopted by the twenty-fifth session of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, which firmly support the initiative taken on questions of disarmament, have put forward a broad set of proposals which embrace all aspects of this problem. Their common foundation is that all the parties should be equal, that all should refrain from making any attempt to derive unilateral benefits to the jeopardy of the others and that equal security should be assured for all.

However, turning to the need to strengthen trust among States which undoubtedly - at least as we see it - is intimately linked to the question of disarmament, we cannot fail to refer to those who oppose détente and disarmament and those who propagate the ideas of the cold war, an increase in international tension, and the arms race which threatens to bring the world to the brink of nuclear catastrophe. Of particular danger in this connexion is the policy pursued by the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bloc to further exacerbate the arms race and all forms of armament. That development of events is further complicated by the fact that the Chinese leadership recently has increasingly taken on the role of an ally of NATO.

At the meeting of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty which was held on 14 and 15 May in Budapest, discussion was once again devoted to the ways and means of ensuring genuine progress in solving the fundamental issues of the present day and, first and foremost, the problem of putting an end to the arms race, to disarmament, to the elimination of military conflicts and sources of tension and to the further

(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

expansion of the process of international détente. Countries which were present at that meeting expressed their readiness even now to proceed to discuss and to agree on practical measures which would help to strengthen trust among States in Europe and which would help to reduce military confrontation and would gradually reduce the concentration and maintenance of armed forces and armaments on that continent. They proposed, to that end, that a conference be convened at a political level with the participation of all European countries, and including also the United States and Canada.

On the agenda of the Commission, item 4 is the "Consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, in order to expedite negotiations aimed at effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war". The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that together with such urgent subjects as concluding an international treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, among the main elements which would go to make up a comprehensive disarmament programme, the main attention of the Commission should be focused on devising genuine steps first and foremost to bring about nuclear disarmament. They might include, for example, the measures put forward by the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty which were published in communiqué dated 16 May 1979 which, inter alia, mentions:

"Expressing the fundamental position of their States on the need to put an end to the arms race and decisively to proceed to undertake genuine disarmament measures, particularly nuclear disarmament, the Ministers unanimously favoured the multiplication of efforts in order to achieve, as speedily as possible, practical agreement on the following points: the conclusion and bringing into force of a new Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of strategic weapons and moving on to the next stage in the talks on reducing them; a time-table and procedures for holding talks on putting an end to the manufacture of nuclear weapons in all forms and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of them until they are completely eliminated; the prohibition in

(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

perpetuity of the use of nuclear weapons; and, at the same time, having all States refrain from the use of force or the threat of the use of force against each other; the conclusion of a treaty on a general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests; steps to strengthen the guarantees of the security of non-nuclear States, including States refraining from using nuclear weapons against States which do not possess such weapons and which do not have them on their territories; and also the commitment not to site nuclear weapons on the territories of States where they do not at present exist."

(Mr. Dolguchits, Byelorussian SSR)

Those who participated in the meeting in Budapest once again emphasized that the countries of the socialist community genuinely favoured the reduction of the military expenditures of States possessing the largest economic and military potential. They asked that we immediately proceed to talks on specific measures to bring about such reductions as a first step within the next three years or any other initial period that would be acceptable to all.

The States parties to the Warsaw Pact are against increases in troop levels and armaments on the territories of other States. They are in favour of the conclusion of agreements to reduce armed forces and armaments, and they favour new efforts in the international arena for the elimination of military bases on the territories of other States, the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other States and the creation of non-nuclear zones and zones of peace in various parts of the world, including Europe. They also wish to recall their readiness to dissolve the Warsaw Pact organization at the same time as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is dissolved. As a first step, they would include the elimination of their military organizations, starting with a joint scaling down of military activity.

We believe that it is of particular significance to reach agreement on steps to prohibit new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction. Of course, a simple prohibition of new varieties of weapons of mass destruction as they appear is not sufficient. That would not guarantee an end to the race for more sophisticated weaponry and the expenditure for that purpose of tremendous material and intellectual resources, which leads to further distrust among States.

Together with the other socialist countries, the Byelorussian SSR attaches great importance to the speedy completion of the talks on the prohibition of the invention, production and accumulation of stockpiles of chemical weapons and the destruction of those stockpiles. A definite step in the ending of the arms race and the bringing about of disarmament would, we believe, be taken if this problem were considered at the broadest and most authoritative forum, a world conference on disarmament. The necessary steps should be taken for its speedy convening.

As is known from the experience gained in the struggle for disarmament, there are no such proposals that the countries of the socialist community would not be prepared to support. Naturally, there can be no question of unilateral steps that would lead to an even greater danger to peace.

The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, Mr. Brezhnev, has emphasized that

"the essence of our position on questions of disarmament can in brief be summarized as follows. There is no form of armament which the Soviet Union would not be prepared to limit, to prohibit on a mutual basis, in agreement with other States. It is important only that everything be done without in any way jeopardizing anybody's security, in conditions of complete reciprocity among States possessing the weapons concerned."

In conclusion I should like to point out that the achievement of a durable peace and the strengthening of international détente is possible only if effective steps are taken towards disarmament. In this connexion we should like to express the hope that the United Nations Commission on Disarmament will in the next few years be able to make a positive contribution towards restricting arms and bringing about disarmament.

Mr. DASHTSEREN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, it is particularly gratifying to me that the work of the present session of the Commission is proceeding under the guidance of someone of your calibre and the representative of a friendly country in which I had the honour of representing my Government and people.

The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic attaches great importance to the whole question of ending the arms race and bringing about disarmament since that is an essential prerequisite if we are to preserve and strengthen peace and international security, bring about détente in international affairs and ensure economic and social progress for the peoples.

The problem of how to put an end to the arms race and bring about disarmament is now becoming much more concrete in view of the new and even more destructive means of waging war that have appeared and the continuous efforts of aggressive forces to step up tension in international affairs.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

Given the ever growing arms race, the socialist countries and other peace-loving States desire to reach a radical stage in the ending of the arms race and to take genuine steps to bring about disarmament. That desire has been reflected in the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations devoted to disarmament and also in the results of the work of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly.

I should like to emphasize that the socialist countries are making tremendous efforts to achieve genuine disarmament, and they have actively and consistently favoured that end by putting forward concrete proposals. In this connexion I should like to refer to the Moscow Declaration of the States parties to the Warsaw Pact adopted at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of that organization in November 1978 and also the document that was submitted by the Soviet Union at the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. They contain constructive proposals envisaging genuine and specific steps the implementation of which would help to further the process of putting an end to the arms race and create the necessary conditions for a transition to genuine disarmament.

The Mongolian People's Republic fully supported those proposals, since we regarded them as a far-reaching programme of international activities designed to put an end to the arms race, bring about disarmament and further developing and extend the process of détente.

The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic attaches great importance to the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission because its essential purpose is to promote the finding of a solution to the most urgent task of the present time, the question of disarmament. The special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament vested in the Commission a very important deliberative role and gave it a specific mandate - namely, to consider the components of a comprehensive disarmament programme.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

It has been proposed that the Commission should present its recommendations to the General Assembly and, through it, to the Committee on Disarmament. The Commission has now convened for its first session to discuss substantive questions, in order faithfully to perform its mandate.

With reference to the question of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, my delegation has frequently had occasion to expound its views on this matter, both at sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations and at meetings of the Committee on Disarmament. In the opinion of our delegation, this work should in the final analysis be aimed at achieving the fundamental purpose, that is, general and complete disarmament under effective international control. At the same time, it should be mindful of the main trends in the development of the present world and also envisage specific and realistic steps to put an end to the arms race and bring about disarmament.

A comprehensive programme of disarmament must necessarily be based on the principle of not jeopardizing the interests of any party to such an agreement and refraining from any attempt to gain unilateral advantages.

It is our assumption that in disarmament efforts we should involve all States, particularly all nuclear States and those States possessing considerable military potential.

The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that involving all States in existing international agreements in the disarmament field should be part and parcel of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

It is our belief that this programme might include, inter alia, the following elements:

Firstly, steps to put an end to the nuclear arms race and bring about nuclear disarmament. In conditions where the nuclear factor has become paramount in the military realities of the present day, steps to bring about nuclear disarmament are of prime importance. Nuclear disarmament means that particular responsibility is borne by those States that possess nuclear weapons themselves. This means that they will have to display the necessary political will in helping to solve this urgent task.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

In this connexion the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic welcomes the positive results of the Soviet-American talks on the limitation of strategic weapons. The forthcoming conclusion of a second treaty in the SALT round will undoubtedly help to create a favourable atmosphere for achieving concrete results at other talks as well on the subject of disarmament.

In order to further the cause of nuclear disarmament, the Mongolian People's Republic, together with a number of brother socialist countries, put forward for consideration by the Committee on Disarmament at the beginning of this year a working document on "Negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed". (CD/4)

The Mongolian delegation considers that steps to strengthen guarantees for the security of non-nuclear States and the non-location of nuclear weapons on the territory of States which have refused to manufacture and to acquire such weapons and do not have them on their territory and the complete prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests, further strengthening the non-proliferation régime of nuclear weapons and the creation of nuclear-free zones, will to a large extent help further to promote the cause of putting an end to the nuclear arms race and bringing about nuclear disarmament. We also believe that the necessary steps should be taken to prohibit nuclear neutron weapons.

Secondly, a comprehensive programme should include steps to prohibit the creation of new forms and systems of weapons of mass destruction. The delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic believes that all the achievements in the scientific and technological revolution should serve the interests of mankind and not serve to annihilate it.

Thirdly, steps to prohibit chemical weapons. The Mongolian People's Republic has constantly favoured the speedy conclusion of a relevant international agreement which would prohibit and eliminate chemical weapons. Radiological weapons should also be outlawed.

Fourthly, a comprehensive programme of disarmament should include steps to reduce conventional weapons and armed forces. The implementation of practical steps in this area is dictated both by the tremendous destructive

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

force of conventional weapons at the present time and the fact that the accumulation and acquisition of conventional armed forces represents a very heavy burden on the economy of States. The reduction of military expenditures and the liberation of tremendous funds and material resources would make it possible for States throughout the world to channel those additional funds directly to meeting the needs of speeding up social and economic development.

Furthermore, the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the solution of the basic problems of disarmament can be achieved only if resolute efforts are made and constructive participation is provided by all States throughout the world. Therefore, we favour the convening of a world disarmament conference. Such a conference, if it were to involve the participation of all States at a very high level, might become precisely the right forum which could concern itself with elaborating practical and effective steps in the field of disarmament. In order to implement the provisions of the Final Document of the special session on the convening of a world disarmament conference, the necessary organizational and preparatory steps will have to be taken.

We also agree with the view expressed to the effect that conceiving and implementing disarmament steps, particularly in the field of nuclear disarmament, would require concomitant steps to be taken by way of strengthening political and international legal guarantees among States. This would be greatly helped by the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. The conclusion of a legally binding and universal treaty enshrining and spelling out the principle of non-use of force in international relations is of great significance also in that it would help to strengthen trust among States.

