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ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TO THE THIRTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: We had agreed this morning that we could begin our general statements this afternoon. As far as the draft report is concerned, it has still to be adopted formally, including the sections relating to item 3 concerning a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Members will have a chance to see the final text before it is voted on, but I would crave the indulgence of members in permitting me to depart from the normal procedure of allowing statements to be made after the report has been formally adopted. This is in order that we may complete our work this afternoon.

Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): As we sum up the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission at this session, the Soviet delegation would like to make certain observations with regard to the document concerning the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme.

I should like to point out that delegations have done a certain amount of constructive work and there has been a considerable exchange of views on the question of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Throughout the Commission's work the delegation of the Soviet Union has adopted a constructive position determined by its policy of principle of slowing down the arms race and bringing about disarmament.

The Soviet Union, together with other socialist countries, submitted for consideration at this session a working document (A/CH.10/7) containing what we think are realistic proposals with regard to the question of limiting the arms race and bringing about disarmament, and this document, along with others was adopted as a basis for work on the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme. I should like to indicate certain important points which, in our view, should be included in any comprehensive programme of disarmament. These points were reflected also in the document submitted by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, to which I have just referred.
These important points include the very important principle that should underlie any measures to curb the arms race and bring about disarmament, namely the principle of not impairing the security of any of the parties. This principle is contained in the Final Document adopted at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament which was held last year. Experience accumulated in the sphere of disarmament shows that strict observance of this principle is an essential prerequisite for the effectiveness of negotiations and the viability of agreements on disarmament once they have been worked out.

We are convinced that the elaboration and implementation of nuclear disarmament measures should be carried out in parallel with the strengthening of political and international legal guarantees of the security of States and be indissolubly linked with them. With this in mind we consider that the preparatory work on a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations should be speeded up. The conclusion of such a treaty in accordance with the decisions of the United Nations would be an important step towards preventing the use of force, including the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

We attach considerable significance to the solution of the question of the non-emplacement of nuclear weapons on the territory of States where they are not at present to be found. There was a resolution adopted at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly on this question. We believe that it is necessary to streamline this into a legally binding international treaty. It should be pointed out, however, that unfortunately this matter was not included in the recommendations of the Commission.

It is necessary that new efforts be made on an international scale in order to eliminate military bases from foreign territory and to bring about the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of other States, and we should like to express our regret at the fact that on this important question no consensus has been achieved.
An important step towards the limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons would be taken if the States permanent Members of the Security Council, and also the countries linked with them by military agreements, were to stop expanding their armies and increasing their conventional weapons. As a matter of urgency, we believe, we must undertake international action which would prevent the emergence, development and deployment of a neutron weapon. This question, we believe, should be the subject of talks.

An extremely important condition for the effectiveness of steps in the field of disarmament is the participation in the talks and the agreements emerging from those talks of as broad a range of States as possible, particularly nuclear States and States which possess the most powerful armaments and armed forces. The participation of all nuclear States in efforts to curb the nuclear arms race and the reduction and elimination of all armaments is necessary in order to achieve the total success of this policy. The Soviet Union attaches great significance to the solving of these urgent problems of disarmament, and we will do everything we can to see to it that this is duly taken into account in the future work undertaken on a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

In our view, the recommendations of the Commission contain a number of positive factors having in mind long-term goals in regard to restraining the nuclear arms race and achieving disarmament.

We should like to express our satisfaction at the fact that in the document that has been prepared there is due reflection of a number of our own proposals on questions of nuclear disarmament. The inclusion in a comprehensive programme of the provision for the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons in all their forms and for the gradual reduction of stockpiles up to and including total elimination of such weapons, should promote the earliest possible commencement of negotiations and the attainment of practical understandings on the question of nuclear disarmament.
We note with satisfaction also that the elements of a comprehensive programme have included provisions on the need for the early convening of a world disarmament conference. Such a genuine worldwide international forum would be competent to examine in depth the whole complex of issues connected with disarmament and to take effective measures to curb the arms race and to bring about disarmament.

In connexion with the proposals put forward for establishing international organs for disarmament and for giving them control functions, we should like to enter the following reservation. The question of machinery for negotiations on disarmament, as is well known, was comprehensively considered at the special session of the General Assembly on Disarmament, which reached agreement on an acceptable solution. The existing system of negotiations on the whole is in keeping with the scale and character of the disarmament question, and there is no need to introduce any changes in the decisions of the special session on this question. Many years of experience have shown that agreements on disarmament questions always have their specific features and peculiarities, because for each of them special forms and special methods of control are necessary. This was properly and duly reflected in the Final Document of the special session, which provides that the volume and character of control should be determined by the nature and specific features of the disarmament measures. Therefore, we cannot agree with the proposals for the creation of international organs empowered to carry out verification functions in isolation from specific agreements on measures for controlling armaments and for disarmament.

The discussion that has gone on in this Commission with regard to the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament has been a kind of initial indication of the lines along which we should work towards such a programme. In the course of the discussion there emerged considerable differences in the positions of States with regard to a comprehensive programme, which could not fail to have an effect on the contents of the recommendations prepared by the Commission. It appears that it will be necessary to make much greater efforts in order to bring about agreement between States in their approach to
this question before it is possible to produce a document that would be in keeping with the task and promote progress in the direction of stopping the arms race and bringing about disarmament. The document adopted by the Commission, which is of a recommedatory nature, contains only the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and cannot, of course, be viewed as covering the whole programme. The basis of the programme should be the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, and this is particularly stressed in the relevant provisions of the recommendations prepared by the Commission.

The Soviet delegation is grateful to those delegations present here that have shown their readiness to make a constructive contribution to the carrying out of the work of this session of the Commission and have given support to proposals which are likely to ensure progress in resolving the problems of disarmament. We should like also to express our gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, for the efforts you have made to ensure that the Commission conclude its work and prepare recommendations for the General Assembly in good time.

In conclusion, I should like to state that the present session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission has coincided with the period of active work of concluding the preparation of an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union with regard to the limitation of strategic arms (SALT II). The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction the great amount of interest shown by the participants in this session of the Disarmament Commission in connexion with the forthcoming meeting of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Brezhnev, with the President of the United States, Mr. Carter, in the course of which it is intended to approve and sign the new Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons.
We should like to express our gratitude to those delegations which, in the course of the general debate, have taken a very favourable view of this major event in international life. The Soviet delegation views the statements as confirmation of the great significance of the new agreement for the cause of ending the arms race and bringing about disarmament. This document, the work on which is now at a concluding stage, will inevitably represent a step more significant than any that has ever been taken before to curb the arms race. Indeed this agreement, for several years to come, will create a certain barrier to the further stockpiling and accumulation of the most destructive forms of weaponry. The new treaty undeniably will have a very favourable effect on the international climate as a whole, and no doubt will make it possible to stimulate other talks which are going on at present on, for example, the total cessation of nuclear-weapon testing, the limitation of trade in conventional weapons, and the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. When the treaty comes into force it will mean that in spite of all the difficulties, the process of curbing the arms race is continuing and that disarmament is a genuinely attainable goal. After the entry into force of this treaty there will be a beginning of work on an agreement on SALT III, which will go even further towards curbing the development of new forms of weapons and provide not only for a limitation of the growth of armaments but for an actual reduction of armaments.

Mr. Chairman, we should like to draw your attention and that of the representatives to the fact that we are circulating in the form of a press release, on behalf of the Permanent Mission of the Soviet Union to the United Nations, material containing the statement of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Leonid I. Brezhnev, on the question of SALT, made recently—indeed, quite recently, on 1 June last—in Budapest. That statement sets forth the attitude of the Soviet Union towards the extremely important agreement which is to be concluded in the very near future.
Mr. MORENO (Italy): Mr. Chairman, as we approach the conclusion of our session, I should like first of all to convey to you personally the sincere gratitude of the Italian delegation for the dedication and skill you have shown in the conduct of our work. The successful outcome of our endeavours is due largely to your wise leadership and your intelligent efforts, to which it gives me pleasure to pay a warm tribute.

On this same occasion, may I also extend my thanks and congratulations to the representative of Argentina, Mr. José María Otegui, for his significant performance as Chairman of the Working Group. Of course, we are grateful also to the Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Corradini, as well as all the other members of the Secretariat, for their excellent work.

The very fact that we are about to adopt by consensus in our Commission 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, is particularly gratifying to the Italian delegation, for more than one reason.

The first of those reasons stems from the consideration that this was the first session of our body actually devoted to the examination of substantive matters; we are therefore especially pleased to see that the reconvened United Nations Disarmament Commission has responded favourably to general expectations, demonstrating vitality and effectiveness in discharging the tasks entrusted to it.

The reconstitution of the Disarmament Commission, in which all Member States of the United Nations are represented, was agreed upon at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, with a view to offering the entire international community a new and genuine opportunity to participate in deliberations on matters which need to be debated on a universal basis.