The Mongolian People's Republic has constantly favoured strict compliance with the principle of the non-use of force or the threat of force in relations among States and has always believed that all disputes should be solved exclusively by peaceful means, by means of negotiation. It is precisely for that reason that we categorically condemned the recent aggression against the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, which was perpetrated by a major State which has always on every occasion given the assurance that it would never turn its weapons against other States.

(Mr. Dashtseren, Mongolia)

The alliance of that State with the most reactionary and aggressive circles of imperialism and the feverish pace which the arms race has taken on, together with the pursuit by a large State of a hegemonistic and adventuristic policy in the international arena, represent a serious danger for peace and security not only in Asia but throughout the world.

In conclusion, the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic would like to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that it is ready to co-operate with members of the Commission in helping to perform the mandate which has been given to this body.

Mr. MULLOY (Ireland): This first substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, operating under the new mandate given to it by the General Assembly at its special session on disarmament, provides a country like Ireland with a welcome opportunity to contribute some ideas for the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We are fortunate that our proceedings are guided by the enlightened chairmanship of a distinguished son of India who combines the national commitment to disarmament of a major Asian nation with the personal commitment to the United Nations of a former United Nations servant of many years' standing.

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

Ireland associates itself with the statement made on 16 May by the representative of France, speaking on behalf of the nine member countries of the European Communities, in which he set out our ideas on the political preconditions for progress on disarmament negotiations. Ireland agrees that comprehensive disarmament will only be possible when alternatives to a recourse to arms have gained widespread acceptance. But the search for a universally acceptable political framework should not delay the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of positive measures of disarmament. Indeed, in these matters the better must not always be the enemy of the good. While retaining the long-term aim of complete disarmament under effective control, we should welcome more limited disarmament measures. If, pending such steps towards real disarmament, the larger Powers can agree among themselves on arms control measures to limit the development of new weapons, we should also welcome that too, while pressing for further steps. When we come to deal with these problems, the steps open to leaders of Governments will differ according to the size and importance of their countries, military and alliance commitments and the armaments already possessed.

The Final Document of the United Nations special session devoted to disarmament recognized that the goal of general and complete disarmament could be achieved through the implementation of a programme of action on disarmament which contained priorities and measures in the field of disarmament which States were to undertake as a matter of urgency with a view to halting and reversing the arms race. Progress since July 1978 in implementing that Programme has not been significant, with the exception of progress in relation to SALT II. For that reason, Ireland is pleased to see an early prospect of the signing of a second strategic arms limitation treaty. We welcome the fact that after seven years of complex negotiations the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have agreed in principle on a SALT II treaty. Those negotiations have an essential role in the détente process and augur well for future negotiations which we hope will lead to a substantial reduction of both strategic and tactical nuclear weapons. The following seven elements are proposed by Ireland for inclusion in the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

The first concerns nuclear disarmament. The nuclear Powers have a special responsibility because it is the weapons they have developed and now deploy that most seriously threaten humanity. We believe therefore that there is a special responsibility incumbent on the nuclear Powers to negotiate agreements among them which will control and lessen the dangers which those weapons pose. We also recognize the need for an immediate moratorium on all forms of nuclear testing, accompanied by steps leading to the negotiation and ratification of a comprehensive test ban treaty. It has been a source of considerable disappointment to us in Ireland that a comprehensive test ban treaty has not yet been agreed on and that the three negotiating States have not yet submitted a draft treaty to the Committee on Disarmament.

The second element relates to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The rest of the world which has not yet developed or acquired nuclear arms has its responsibilities too. Many of us have voluntarily renounced any right to acquire nuclear weapons under the terms of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons which was first proposed in a draft resolution by Ireland in 1958. The Treaty now needs to be further strengthened and also accepted and ratified by all those States which have not yet acquired nuclear weapons. Likewise, the safeguards programme of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) must be reinforced and strengthened.

The third deals with guarantees to non-nuclear Powers. If we voluntarily give up our right to acquire nuclear weapons we are, of course, according a position of privilege to the major Powers which already have those weapons. We recognize that as a reality, and we accepted it voluntarily under the Non-Proliferation Treaty, because the alternative is a world where nuclear weapons gradually spread and the danger of disaster increases dramatically. But we are entitled in return to make certain demands of the Powers which now have nuclear weapons. We can require of them that there be an adequate system of guarantees to assure those States which have renounced nuclear weapons for ever that nuclear weapons will not be used by others to attack or threaten them. We note that statements were made in this connexion during the special session on disarmament by China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. Nevertheless,

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

we are entitled to demand that the effort to stop nuclear weapons from spreading widely should be matched by an equal effort by the nuclear Powers themselves to stop the constant increase in the quantity and the destructive power of the weapons they hold.

The fourth element concerns chemical, environmental and mass destruction weapons. Nuclear weapons are of course the greatest danger, since it is those weapons that have the greatest destructive power. But there are other weapons of mass destruction, such as chemical weapons or weapons which modify the environment, now within the capacity of great Powers. We need action now to halt the development and deployment of these weapons - matters which are the responsibility in the first instance of the Powers which have the capacity to build such weapons.

The fifth deals with international arms transfers. There has in recent years been a steady and dangerous growth in the spread of conventional weapons in every part of the world. This is something which involves great and small, rich and poor alike. Today in many cases arms sales abroad are encouraged, since greater sales reduce the unit cost of weapons required for defence purposes by the country which manufactures them. But the consequence all too often is a diversion of resources which might otherwise be used for development. There must be positive efforts to control and limit conventional arms sales and diminish the burden of such purchases on the economies of poor countries.

The sixth deals with the reduction of military budgets. Ireland has in the past associated itself with efforts to advance studies within the United Nations to promote the reduction of military budgets. Clearly much remains to be achieved in this area, and there may be difficulties in arriving at agreed international definitions as to what may or may not constitute valid military expenditure in a specific country. Without prejudice to the outcome of existing studies in this area, Ireland feels that significant progress in disarmament could be achieved if countries studied the possibility of establishing a system of targets and incentives to promote and encourage progress in arms control and disarmament and, in particular, the possibility of proposing for

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

general adoption a voluntary ceiling - or ceilings - on national defence expenditures, expressed as a proportion of gross national or domestic product, which States would be encouraged to observe.

Ireland's ideas on this issue were presented at the special session on disarmament and were referred to in paragraph 125 of the Final Document of that session as one of a number of proposals which deserve to be studied "further and more thoroughly" in the Committee on Disarmament and in this Commission. It is noted that the Irish proposal is among those formally transmitted to the Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission by the Secretary-General in his letter of 1 February 1979, issued as document A/CN.10/3 of 11 May 1979.

(Mr. Mulloy, Ireland)

The seventh concerns greater international security within the framework of the United Nations Charter. Above all, progress in this area requires an increased commitment on the part of Member States to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and a willingness on the part of Member States to be guided positively and negatively by the implications of such a commitment. This commitment needs to find expression in concrete actions. The continued reiteration of positions of principle in this and other United Nations forums serves a useful purpose, but this is a limited purpose and the time may soon be approaching when its actual effect may prove to be negative. The peoples of the world expect the promise of the United Nations special session devoted to disarmament to be carried into effect. This newly created forum - the United Nations Disarmament Commission - is one of the few visible results of that session. If we fail to show that its creation has been worth while, then public confidence in the ability of the United Nations to lead us to a safer world will surely falter.

Mr. LIE (Norway): First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me express the gratitude of my delegation for your skilled and experienced leadership, which we are certain will greatly facilitate the successful outcome of this first substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

We are in agreement with the suggestion that the Commission initiate work on the comprehensive programme as soon as possible and that our initial exchange of views be confined as far as possible to item 3 of our agenda - the consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

According to paragraph 118 (a) of the Final Document of the special session, the task before us as a deliberative body is to consider the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament to be submitted as recommendations to the General Assembly and, through it, to the negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament, whose task it is to elaborate the comprehensive programme as such.

Since Norway is not among the members of the Committee on Disarmament, we welcome this opportunity to express our views on the elements of the programme.

We have presented a working paper on this subject that has been circulated. Let me therefore just briefly present our views on the nature and scope of a comprehensive programme. To a great degree, we have had the

Final Document of the special session as reference. Much effort has gone into this important consensus document, which should guide us in our work for a long time to come.

From the discussions at the special session there emerged the urgent need for a programme based on new approaches to curbing the arms race, which to an increasing extent is technological and qualitative in character. This trend introduces uncertainty and unpredictability into the relations among nations.

Keeping in mind the need for balanced measures, giving undue advantages to none, we should instead strive to gradually achieve increased security at a lower level of armaments.

The international arms competition in its qualitative as well as its quantitative aspects represents not only a threat to the security of mankind but a deplorable misuse of resources in a world marked by poverty and distress. Disarmament efforts should, in our view, therefore also be undertaken with the aim of contributing to the establishment of the New International Economic Order by reallocating scarce human and material resources from military purposes to social and economic development, particularly for the benefit of the developing nations.

There is a need for a unified and balanced approach combining measures of quantitative limitation and reduction with simultaneous efforts to curb the qualitative aspects of armaments development. Ways must be found to prevent technological development from circumventing efforts to bring the arms race under control through a truly comprehensive approach in the sense that it should embrace the whole life cycle of weaponry from genesis to actual deployment.

The idea of restricting the arms race in its genesis was reflected in the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament by a recommendation that States should assess the possible implications of their military research and development for existing agreements. This demonstrated the acceptance of this approach to arms control. My Government has proposed as a further step that countries adopt a procedure whereby major new weapons and military programmes are made the subject of analysis as to their impact on arms control efforts.

A comprehensive disarmament programme should also strive to involve all nations, whether within a global, regional or bilateral framework.

(Mr. Lie, Norway)

It is furthermore necessary to include in our programme factors such as verification, security arrangements and confidence-building measures.

Let me offer a few remarks on some of the elements of the comprehensive programme to which my Government attaches particular importance.

The first major general heading would be nuclear weapons.

One of the lessons learnt from our discussions at the special session was the need to re-emphasize the shared responsibility of nuclear and non-nuclear-weapon States for halting further nuclear proliferation, a development that we see as the most urgent task facing the world community.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty itself provides such a balance of obligations by stipulating that the nuclear Powers shall agree to certain measures to curb the nuclear arms race, while the non-nuclear nations shall undertake not to produce or to acquire nuclear weapons. It is therefore a matter of great importance for the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime that agreement now has been reached on SALT II. We welcome this highly significant event and hope that the agreement soon will be ratified. Further efforts in this direction are needed within the framework of SALT III. The so-called gray-area weapons should also be made the subject of arms control negotiations in a suitable forum.

Another urgent measure in this connexion would be a complete nuclear test ban.

We would also urge the inclusion in the programme of a treaty on the cessation of the production of fissionable material for military purposes.

The non-proliferation régime should also be enhanced through the strengthening of the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as well through the development of more proliferation-resistant technologies. A guiding principle should be that non-proliferation considerations must take precedence over commercial interests.

Under certain specific conditions, the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones may be an important supplement to the régime of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. When such conditions exist, States should initiate regional discussions with a view to establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such zones could have a stabilizing effect in areas of tension and conflict.

(Mr. Lie, Norway)

The negative security guarantees given at the special session devoted to disarmament could be further strengthened and formalized. Nations which are not protected by a nuclear security system and which meet the same conditions of denuclearization have a legitimate claim to universally applicable security guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Another important element in our programme should be other weapons of mass destruction. Under this heading we would urge the inclusion of a treaty prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and calling for their destruction.

Strenuous efforts should be made to avoid the further development of destabilizing weapons of mass destruction. In this connexion, specific measures must be taken to prohibit the development of new weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles. Ways must also be found to place restrictions on military research and development of weapons based on new as well as existing scientific principles. The political control over this sector should be strengthened.

Another major group of elements would relate to conventional weapons. Important in this connexion are restrictions on international transfers of weapons. Such transfers represent both a danger for the escalation of local conflicts and a misuse of scarce resources.

As a step towards limiting the conventional arms race, States should furnish information with more openness on their expenditures for military purposes and mechanisms should be established to collect such information.

Finally, let me again mention the disarmament/development problem. The United Nations study on this subject, scheduled to be completed in 1981, should clarify the basic conditions for the release of resources through disarmament, and particularly focus on the mechanisms for reallocating material and human resources to development efforts in the developing countries.

Thanks to the re-establishment of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, all Member States have now been given an opportunity to take an active part in global deliberations on disarmament matters.

(Mr. Lie, Norway)

In the years ahead until the next special session, it will be our shared responsibility to implement the decisions of the special session devoted to disarmament. An important task in this connexion is the comprehensive programme, the elements of which we are certain will emerge from this session conducted in the spirit of the special session under your eminent leadership, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KABIA (Sierra Leone): Mr. Chairman, the Sierra Leone delegation is indeed pleased to see you once again in the Chairman's seat as we commence this first substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, which came into existence as a result of paragraph 118 of the Final Document of the tenth special session devoted to disarmament. We are certain that, with your wide experience in the international milieu, coupled with your fine diplomatic skills, you will no doubt lead our present deliberations to a fruitful conclusion. The Sierra Leone delegation pledges its fullest co-operation in the task of fulfilling the mandate entrusted to this Commission.

The Sierra Leone delegation is indeed appreciative of the fact that it could participate in this general exchange of views on agenda item 3 now before us, namely, "Consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament". General and complete disarmament is the most urgent and most important objective the world has to grapple with today. Consequently, efforts must not be spared in our attempt to arrest and subsequently overcome this ogre that is threatening the very fibre of man's existence in today's world.

It should be recalled that our individual Governments, and indeed this illustrious body, have on innumerable occasions set as their goal the total and complete eradication of both existing nuclear and conventional arsenals. We have all, on innumerable occasions, in United Nations forums, and through countless resolutions, called for a collective effort to eliminate the threat to our peace and security by working in harmony towards general and complete disarmament. Can we at this juncture admit success in this regard? If we cannot, is it not time for us to stop, reflect and re-evaluate our mandate and the goals we had set for ourselves to achieve general and complete disarmament?

The actual situation as it now exists is gloomy and, given the reality of the situation and the consciousness of the possible annihilation of mankind from this planet, we must use this present session of the Disarmament Commission to reset new goals and objectives. We could pursue these goals and objectives with all candour and vigour in an attempt to eradicate this nemesis.

Against this backdrop, the Sierra Leone delegation is indeed pleased and encouraged at the recently successful conclusion of the negotiations on SALT II.

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

My delegation is confident that, with the responsibilities squarely on the shoulders of the super-Powers to curb the arms race, SALT II will soon be ratified and that it will be followed by new negotiations in SALT II which will be aimed at a further reduction of nuclear arms.

It is my delegation's opinion that to achieve a meaningful disarmament of the world's hideous arsenals of weapons, negotiations on the limitation of arms should include all nations, be they significant, militarily-established nations, or less powerful nations like mine and, most significantly, such negotiations should be carried out under the aegis of United Nations supervision, particularly in forums such as our Disarmament Commission or the newly established Committee on Disarmament.

The Sierra Leone delegation is of the opinion that elements pertaining to the comprehensive programme of disarmament should be entrusted to the Disarmament Commission for extensive discussion. The Disarmament Commission, being a deliberative body, should exercise its fullest potential in making these deliberations successful.

My delegation would at this juncture express some thoughts on measures to be incorporated as elements pertaining to a comprehensive programme of disarmament. First, a comprehensive programme of disarmament should clearly delineate what it intends to achieve, how it hopes to achieve those objectives and to be flexible in the time period.

Secondly, it should outline a broad and all-inclusive approach to the question of disarmament based on the above strategy. In this, my delegation is of the opinion that it must include both nuclear and non-nuclear weapons; all negotiations and agreements should fall within this category.

Thirdly, the comprehensive programme of disarmament should have and maintain a priority-oriented programme for disarmament, with a flexible step-by-step approach depending on the urgency and the practicability of achieving significant and positive results.

Fourthly, the comprehensive programme of disarmament should encourage and champion world-wide interest in disarmament. Particular interest and concern must be given to developing countries which are already of the opinion that disarmament should be a matter for the super-Powers and developed countries

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

alone. The comprehensive programme of disarmament must find ways to encourage small developing countries to become interested and involved in the objectives behind disarmament.

Fifthly, it must help in the orientation, education and the negotiating process of disarmament.

My delegation would like to propose further that, on a much broader basis the comprehensive programme of disarmament must concern itself primarily with halting, reversing and totally eradicating the arms race. The objective behind this is to gradually put a freeze on the quantitative and qualitative levels of weapons of mass destruction. Also, without deviating from the all too important aspect of the retardation of nuclear arsenals, further emphasis must be expended in the reduction of nuclear weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons.

My delegation is aware of the close link between disarmament and national security. We are also aware that there is reluctance among nations to disarm without finding other adequate measures that will ensure the security of their national boundaries.

Against this backdrop, the comprehensive programme of disarmament must ensure the security of nations through such avenues as peaceful settlement of disputes, the availability of an adequate United Nations organized peace-keeping force, effective security guarantees, confidence-building measures and safe and effective verification measures.

My delegation has already delineated certain areas of disarmament that we feel should be included as part of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. There are, none the less, additional areas of equal importance which should be included within the range of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. My delegation would take this opportunity to urge this Commission to engineer the strongest encouragement for the rapid conclusion of negotiations on the comprehensive test ban treaty because the completion of a comprehensive test ban will no doubt generate positive contributions to non-proliferation efforts. We will further urge this Commission to encourage, through the comprehensive programme of disarmament, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, particularly in the region of Africa. My delegation will give its

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

unflinching support to any action that could thwart the instalment of nuclear weapons in Africa, particularly by South Africa. To quote my Foreign Minister, Mr. Abdulai Conteh, during his statement at the tenth special session devoted to disarmament:

"It was therefore with a feeling of numb disbelief and anguish that the Government of Sierra Leone received the news that South Africa was on the threshold of acquiring weapons of this class. This will not only negate the possibility of making Africa a denuclearized zone, it will also put in the hands of the oppressive apartheid régime a cruel and callous weapon for blackmail against all mankind." (A/S-10/PV.10, p. 42)

This Commission must doubly ensure, through the comprehensive programme of disarmament, the denuclearization of Africa. It must take appropriate action where possible to meet this inhuman threat to the peace and security of the African continent.

It is my delegation's candid view that among the important issues to be incorporated within the comprehensive programme of disarmament is the question relating to chemical weapons. In this regard, efforts must be made through negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament, to ensure the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. Further efforts must also be made to ensure the non-production of new types of weapons of mass destruction. The comprehensive programme of disarmament should also be concerned with the appropriate measures necessary for the limitation of the production, stockpiling, use and transfer of conventional weapons.

(Mr. Kabia, Sierra Leone)

My delegation is also of the opinion that there should be effective verifiable measures for the monitoring of any new development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons systems. This could ensure the cessation of the production of fissionable material. This verification programme should be in a position to strengthen the non-proliferation régime based on generally accepted principles and non-discriminatory safeguards under IAEA measures.

Finally, the Sierra Leone delegation is particularly concerned about the exorbitant sums of money being expended every year on the accumulation of nuclear and non-nuclear weapons. My delegation feels that these billions of dollars could be redirected and diverted from the development of armaments to the reconstruction of the economic and social fabric of all countries, especially that of the developing countries -- and the countries of Africa in particular.

By reorienting these resources to more productive use, we could achieve a twofold objective: the reduction and possible elimination of the danger of a nuclear holocaust, which is threatening mankind's security and survival, and the establishment of a New International Economic Order.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to assure you of its genuine concern over the existence of the tensions, uneasiness and insecurity that have resulted from the threat of nuclear war.

We would emphasize our willingness faithfully and positively to contribute in our quest to find ways to eradicate the threat of the escalation of nuclear and non-nuclear arsenals. We hope that the Commission will be successful in carrying out its mandate.

Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to express my delegation's gratification at participating once again in the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission under your chairmanship. We are confident that with the benefit of your extensive experience and with your skilful guidance this session of the Disarmament Commission will be able to make substantial progress and to bear fruitful results.

The current session of the Disarmament Commission has been assigned the mandate of preparing a report on a comprehensive programme of disarmament to be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session and to the Committee on Disarmament. This is a task of immense significance since the objective of the

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

report is to provide a blueprint for the realization of enduring global peace and security, which is the cherished aspiration of peoples throughout the world. I take this opportunity to express my delegation's assurances of our fullest co-operation with other delegations in the endeavours of the Commission to work out a realistic and action-oriented programme for comprehensive disarmament.

It is our conviction that the realization of genuine and complete disarmament alone can ensure a peaceful and prosperous future for mankind. The attainment of that objective should therefore be regarded as our paramount responsibility to coming generations. The continuous development of weapons of mass destruction as well as the relentless arms race all over the globe continues to cast a bleak shadow on human civilization. We have to make an earnest start to contain this evil and secure the future of mankind. In this regard the United Nations has an historic role to play.

As envisaged in the resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session, the primary responsibility for the realization of comprehensive disarmament lies with the nuclear Powers, particularly the super-Powers. From this point of view, the understanding on the SALT-II agreement reached between the United States and the Soviet Union is an auspicious development, and we welcome it. It is our sincere hope that that agreement will lead to a significant reduction in the nuclear arsenals of the two Powers and will be followed by new agreements to further that end. Measures aimed at containing the qualitative and quantitative proliferation of nuclear weapons, even if inadequate, arise from a commitment to the ultimate objective of complete disarmament, and they deserve to be acclaimed.

While the elimination of nuclear weapons remains the central theme of global disarmament efforts, it does not diminish the urgent need for adopting international and regional measures to enhance the security of small and medium-sized non-nuclear developing States by eliminating or reducing the danger of war and the nuclear threat to them. Pakistan's thinking in this regard is outlined in a paper envisaging a stage-by-stage programme for complete disarmament. The complete text of the paper, which was prepared in response to the Secretary-General's communication of 16 January, has already been circulated in a Commission document, A/CN.10/1/Add.1 of 7 May 1979. In this brief statement I should like

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

to emphasize some of the concerns which, apart from the principal issue of the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons, in our opinion constitute essential elements of any comprehensive programme of disarmament. These concerns are fully reflected in the goals, principles and measures approved at the tenth special session. We consider that those objectives, principles and measures should provide the framework for the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament since they are based on consensus and have an intrinsic balance within themselves and also cover all the relevant aspects.

For the sake of convenience, the paper submitted by my delegation discusses the measures to be included in the comprehensive programme for disarmament in three broad phases: immediate, short-term and final. The first phase envisages measures that are indispensable to prevent a further escalation of the arms race and to bring it to a halt, as well as those on which an international consensus has been evolved. The second, or short-term, phase consists of measures to reduce the existing arsenals of nuclear, conventional and other weapons. The third, and final, phase comprises measures to bring about the complete elimination and destruction of nuclear, conventional and other weapons.

The basic considerations underlying our perception of the comprehensive programme of disarmament have been listed in the body of the working paper. Among these, we attach special importance to the idea that general and complete disarmament is to be achieved under effective international control in a manner which must ensure that war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems and that reliable procedures are to be established for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements made for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We should also bear in mind that a comprehensive programme of disarmament should be both a programme of work and a commitment to act to be adopted in the form of a legally binding international instrument. Moreover, in articulating a step-by-step process for general and complete disarmament, the various stages and different kinds of disarmament negotiations should be clearly linked to each other. For that purpose, linkages between global and regional measures, between nuclear and conventional disarmament and between arms control and measures to promote confidence among States appear to be inescapable. Finally, it must be recognized that the United Nations will have to play the central role in the formulation, adoption, implementation and review of the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

Notwithstanding the ultimate goal of the total destruction of weapons in a comprehensive programme of disarmament, the measures of immediate consequence are of immense importance and, pragmatically speaking, perhaps the most feasible in the present international environment. These measures encompass a wide range within and outside the purview of the United Nations; examples are bilateral efforts leading to reductions in the strategic nuclear and conventional arsenals and a halt in their qualitative development, multilateral agreement on prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, and measures to contain the danger of nuclear proliferation and to bring all nuclear facilities under international safeguards, as well as confidence-building measures to strengthen the security of States and prevent external intervention in the internal affairs of States. Significant progress can be achieved in these areas even if comprehensive disarmament remains a distant goal. Among the measures identified under the immediate phase, I should like to draw the attention of the Commission specially to the following: first, the need for the conclusion of internationally binding assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and, secondly, the promotion of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Pakistan has been consistently pursuing the cause of strengthening security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States and acknowledges with deep satisfaction that, in this regard, paragraph 59 of the Final Document of the tenth special session fully reflects the concerns of the majority of non-nuclear-weapon States. It calls upon the nuclear Powers to conclude

"... effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." (General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 59)

My delegation is of the firm view that such "effective arrangements" can best be provided in an international instrument with binding legal effect. The question of security assurances has to be viewed essentially as an international responsibility. Secondly, such assurances will be devoid of credibility without an internationally recognized and a legally binding form. Any other modality such as unilateral declarations, however positive in content, will possess neither the authority nor the binding force of a multilateral commitment either incorporated in a Security Council resolution or formalized in an international legal instrument.

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

My delegation, along with those of many other Member States, has been making persistent efforts to evolve a universally acceptable formulation, particularly one acceptable to the nuclear-weapon Powers. So far a common formula has proved elusive, on account of the divergent strategic military doctrines and interests. However, the efforts of over one decade have succeeded in considerably narrowing down the differences in the various positions adopted on this issue, and it should now be possible to articulate elements of security assurances to non-nuclear States which meet universal approval. In this regard my delegation has circulated a paper as document CD/10 in the Committee on Disarmament, containing a draft convention, at the recently concluded meeting of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. This draft convention is based on the premise that the existence of the opposing global alliance systems under which the option to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States is kept open must not form an insurmountable obstacle to the extension of security assurances to those non-nuclear States which are not parties to these alliances. My delegation believes that this draft convention not only conforms to the aspirations of the non-nuclear-weapon States to enhance their security against the nuclear threat but also takes cognizance of the realities of the present strategic environment. It therefore provides a sound basis on which to begin negotiations on the question of security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States. What is required now is a definition of the scope and nature of the guarantees to be provided to the non-nuclear-weapon States and, secondly, the precise effective international form in which those guarantees could be extended. We sincerely hope that, in the spirit of paragraph 59 of the Final Document of the tenth special session, this session of the Disarmament Commission will be able to formulate specific recommendations in this matter.

It is highly encouraging that the precedent of establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones has gained universal acceptance. The creation of such zones is, in our opinion, one of the most effective ways to contain the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to promote regional and international security. While the nuclear Powers have encouraged the promotion of this idea, certain practical difficulties have yet to be overcome for its realization in many important regions of the world which can still be saved from the nuclear menace.

(Mr. Maik, Pakistan)

We fully support the initiative for the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. The limitation and eventual elimination of the military presence and rivalry of the super-Powers in the Indian Ocean as well as the adoption of measures to create conditions of security in the region constitute the basic parameters determining the endeavours to be undertaken for the realization of this goal. For our part, sharing the concern for disarmament of other States in our region, we have been working for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. The objective conditions in our region have strengthened our conviction that an early establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia would be in the interests of the welfare of the entire people of the region. Each South Asian State has unilaterally declared that it will not produce or acquire nuclear weapons. In our view, the next step is to translate these declarations into a multilateral and binding form. Pakistan for its part is prepared to consider entering into a joint declaration with the Governments of South Asian States to renounce the production or acquisition by other means of nuclear weapons.

Pakistan's concerns for non-proliferation and its awareness of the danger of a nuclear holocaust are second to none. We have an immutable commitment to the goal of nuclear non-proliferation and believe that this involves obligations and responsibilities on the part of both nuclear-weapon States as well as non-nuclear weapon States. However, like most of the developing countries, we think that the cause of nuclear non-proliferation should be promoted on the basis of universality, non-discrimination and the sovereign equality of States. The approach to this problem should be global and not on a subjective or selective basis applying different standards to different States. The universal desire for genuine disarmament should not be allowed to prevent developing countries from acquiring modern technology, including nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. It would indeed be ironic if the noble cause of disarmament were to be given an interpretation and to be pursued in a manner which deprived those countries of the benefits of advanced technology without which their economic backwardness would be perpetuated and their progress paralysed. The concerns of the developing countries in this regard have been fully reflected in paragraphs 68 to 70 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to emphasize that distrust and conflicts will continue to vitiate international peace as long as the development of conventional weapons continues unrestrained and the military strength of States is not restricted and balanced at levels commensurate with the requirements of their internal security. A programme of gradual reduction and eventual liquidation of nuclear weapons must therefore envisage a simultaneous reduction in the conventional arsenals of major Powers in the world, as well as global and regional measures, to build an international environment in which small and medium-sized nations can live in peace, security and independence. The colossal expenditure on production of armaments has to be drastically curtailed and the resources spent on acquiring these means of destruction have to be channelled for socio-economic development, particularly that of the developing countries, in order to bring about an equitable international economic order free of disparities and festering crises. Unless steps are taken towards a rational reallocation of world resources, mankind's hope for peace will remain elusive.

Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): As the Chairman has proposed, my delegation will limit itself to discussing briefly agenda item 3.

The question of a comprehensive programme of disarmament has long been under consideration by the international community. In 1959 the General Assembly, in its resolution 1378 (XIV), accorded recognition to it as the most important matter facing the world and called upon Members to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem. In 1961, the joint statement of agreed principles by the United States and the Soviet Union on general and complete disarmament identified several elements of a comprehensive programme which have retained their validity. Again in 1969 the Assembly appealed for continuing and intensive negotiations on a comprehensive programme dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under international control. Thus, the decision to entrust the Commission with the task of considering the elements of a comprehensive programme is the culmination of years of concern evinced by the international community.

(Mr. Kamil, Indonesia)

In my delegation's view, the comprehensive programme is indeed what it literally means: an all-encompassing enumeration of all disarmament measures in all relevant areas leading to complete and general disarmament as the final objective, in order that international peace and security may prevail and economic and social progress may be attained. Broadly interpreted, the programme should include all measures intended to end the arms race and to limit and control armaments, the elimination of armaments and armed forces, and measures of effective disarmament. In the context of disarmament negotiations and in the ensuing agreements, efforts should be exerted to develop appropriate methods and procedures which are non-discriminatory and which do not unduly interfere with the internal affairs of States or jeopardize their development efforts. It is also particularly important that throughout the various stages the principles of balanced disarmament and equal security for all are ensured in such a way that no State or group of States will acquire military superiority over others.

Indonesia believes that negotiations on comprehensive disarmament should be planned in phases and accord with priorities set by the tenth special session devoted to disarmament. Thus, high priority should be given to nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, including the following related issues: the cessation of nuclear weapon testing by all States, the cessation of the production of all types of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, a significant reduction of strategic arms, and a comprehensive programme with agreed time frames for the reduction of nuclear stockpiles leading to the ultimate destruction of those stockpiles. The implementation of all those measures should be carried out with the participation of both States which possess nuclear weapons and States which do not possess them.

The comprehensive programme should also include measures for the establishment of regional arrangements for denuclearized zones and measures for the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Concurrently, efforts should be undertaken by the nuclear Powers to reduce the military imbalance with the non-nuclear countries. Significant progress in nuclear disarmament would facilitate the strengthening of the security of States, as well as the limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments of nuclear-weapon and other States.

(Mr. Kamil, Indonesia)

It is in this light that my delegation essential the elaboration of the following measures: first, guarantees through binding international commitments to insure the non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons; secondly, international co-operation for the acquisition of nuclear technology and materials for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy; thirdly, consideration of steps to facilitate the reduction of military budgets on an agreed basis, particularly by nuclear States; and, fourthly, channelling of resources freed by measures of disarmament to the promotion of the economic and social development of the developing countries.

Finally, the comprehensive programme of disarmament should give adequate consideration to confidence-building measures, the establishment of zones of peace, measures to strengthen the institutions for maintaining peace and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means.

Negotiations on those and other issues could be conducted concurrently with negotiations on partial measures and pursued on bilateral, regional and multilateral bases. It would be necessary to provide for international machinery to apply adequate measures of verification so as to ensure that all parties honoured their obligations.

In conclusion, States should intensify efforts towards the achievement of the objective of general and complete disarmament, and the participation and political will of all nations are indeed indispensable for a full measure of success in these efforts. In this light, during current and future negotiations efforts should be exerted for the cessation of the nuclear arms race, the conclusion of agreements on specific measures, the elimination of nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons. My delegation hopes that the Commission, in accordance with the task assigned to it, will be able to play a substantial role in these endeavours.

Mr. KATAPODIS (Greece)(interpretation from French): First of all, may I say how satisfied the Greek delegation is at seeing you, Mr. Chairman, presiding over the work of our Commission. Your lengthy experience and distinguished qualities are the best possible guarantee that this Commission will be equal to its difficult duties.

(Mr. Katapodis, Greece)

In accordance with the Chairman's wish I shall try to confine my comments to agenda item 3, particularly since my delegation has already made known its opinions, on behalf of the Greek Government, on the question of disarmament in the reply sent to the Secretary-General and circulated in document A/CN.10/1 of 19 April 1979.

Greece, traditionally a peaceful country, has always favoured the most general and complete disarmament possible. Such disarmament would not only be in keeping with the principles of the Charter but would also mean that, through the reduction of military budgets, considerable sums could be devoted to the development of the least developed of the developing countries, as was emphasized by the Prime Minister of Greece, Mr. Karamanlis, in his statement to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Therefore, we cannot fail to express our gratification at the agreement reached recently between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the limitation of strategic weapons, which will be signed next month.

(Mr. Katapodis, Greece)

However, we believe that an essential prerequisite of any disarmament initiative must be that it will effectively ensure the security of all countries, particularly those that do not have significant arsenals of nuclear or conventional weapons or surplus financial resources which would enable them to indulge in an arms race. For it is obviously incompatible with the principle of disarmament for there to be any threat of military intervention whenever a State, particularly a powerful one, has a dispute with another State.

The surest way of meeting this indispensable condition would be, in the view of the Greek delegation, to have all members of the international community respect the principle of the peaceful settlement of international disputes. Once this principle has been universally accepted adequate procedures exist for settling the most complex international problems. Furthermore, our Organization is at present considering through its various bodies specific measures to bring this about such as strengthening the Charter and, in general, the enhancement of the role of the United Nations, the non-use of force, the strengthening of international security, and so on.

As you yourself stated, Mr. Chairman, the main topic in our discussions is consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. This work should, of course concentrate on, inter alia, the order of priorities of such a programme. My delegation, while it recognizes the undeniable importance of nuclear disarmament, would like to stress the equally great importance of this reduction of conventional weapons. In fact, in view of the destructive nature of nuclear weapons, the use of conventional weapons in localized conflicts is becoming more and more frequent, so that there are taking place in the world at present a whole series of armed confrontations that are causing ever more appalling losses of human lives. It is therefore essential to reach as quickly as possible an agreement on the limitation of conventional weapons, which would strengthen the sense of security of small countries and spare them military expenditures which they can ill afford.

In conclusion, I should like to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that my delegation will do everything in its power to ensure that our Commission reaches a consensus in carrying out its mandate, which is, of course, the only possible way of proceeding.

Mr. GAVIRIA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, my delegation is pleased to see you once again presiding over our debate and it is our firm hope that with your capable support we will successfully complete this session.

First, my delegation agrees with the decision taken to the effect that we concentrate our efforts on agenda item 3, namely, "Consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament". This does not, of course, mean that we underrate the importance of the other items on our agenda. On the contrary, we consider as extremely important the content of agenda items 4 and 5, bearing respectively on "Consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, in order to expedite negotiations aimed at elimination of the danger of nuclear war", and "concrete steps to be undertaken by States regarding a gradual agreed reduction of military budgets and reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries".

In this already substantive stage of our deliberations, it seems almost impossible to add anything new to what has already been said in the past on disarmament. All the more so if we bear in mind that the Final Document, which was adopted at the last special session of the General Assembly, doubtless contains and reflects very important elements for a future comprehensive programme of disarmament.

But withal, and at the risk of seeming to be repetitive, my delegation does not consider it to be entirely futile to reiterate some concepts, objectives and priorities in connexion with the item before us. On the contrary, we consider that by means of this system of mutual persuasion we may in the future achieve the desired results.

Undoubtedly, general and complete disarmament under effective international control is and must continue to be the very purpose of disarmament. But regrettably, this noble ideal is in stark contrast with the cold facts. The world, instead of disarming, is increasingly threatened with the dangers of a nuclear war and with the unceasing arms race which endangers international peace and security. This latter aspect is of singular importance in the context of a serious negotiating process on disarmament, particularly in the nuclear field, where a quantitative arms race has given way to a clearly qualitatively race.

(Mr. Gaviria, Colombia)

It is well known that at present many material and human resources are used for military research while poor and developing countries patiently hope that those resources being uselessly wasted in the manufacture of the most sophisticated and dangerous weapons will be invested, rather, in solving the acute economic and social problems of the developing world. In this respect my delegation is pleased with the studies being prepared regarding the relationship between disarmament and development, and it is our hope that in a future comprehensive programme of disarmament practical measures will be included so as to guarantee that the resources released as a result of the measures adopted for disarmament will be used in such a way as to contribute to promoting the well-being of all peoples and to improving the economic conditions of the developing countries.

Naturally, my delegation is aware of the complexity of drawing up a genuine comprehensive programme of disarmament. However, we deem it desirable at the present stage of our debate to recommend the inclusion of a series of priorities which may become part of the negotiations that will be ongoing on the subject.

Doubtless, the most significant and most important item is that of nuclear disarmament. A reiteration of the danger for mankind and the survival of civilization of an eventual war with nuclear weapons is sufficient justification for demanding the total and complete elimination of those deadly instruments. In this respect, we agree with paragraph 50 of the Final Document which provides, inter alia, for the cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon systems as well as of the production of new types of nuclear weapons and fissionable material for weapons purposes.

In this respect, we applaud the conclusion of the SALT II agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union, which proves the practical possibility of creating an atmosphere propitious for understanding in regard to limiting strategic weapons and of the possibility of later developments that will lead to a genuine nuclear disarmament.

As we see it, within this selective criterion for the preparation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament we must also provide for effective measures that will totally and absolutely prohibit chemical, bacteriological, incendiary,

(Mr. Gaviria, Colombia)

radiological and other weapons of mass destruction which also threaten the very survival of mankind. The same must be said regarding the reduction of military budgets and armed forces. But all of this logically must be under effective international control and supervision. Otherwise, the effectiveness of disarmament would be subject to the capricious will of States, and negotiations could be no more than a dead letter. In this respect, the suggestion of France for an international agency monitoring by satellite is interesting and plausible.

My delegation would not like to conclude this brief statement without emphasizing the peaceful vocation of Colombia and the Latin American countries, which are always desirous of contributing to the disarmament process, as proved by deeds with the setting up of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL) and the Ayacucho Declaration, signed by 18 countries in 1974, designed to limit conventional weapons in the area.

Those are the brief remarks which my delegation wished to make with regard to the item before us, and we hope to continue to co-operate actively in the Commission's work to the end of our present deliberations.

Mr. FUTSCHER PEREIRA (Portugal): For the whole of this week, this Commission has been engaged in what it has called a general exchange of views on one of the items of our agenda: "Consideration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament".

The decision this Commission took to try to focus our attention and efforts on that particular item raises hopes that some progress can be achieved in arriving at an agreement on the main components of the comprehensive programme and, consequently, in establishing its structure.

I should like, at this stage, to express my Government's views on this subject.

Although mankind endured, during the Second World War, a suffering never experienced before, entailing the loss of millions of lives and the destruction of a substantial part of the material resources of the globe, we are now witnessing, a few years later, an arms race of an unprecedented nature. In particular --and this is of great concern to my Government-- we are facing a shift in emphasis from a basically quantitative arms race to a more qualitatively-oriented arms race. It would seem that whenever disarmament measures are envisaged human ingenuity achieves a new "success" in weapons technology, thereby provoking a further destabilization of the political balance.

Yet, some encouraging events have also taken place: as regards the process of arms control, the conclusion of certain bilateral or multilateral treaties; as regards the process of disarmament, the holding of the tenth special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In fact, this session can be seen as constituting a major step forward in the international community's efforts to cope with the complex matters of disarmament, in so far as it has established principles and a strategy for disarmament.

My delegation believes that general and complete disarmament, under effective international control, is a necessary element for the establishment of a true climate of peace and general security. We must admit, however, that the present state of international relations hardly favours the realization of this objective, which can only be reached at the final stage of a long,

(Mr. Futscher Pereira, Portugal)

difficult and complex process. Portugal therefore considers that the preparation of a comprehensive disarmament programme constitutes a positive element and a necessary step towards the achievement of this aim.

This programme, therefore, must necessarily be drawn up in such a way as to ensure its adaptability to changing conditions. My Government believes the programme should be: realistic - in other words, it must take into account the structure of international relations; of a general nature - that is to say that it must comprise the most significant weapons and weapons systems of the offensive military potential of States, particularly the major Powers; and finally, flexible - in order to facilitate and bring about negotiations of a partial nature and regional character, which can play an important role in the establishment of an environment of peace and security in international relations.

Another aspect to be considered is the fact that the various elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme must be assembled in such a way as to form a complete and coherent structure. Perhaps it could comprise an introduction which would reflect the basic underlying principles of the whole programme, and in a way explain the operative part. We suggest, for instance, that the fundamental principles mentioned in paragraph 25 and following paragraphs of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the United Nations General Assembly be incorporated in the programme. In particular, my country attributes great importance to the principles embodied in paragraphs 29 and 30 of the document.

The operative part of the programme should include measures aimed at limiting and curbing the arms race, in order to arrive at general and complete disarmament under effective international control. These measures must take into account the agreements already in effect and those under negotiation.

While we recognize the particular responsibility of the nuclear Powers in the disarmament process, my delegation believes it to be of great importance that the programme, in establishing disarmament measures, take into account the fact that the global military potential of States results from the conjunction of nuclear and conventional weapons. Consequently, the programme must establish

(Mr. Futscher Pereira, Portugal)

a balance between the measures related to each of those two types of weapons so as to prevent one State or group of States from gaining superiority over another in any phase of the disarmament process.

Before I conclude, I should like to recall once again that genuine disarmament can only become a reality in an atmosphere of confidence. We therefore shall welcome the inclusion in the programme of any measures, apart from those specifically related to disarmament, conducive to the establishment of such a climate of confidence among nations.

Mr. AZAR GOMEZ (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that the delegation of my country has addressed this first substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, I should like to congratulate you most sincerely and at the same time assure you of our complete co-operation towards achieving tangible results on the items we are considering.

We believe that beyond the recommendations and basic postulates which were agreed to at the end of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament, one of the major achievements was the reactivation of the Disarmament Commission, conceived of as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly with the full participation of all States Members of this Organization.

Thus, the Disarmament Commission is set up as a forum in which, without regard for quantitative and qualitative considerations, all Members of this community of nations which really deeply feel the disarmament cause, can state their views and/or make constructive suggestions in regard to the ultimate objective, which is general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

We agree with the opinion expressed by several countries to the effect that the democratic character of this body and its close link with the Committee on Disarmament make it the framework par excellence where we shall ascertain the various positions on the most important items of disarmament.

Undoubtedly, the tenth special session bequeathed to us documentation and facts which are a genuine challenge. This is the time when we each and every one must do our best in order to arrive at the positive results which all mankind expects.

(Mr. Azar Gomez, Uruguay)

Among the basic matters we have to consider at this first substantive session are the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme, as laid down in the defined mandate in paragraph 118 (a) of the Final Document. In the opinion of the delegation of Uruguay we should take as a basis those points on which there is already wide agreement, and we should, further, set an order of priority for the measures to be adopted - all of this within the framework of and in the light of the priorities expressly stated in the Final Document of the tenth special session - namely, nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction including chemical and conventional weapons, weapons that can be considered to be excessively harmful or to have indiscriminate effects, and, finally, a reduction in armed forces.

In formulating a comprehensive programme of disarmament we must be particularly careful to revitalize the steps taken at the most recent international gatherings on the subject and in particular the achievements of the tenth special session. To this end, we believe it to be of vital importance to implement the commitments entered into at the tenth special session and at the same time to create the conditions necessary to begin negotiations that would lead to a halt in the arms race so that we may finally embark on a real disarmament process under effective international control.

It is true that the present stage is described as a general exchange of views, but it is also true that it is of far-reaching importance because the task of detailing the elements of the programme must be faced with the utmost responsibility by each one of us. We cannot and must not allow ourselves to consider haphazardly setting down on paper a series of hollow words merely to comply with our mandate to submit recommendations or suggestions to the Assembly. Our final objective is too valuable for it to be used in an interplay of selfish interests or superficial considerations.

Delegations that have spoken this week have brought very interesting points of view to bear, and they have formulated proposals to be taken into account in the informal working group, which is to begin its work next week. Our delegation wishes to indicate some of the elements which in our opinion should be included in the programme we are about to prepare.

In the first place, we believe that the philosophy behind a comprehensive disarmament programme should have as its primary goal release of the resources used in the arms race for the benefit of the economic and social development of peoples. That is the premise on which we must build the entire

(Mr. Azar Gomez, Uruguay)

disarmament programme. We must make use of resources hitherto wasted in manufacturing and improving war material to bring into being and consolidate a new international economic order. Having established that premise, we must carefully safeguard it and consider specifically all that pertains to nuclear weapons, nuclear tests and so on, so that nuclear energy for peaceful purposes may be made available to countries that cannot develop it themselves. For the good of humanity the concept of monopoly should be discarded by those who have a monopoly.

Our delegation has carefully analysed the replies of various Governments regarding the comprehensive programme. We have given them particular attention because we believe they contain the most relevant elements for inclusion in the programme. The various elements listed in paragraph 6 of the reply of India in document A/CN.10/1 should be used as the basis for our future work in the group. We believe that this point of departure is realistic and is, further, in accord with the recommendations in resolution S-10/2.

That is all we wish to say at this time. We reiterate our willingness fully to co-operate with the working group.

Mr. BLANKSON (Nigeria): Mr. Chairman, please accept once again the congratulations of the Nigerian delegation on your election to the esteemed position of the chairmanship of the Disarmament Commission. My delegation trusts that the Commission will profit not only from your most valued and rich experience but also from your expertise on the various issues before the Commission. In the same vein, we extend our congratulations to the other members of the Bureau.

In declaring the 1970s a Disarmament Decade the United Nations General Assembly, in the relevant resolution, 2602 E (XXIV) of 16 December 1969, directed the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament,

"while continuing intensive negotiations with a view to reaching the widest possible agreement on collateral measures, to work out at the same time a comprehensive programme, dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which would provide the Conference with a guideline to chart the course of its further work and its negotiations".

(Mr. Blankson, Nigeria)

The first special session of the General Assembly to be devoted to disarmament highlighted the gap between the lofty objectives set at the launching of the Disarmament Decade and the achievements at the end of that Decade. The arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, continues unabated, endangering the very survival of mankind. In a world of increasing want and poverty, the arms race consumes an ever increasing proportion of scarce resources which should otherwise be devoted to economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries.

Furthermore the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament stressed the need for the Committee on Disarmament to 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.

Negotiations in the multilateral negotiating body in Geneva since 1961 have in my delegation's view, been taken up in a rather haphazard and ineffective manner. Negotiations have also been taken up outside the multilateral body on issues of interest, but with very little co-ordination with either that body or the United Nations. While it is recognized that the multiforum approach to disarmament is useful and perhaps inevitable, it is essential to ensure the inter-relationship of these efforts and their co-ordination so as to facilitate periodic reviews of over-all progress.

Thus, in the view of my delegation, the aim of a comprehensive programme of disarmament will have to be broadened beyond the original perspective of General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV). Such a programme should form a reference-point not only for the Committee on Disarmament but also for disarmament negotiations conducted in all other forums, so that, taken together, these negotiations form a co-ordinated effort that will permit discernible progress in the over-all objectives of general and complete disarmament. Such a programme should also enable the United Nations to play the role envisaged for it. As stated in the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament, according to its Charter the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament.

(Mr. Blankson, Nigeria)

As members of the old Conference of the Committee on Disarmament will recall, a comprehensive programme of disarmament has been one of the major concerns of my delegation. Nigeria has been taking initiatives to have the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament discharge the responsibility entrusted to it as far back as 1969 in the resolution of the General Assembly to which I have referred.

(Mr. Blankson, Nigeria)

My delegation raised the issue in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) in 1975. In spite of that, the Committee did not take a decision to set up an ad hoc working group to work on a comprehensive programme until 1977, and even then the working group was not set up until March 1978. As our contribution to the substantive work of the Ad Hoc Group, the Nigerian delegation submitted a working paper - CCD/555 - containing our views on the subject of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. We have reviewed and updated this paper to take account of developments since 1975 and, following the adoption of resolution 33/91, a copy was submitted to the Secretary-General for transmission to this Commission.

The ultimate objective of disarmament negotiations is the attainment of general and complete disarmament, which will facilitate the creation of conditions of peace, security and a New International Economic Order. To this end, a comprehensive programme of disarmament should aim at providing negotiations in whatever forum with an orderly, well-balanced programme complete with a system of priorities and with co-ordination that will ensure discernible and constant progress towards general and complete disarmament, again under effective international control. The programme should also envisage a time-frame for completing this process.

In formulating the principles that should govern disarmament negotiations, it should be borne in mind that disarmament constitutes a vital means to an end. It is an important corner-stone of a new international peace and security order which will combine the much-desired world-wide relief from the present nuclear overkill capacity with acceptable economic and social living conditions for all peoples. It is now obvious that international peace and security cannot be enhanced by the continued accumulation of arms by opposing military alliances. The concept of balance of deterrence or, as some have termed it, terror has failed to provide security for its adherents. Until genuine disarmament is achieved, it is clear that neither world peace and security nor world economic and social progress can run their full course.

Disarmament is obviously in the basic interests of all States both in its aspect as a sine qua non of international peace and security and as a necessary

(Mr. Blankson, Nigeria)

input into the economic and social development of all States, particularly the developing countries. Thus negotiations on disarmament should take account of this basic interest of all States and, therefore, all States should be enabled to participate in the formulation of disarmament instruments, which, in turn, ought to attract universal adherence.

Consequently, in carrying out meaningful disarmament measures, States which have more weapons will have to give up more. Thus a special responsibility devolves on the nuclear-weapon States, particularly the two super-Powers, in facilitating disarmament negotiations. All nuclear-weapon States should participate in such negotiations. Nuclear weapons, once again, constitute the gravest threat to mankind. Highest priority should therefore be given to measures leading to nuclear disarmament. Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should be an important aspect of the effort to rid the world of the fear of nuclear threat. Non-proliferation should, however, not interfere with the development of peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The use of other weapons of mass destruction should be prohibited as a matter of urgency and so should their development and stockpiling.

The continued subjugation of peoples and the denial of their right to self-determination and independence by racist minority régimes are inconsistent with steps towards disarmament and relaxation of international tension. Measures for control of conventional weapons should be undertaken, bearing in mind the security of States and the inalienable right of peoples under colonial and racist domination to self-determination and independence. The important boost which disarmament would give to development efforts and the importance to international peace and security of balanced world economic development, dictate that efforts at meaningful disarmament negotiations be promoted most vigorously so as to release the vast human and material resources now tied to armaments for use in promoting economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries.

In keeping with its responsibility the programme of disarmament should also contain an aspect which enhances public awareness of the dangers of the armaments

(Mr. Blankson, Nigeria)

race in both its military and its economic aspect. The United Nations should be kept informed of all efforts at disarmament, whether unilateral, bilateral or multilateral, so that it may co-ordinate these efforts.

As stated earlier, the views and suggestions of the Government of Nigeria on the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament have already been forwarded through the Secretary-General to this Commission, and we expect that they will be published shortly.

My delegation wishes, however, to seize this opportunity to highlight some of these elements.

First, we are of the view that utmost priority should be given to the issue of nuclear disarmament. The continued research on and development and production of nuclear weapons is not only inimical to peace and security but an unfortunate diversion of our limited resources, resources destined for the good of mankind. We therefore urge that no effort should be spared in ensuring a total ban on the production of this range of deadly weapons and a gradual reduction in the existing stockpiles. My delegation wishes to emphasize the following measures which fall within the ambit of nuclear disarmament: urgent conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty; the establishment and/or encouragement of nuclear-weapon-free zones or zones of peace, whichever is appropriate in the various regions; the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes and subjection of all nuclear programmes to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards; the promotion of non-proliferation measures; and the promotion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy in all countries.

Secondly, the Nigerian delegation urges the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, whether based on new or existing scientific principles. In order to ensure that no State takes undue advantage of these measures over others, the prohibition of the development and production of all chemical, bacteriological and radiological weapons should also be decided upon, while a gradual phasing out of all existing stockpiles is actively pursued.

(Mr. Blankson, Nigeria)

Thirdly, the interrelationship between disarmament and development should be borne in mind and definite measures taken progressively to free resources now being devoted to armaments for economic and social development.

To this end, urgent measures should be taken for the reduction of the military budgets of nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States. The savings from such reduction could well be ploughed into more useful and purposeful economic measures.

On the question of conventional weapons and armed forces, the Nigerian delegation wishes to reiterate its stance that there should be a prohibition on the development of all types of conventional weapons, while further international action should be pursued to conclude agreements on restrictions on the use of specific weapons that may be excessively injurious to mankind.

It is also our belief that, as a corollary to the reduction of military budgets, States should embark upon the gradual reduction of their armed forces, bearing in mind of course their obligation to provide the United Nations with the necessary personnel with appropriate training and experience if and when requested to do so for peace-keeping purposes.

Finally, in order to ensure confidence among States that disarmament measures do not jeopardize their security, the following confidence-building measures should be adopted: first, appropriate verification procedures should be made an integral aspect of disarmament agreements; and, secondly, agreed procedures should be worked out for the progressive reduction of the military budgets of States - also bearing in mind States that have particularly high military budgets.

The United Nations General Assembly, having adopted the comprehensive programme of disarmament, should also decide on a time-table and schedule for the consideration and negotiation of specific instruments and other measures so that the entire process is completed as early as possible. To that end, the General Assembly should make regular reviews of the progress

(Mr. Blankson, Nigeria)

made on disarmament at its annual regular sessions and at periodic special sessions held at not more than at four-yearly intervals. Furthermore, the Committee on Disarmament should continue to be the main negotiating body under the auspices of the United Nations. The United Nations Disarmament Commission should serve as a deliberative forum on disarmament issues, thus enabling all Member States to contribute to this important problem and challenge of our time.

Finally, there should be encouragement of parallel disarmament negotiations on specific items in the comprehensive programme, provided that the United Nations is given regular reports of such negotiations.

Mr. SY (Senegal)(interpretation from French): At a time when the disarmament decade is drawing to a close, it is very encouraging to see the Disarmament Commission meeting to consider, inter alia, the elements which will go to make up a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

After almost two decades of arms control and limitation, the final goal of general and complete disarmament seems to be as remote as ever, whereas the arms race is continuing to grow apace. This situation must necessarily give rise to growing concern throughout the world, a concern which was the reason for convening the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In this connexion, we must express our gratification at the consensus which surrounded the Final Document emerging from the special session and which bore witness to the desire of the international community to give a fresh impetus to disarmament negotiations. Nevertheless, as emphasized in paragraph 112 of the Final Document

"In addition to the several questions dealt with in this Programme of Action, there are a few others of fundamental importance, on which, because of the complexity of the issues involved and the short time at the disposal of the special session, it has proved impossible to reach satisfactory agreed conclusions. For those reasons they are treated only in very general terms and, in a few instances, not even treated at all..." (General Assembly resolution S-10/2)

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

That means that the Programme of Action contained in the Final Document simply outlines short-term and medium-term steps which should be carried out in the matter of disarmament; but it is as yet incomplete and it is essential to identify some steps of a long-term or medium-term nature. It is for that reason that my delegation is convinced of the importance of our work as a necessary follow-up to the impetus provided by the special session and as a fresh effort to identify new ways and means of bringing about general disarmament.

But what form should this comprehensive disarmament programme take, the elements of which it is our task to determine? In the opinion of my delegation the comprehensive programme of disarmament should provide a context in which to gather together in a coherent manner a certain number of measures all aimed at the final objective, that is, general and complete disarmament. Those measures would be determined on the basis of freely negotiated agreements at both the international and the regional level. The implementation of those measures would be spaced out over a number of stages which would correspond to the priorities which have been established in the field of disarmament.

Paragraph 118 of the Final Document states:

"The Disarmament Commission should, inter alia, consider the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament to be submitted as recommendations to the General Assembly and, through it, to the negotiating body, the Committee on Disarmament." (ibid.)

My delegation regards this exercise that we have been requested to undertake as falling under three different headings. The first is the collation of these elements which started when States replied to resolution 33/91 A and was further continued by the proposals which have been made by the representatives of States in their statements in the Commission. My delegation attaches great importance to this task and hopes that the collation of elements will be carried out on the broadest possible basis taking account of proposals and suggestions made by all States, both large and small. Since all States Members of the United Nations are part of the Disarmament Commission, it provides a proper framework for the compilation of the various components which will go to make up a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

The second type of operation which the Commission has to carry out is to classify the elements thus gathered under several main headings, such as nuclear disarmament, conventional disarmament, strengthening international security, disarmament and development, and so on.

This classification of the components in a coherent framework taking into account the priorities laid down in paragraph 45 of the Final Document will be our main task during the present session.

A third type of operation would appear to be necessary. I refer to the preselection of certain elements which we should transmit through the General Assembly to the Committee on Disarmament. Although the criteria underlying such a selection should be the subject of a consensus, my delegation believes that particular stress should be laid on medium-term and long-term elements. Equally, it would be useful to classify identical proposals under the same heading and avoid simply repeating in a different form proposals already contained in the Programme of Action in the Final Document.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

However, my delegation considers that the real work of selecting the elements thus gathered will be done when negotiations take place in the Committee on Disarmament. What we have to be sure about is that we provide that Committee not with a skeleton document but rather with abundant material that will enable it to have a broad choice of elements taking into account the problem of disarmament in all its aspects.

We would be remiss in our duties if, in order to be concise, we simply sent the Committee on Disarmament so few elements that it would be forced to propose new ones itself.

I should now like to touch upon those elements that Senegal would like to see appearing in the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

In this connexion, my delegation believes that a comprehensive programme of disarmament should contain not only disarmament measures, but also political, economic and legal measures since it is quite obvious that disarmament, the strengthening of international security and the establishment of a new international economic order are complementary processes and mutually influence each other.

Referring, first of all, to disarmament measures we believe that nuclear disarmament should have priority and should be substantially implemented at the first stage of the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Thus, the qualitative improvement of arms and the devising of new systems of nuclear weapons should be tackled during that stage.

Also, pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs 60, 61 and 62 of the Final Document, the process of establishing nuclear-free zones in Latin America, Africa, and Middle East and in other parts of the world should also be part of the first stage of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. Renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons, pending their total prohibition against States which neither manufacture nor possess such arms in their territories also appears to us to be a measure that should be carried out in the not-too distant future.

In the field of conventional weapons, we believe that equal importance should be attached to the production and transfer of armaments, as stated in paragraph 29 of the Final Document, as follows:

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

"The adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner as to ensure the right of each State to security and to ensure that no individual States or group of States may obtain advantages over others at any stage. At each stage the objective should be undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces". (Resolution S-10/2, para. 29)

It is obvious that this principle cannot be implemented if some could freely continue to produce and to improve conventional weapons whose destructive power sometimes approximates that of nuclear weapons.

It also appears to us that in the second stage of the comprehensive programme of disarmament, that is, once nuclear disarmament is sufficiently under way, regional conferences could be convened on the initiative of States belonging to the region in order progressively to reduce arms and to establish quantitative and qualitative ceilings on armed forces and military equipment for States in that region.

Equally, the conclusion of regional non-aggression pacts and the peaceful settlement of disputes on the initiative of States belonging to the region are a measure that could also be part and parcel of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. There can be no doubt that neither nuclear disarmament nor even conventional disarmament can be effected if measures are not concurrently taken to improve international relations. In this connexion, the elimination of colonialism, racism and foreign occupation, as well as the establishment of a climate of détente, should also be included among the component parts of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

In paragraph 35 of the Final Document it is stated that there is a close relationship between disarmament and development. My delegation believes that part of the comprehensive programme of disarmament should be devoted to this matter. It is our hope that the recommendations of the group of governmental experts who were instructed to draw up a report on the relationship between disarmament and development will be included as elements of the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Turning to the question of the reduction of military budgets, I should like to recall that during the special session devoted to disarmament the Head of the Senegal State, President Senghor, proposed a 5 per cent reduction in military budgets and the transfer of resources thus released to developing countries.

(Mr. Sy, Senegal)

In conclusion, my delegation would like particularly to emphasize the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the peaceful settlement of disputes and peace-keeping operations.

We think it also would be desirable for a United Nations body to be set up whose job it would be to co-ordinate the verification of the various disarmament agreements.

These then are some of the elements that we would like to have included in the comprehensive programme of disarmament. To that end, my delegation intends to participate actively in the preparation of the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Sri Lanka who will present the working paper in document A/CN.10/6.

Mr. GOONERATNE (Sri Lanka): I have the honour, on behalf of the non-aligned group of countries, to introduce the working paper that has been submitted to the Commission entitled "Elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament".

In your introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman, you mentioned the very encouraging responses of Member States in submitting their views on a comprehensive programme of disarmament, and in this connexion one notes the contribution of a large number of non-aligned countries, both in their written responses and in their participation in the debate this week.

The initiative and impetus of the non-aligned countries that led to the convening of the special session devoted to disarmament is being sustained in the work following the special session in forums such as the Committee on Disarmament, here in the Disarmament Commission, in the main Committees of the General Assembly and in other forums where the subject of disarmament is discussed, and it is in this spirit that the present working paper is being submitted to facilitate the work of this Commission. As the text of the non-aligned working paper is not yet ready for distribution to members of this Commission - although I understand it will be shortly - I should briefly like to outline the contents of this working paper.

(Mr. Gooneratne, Sri Lanka)

In the introduction the main point is made that the comprehensive programme of disarmament is not to be identified as an agreement on general and complete disarmament and that at the same time it is not meant to replace the programme of action contained in the Final Document adopted at the tenth special session. Rather, it is meant to supplement and complement what was contained in the Final Document and to provide for a framework of international action.

In the section entitled "Objectives", it is stated that the comprehensive programme of disarmament is meant to maintain and further the momentum generated by the tenth special session with the long-term objective of the realization of general and complete disarmament.

In the next section, entitled "Approach", the urgency of elaborating a comprehensive programme of disarmament is mentioned and also the need for it to contain a phased programme of implementation.

In the section entitled "Principles and priorities", the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament is placed firmly in the context of the fundamental principles contained in paragraphs 25 to 42 of the Final Document and also in accordance with the priorities stated in paragraph 45 thereof.

Then in the section entitled "Disarmament measures", different areas are mentioned wherein the elaboration of measures for the limitation, reduction and elimination of weapons and weapons systems are outlined. The main subheadings under this section are (i) nuclear weapons; (ii) other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons; (iii) conventional weapons; (iv) reduction of armed forces; (v) military expenditures; (vi) nuclear-weapon-free zones. Under these different subheadings are mentioned in varying degrees of particularity areas in which disarmament measures need to be elaborated. I should mention that the order of listing does not necessarily indicate any particular priority. Rather, they were conceived as elements under these different subheadings.

The next section is entitled "Verification", in which the basic principles of verification as contained in paragraph 31 of the Final Document of the special session are referred to, and the need for the establishment of an international machinery for disarmament verification is stated. The elaboration of such machinery, it is suggested, takes into account the proposals on the subject submitted at the tenth special session.

(Mr. Gooneratne, Sri Lanka)

In the next section entitled "International security measures" reference is made to the close relationship that was recognized as existing between disarmament and international security and the section also outlines several measures that were recommended by the General Assembly as being suitable for inclusion in a comprehensive programme of disarmament, including confidence-building measures and the creation of zones of peace.

In the next section entitled "Disarmament and development measures" mention is made of the recognized link between disarmament and development and the establishment of a new international economic order. The need is stressed for the outlining of practical measures for the reallocation of resources released as a result of disarmament. Mention is also made of the need for promotion of international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for economic and social development, especially in the developing countries, in accordance with the principles of General Assembly resolution 32/50.

In the penultimate section called "Adoption and implementation" the working paper strives to set broad time-frames for the adoption and implementation of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. It was felt that without any mention of time-frames this whole study could be a fruitless exercise without any foreseeable result. Hence, it is suggested that the comprehensive programme of disarmament should be elaborated and adopted not later than at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1982.

It also calls for the comprehensive programme of disarmament to provide for agreed time-frames for the implementation of its various phases.

In the final section entitled "Role of the United Nations" stress is placed on the fact that the United Nations has played and should continue to play a central role both in the consideration and the adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and that it should also play the same role in its implementation. It also speaks of the need for the Committee on Disarmament to submit progress reports on the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament to the Disarmament Commission, thus maintaining the organic link between these bodies that was outlined in the Final Document of the special session.

(Mr. Gooneratne, Sri Lanka)

As I said earlier, this working paper is offered in a spirit of trying to facilitate the work of the Commission. The working paper is not meant to signify the totality of the views of the non-aligned countries. When we get to a stage of negotiations there will be several areas in which individual countries will wish to elaborate further, and indeed suggest new ideas. However, at this stage we feel that this working paper could provide a comprehensive basis to facilitate the task of negotiations in the Working Group.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of China who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. CHOU Nan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): At this morning's meeting the representative of Viet Nam made a lengthy speech to hurl vicious slanders against China - not to discuss disarmament questions but to slander China. At the same time the representative of the Soviet Union also made unwarranted attacks against China. We are compelled to make the necessary reply.

In his statement, the representative of Viet Nam confounded truth with falsehood and blatantly attacked China in an attempt to excuse Viet Nam from its aggression and expansionism and shirk its responsibility for disrupting the Sino-Vietnamese relationship and creating armed conflicts on the Sino-Vietnamese border. This is utterly futile.

The Chinese Government and people have always valued the traditional friendship between the peoples of China and Viet Nam and worked actively to make important contributions towards this purpose. To support the Vietnamese people's cause of national independence and construction, the Chinese people, for a long period of time, tightened their own belts and made sacrifices on a national scale - these are facts known to the whole world.

In recent years, to attain regional hegemony, the Vietnamese authorities supported by Soviet social-imperialism, have launched flagrant armed aggression against Democratic Kampuchea and at the same time deliberately poisoned Chinese-Vietnamese relations by continuously provoking disputes on the border between the two countries. They unscrupulously launched numerous

(Mr. Chou Nan, China)

armed provocations and incursions against the Chinese frontiers, causing great losses of lives and property among the Chinese inhabitants there. The Chinese Government and people have shown the utmost forbearance and restraint vis-à-vis these acts. But, aided and abetted by the Soviet Union, the Vietnamese authorities grew bold and took China's forbearance and restraint as a sign of weakness and their provocations and intrusions continued to escalate. Unable to bear such insolence, the Chinese Government was compelled to order its border troops to hit back in self-defence so as to defend its frontiers and check Vietnamese aggression. This was a righteous act in conformity with the principle of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter relating to the inherent right of self-defence of States. All countries that love peace and uphold justice have drawn their own conclusions about the whole affair, and the attempt of the representative of Viet Nam to shift its responsibility can only be in vain.

As of 17 March, China's border troops had all withdrawn to China's territory, having completed their mission. After repeated proposals and efforts made by the Chinese Government, talks between Deputy Foreign Ministers of the two countries started on 18 April. In these talks, the Chinese delegation put forward an eight-point proposal aimed at fundamentally solving the Sino-Vietnamese disputes and safeguarding the peace and security of that region. Recently China decided unilaterally to release and repatriate a group of captured Vietnamese personnel. This once again testifies to the sincerity of the Chinese side. It is to be regretted that the Vietnamese side not only is setting up obstacles in the way of negotiations but has made renewed armed provocations against China in the course of the talks. At the same time, it has continued with its anti-China slanders both at home and abroad. This shows that the Vietnamese side lacks a sincere desire to solve the disputes through negotiations.

The Vietnamese authorities talked glibly about general and complete disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security. If they are really sincere about that, they should proclaim to the world that they will immediately withdraw their armed forces from Kampuchea and Laos and refrain from

(Mr. Chou Nan, China)

providing the Soviet Union with any military bases and installations. That is the least they could do to match their words with deeds. We still sincerely hope that the Vietnamese authorities will curb their steps along the wrong course and change their ways.

It is necessary to point out that an important cause of the Vietnamese authorities' anti-China hostility is that they are encouraged by the Soviet Union to push rabidly a policy of expansionist nationalism and regional hegemonism, a policy which is also the source of present tension in Indo-China and South-East Asia. The Vietnamese authorities have been plotting painstakingly to establish a so-called Indo-Chinese Federation controlled by Viet Nam as a base for their further expansion in South-East Asia.

Viet Nam's expansionist policy meets the needs of Soviet social-imperialism's global strategy, and it is only natural that it has the Soviet Union's strong support. Without Soviet backing the Vietnamese authorities could not conquer Indo-China or proceed to establish their hegemony in South-East Asia. On the other hand, the Soviet Union needs to have Viet Nam as its "reliable outpost" and "strategic base" in order to realize the southward drive in its global strategy, further control the sea route from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean and so link up its strategic deployments in these two oceans.

(Mr. Chou Nan, China)

Thus the big and small hegemonists are working hand in glove. Not long ago, making use of the tension along the Sino-Vietnamese borders, the Soviet Union sent its warships into Da Nang and Cam Ranh Bay. More recently, Soviet military aircraft have begun to use the air base at Da Nang. But the hard facts show that the Soviet and Vietnamese hegemonists are working closely in expanding the armed aggression in Democratic Kampuchea and aggressive and expansionist activities in the whole of South-East Asia and the Pacific region, posing a direct threat to the peace and security of many countries in that region. This inevitably compels the countries subjected to Soviet and Vietnamese aggression, bullying and threats further to unite and struggle together to thwart the expansionism of the Soviet Union and Viet Nam and safeguard the peace and security of that region. We believe that this session of the Disarmament Commission should also contribute towards this just cause.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Viet Nam who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. CU DINH BA (Viet Nam): On Tuesday, 15 May 1979, the Chinese delegation in this Commission said that China was a peace-loving country. According to the Chinese leadership's definition, a country which in February of this year brazenly started a massive war of aggression against Viet Nam is a peace-loving country.

It should be asked whether it was the Chinese leaders' intention to preserve friendship with the Vietnamese people when they mobilized over half a million troops along with thousands of tanks and artillery pieces to launch a brazen attack against Viet Nam, to massacre Vietnamese civilians, mostly old folk, women and children, to raze to the ground provincial capitals, townships, villages and hamlets, to destroy every economic establishment, cultural institution and public utility in Viet Nam's border regions.

By invading Viet Nam the Chinese rulers have totally revealed their expansionism, big-Power hegemonism and reactionary policy, which run counter to the interests of the Chinese people and seriously undermine the traditional friendship between the Vietnamese people and the Chinese people.

(Mr. Cu Dinh Ba, Viet Nam)

By invading Viet Nam the Chinese rulers have opposed the whole socialist system and the national liberation movements, and sabotaged peace and stability in South-East Asia and in the world.

It is the Chinese rulers in Peking who have committed monstrous crimes against the Vietnamese people and against the Kampuchean people.

My delegation totally rejects the slanderous allegations made by the Chinese delegation this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the Lao People's Democratic Republic who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. SOUTHICHAK (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): I am speaking because the representative of China, in exercise of his right of reply, has just referred to my country.

In his statement before this Commission, as well as elsewhere, the representative of China has claimed to be the defender of the medium-sized and small countries. Actually, it is well known to all that those who hold power in China, contrary to their words, which are devoid of meaning, are actually conducting a dangerous policy of expansionism and a war of aggression against medium-sized and small countries, as was the case in the aggression perpetrated last February against Viet Nam and the concentration of troops along the Laotian border, the incursions into Laotian territory, and the constant interference in the affairs of Laos, a small country having just barely 3 million inhabitants.

All these facts are unassailable. There have been arrogant claims concerning the teaching of lessons to sovereign countries, demonstrating the hypocrisy of China and the policies of Peking in Indo-China and South-East Asia.

In order to achieve their objectives in that part of the world, the Peking authorities have not even hesitated to ally themselves with the most reactionary forces and imperialist forces and, against the legitimate aspirations of the Korean people, to call for the maintenance of American troops in South Korea. That is, to say the least, strange on the part of those who have made the withdrawal of foreign troops wherever they may be one of the important pillars of their foreign policy everywhere.

The PRESIDENT: We have now concluded the general exchange of views, and I wish to take this opportunity to thank all delegations for their co-operation, without which we could not have met the time-limit we imposed for this general exchange of views.

I should also like to take this opportunity on my own behalf and on behalf of the other officers of the Commission to thank all those delegations that have expressed very generous sentiments about us.

As we agreed on Monday last, we shall proceed with the next stage of our work in an informal open-ended working group, which will begin its work on Monday afternoon at 3 p.m. I suggest that we meet on Monday afternoon so as to give delegations at least half a day to see the documents to which references have been made.

In this connexion I wish to point out that, in addition to the working paper to which the representative of Sri Lanka has referred, the Secretariat has received a working paper from the delegation of China. Although I had indicated that working papers should be submitted by today, that does not, of course, prevent other delegations that wish to submit papers from doing so. I only request them to do so by Tuesday at the latest, because the working group will best be able to make progress if the working papers are available at the beginning of its deliberations.

I wish also to indicate to members some details about the working group. First, concerning its chairmanship, I have had extensive consultations, and have discussed this matter with the other officers of the Commission. There appears to be a consensus to the effect that we might ask our Rapporteur to chair the meetings of the working group.

During the meetings of the working group interpretation facilities will be available. There will be no records of the discussions, but the Secretariat will be available, and if any conference room papers are to be reproduced it will provide the necessary assistance.

I have referred to documentation. Apart from the Final Document of the special session, and document A/CN.10/1 and Add.1, which contains the replies of Governments to the Secretary-General's communication on the elements of a comprehensive programme, there are various other relevant documents that were available to us even before we started our work here.

(The Chairman)

The officers of the Commission have also discussed the question of the plenary meetings, and here again there seems to be consensus that we should certainly meet once towards the end of next week, and I submit that we do that on Friday morning, 25 May, to hear a report from the Chairman of the Working Group regarding the progress in its deliberations. That does not, of course, preclude the possibility of our meeting in plenary if the occasion warrants it.

Does any member of the Commission wish to make any comments or observations on the points I have indicated with regard to the work schedule for next week?

Since no one wishes to speak, I should like once again, before adjourning, to thank all of you for your co-operation.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.