Therefore, we have been encouraged to see that such an occasion has been concretely and opportunely seized by so many countries that have been taking part in our work in a businesslike and co-operative spirit. The active contribution of the five nuclear-weapon Powers assumes, in our view, a special value, since this is the only disarmament forum in which, for the time being, they are all participating.
Beyond these general considerations and feelings — which I am sure are shared by all participants gathered here — my delegation has particular reasons to be gratified by the results of this session, inasmuch as Italy has traditionally and consistently been in the forefront in advocating a comprehensive programme of disarmament negotiations.

Our views have been expressed repeatedly over the past decade, both in the General Assembly and in the Geneva negotiating forum. We have submitted constructive proposals in a number of working papers. The last of these was reproduced in the reply of the Italian Government to the Secretary-General in pursuance of resolution 33/91 A and circulated in document A/CN.10/1.

The reality is that disarmament is a single global challenge which requires not only political will, universal participation and common perseverance, but also, and perhaps above all, a clear and far-sighted understanding of the goal to be reached, as well as a co-ordinated and comprehensive approach to the various steps whereby such a goal must be attained.

Italy in no way underestimates the value or the benefits of specific, partial arms-control and disarmament measures. The long-term perspective must, however, be borne constantly in mind if our efforts are to be infused with a sense of purpose and coherence. In other words, each step along the road to disarmament should be conceived in the framework of a phased and balanced over-all approach, identifying priorities, stressing interrelationships and envisaging a parallel development of disarmament initiatives, confidence-building measures and security requirements. In this context, the document before us constitutes a useful basis for the further action to be taken, we trust, in the near future by the Committee on Disarmament.

We all realize that no consensus document can reflect every single wish, expectation or viewpoint expressed. Many concessions had to be made, in a spirit of compromise and accommodation, during the process of drafting our document, which at the end proved to be the only possible common denominator.
(Mr. Moreno, Italy)

Bearing this in mind, if I may go rapidly through the document, I should like to comment on a few issues which are of particular concern to the Italian delegation.

In connexion with the heading concerning the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, I would recall the position consistently taken and repeatedly expressed by my Government. Italy considers that the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones under appropriate circumstances can play a useful role in promoting disarmament, peace and security. The initiative for establishing such zones should, however, originate with the States of the area concerned and be pursued through agreements freely reached by such States, with due regard to the characteristics of each area and to the need not to prejudice the right of individual or collective self-defence guaranteed in the Charter of the United Nations. The same requirements, may I stress, must apply to the establishment of zones of peace envisaged under the section on "Other Related Measures" of the document before us.
My delegation attaches great significance to the elements of the programme that concern conventional weapons and armed forces.

As the head of the Italian delegation, Ambassador La Rocca, indicated in his statement before this Commission on 15 May, it is the intention of my Government to submit in the near future a memorandum containing concrete proposals for dealing with this issue, and, in particular, with the limitation of international transfers of conventional weapons.

My delegation duly appreciates the references made to the problem of verification methods and procedures, including the reference to the relevant proposals contained in paragraph 125 of the Final Document. May I emphasize once again that disarmament without verification is, in our view, hardly conceivable. For this reason, we feel that the establishment of a global verification organization should be taken into account in the context of a comprehensive programme leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

May I stress our satisfaction at the inclusion in our document of specific mention of the need for "further steps to prevent an arms race in outer space". Italy has recently introduced in the Committee on Disarmament a working paper devoted to this issue as our contribution to ideas for the implementation of paragraph 80 of the Final Document. It is our hope that this problem will receive due consideration, at an appropriate stage, in the relevant multilateral forum.

We are equally pleased to note that under the section concerning disarmament and international security, recognition is given to the importance of strengthening, on a parallel with the disarmament efforts, international procedures and institutions for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations; the peaceful settlement of disputes; the effectiveness of the security system of the Charter; and United Nations peace-keeping. Italy has stressed on many occasions the essential role of such measures in the disarmament process.

Those are some of the remarks I wished to make on specific items included in the document before us. In view of the very limited time at our disposal, I should like to put on record just one final comment of a general nature, also in view of the future steps to be taken in Geneva by the negotiating body.
The document states clearly that all the measures envisaged as elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme should be consistent with the principles set forth in the Final Document of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. For our part, we should like to stress especially the need to prevent any destabilizing effects and to avoid any prejudice to the right of States to undiminished security at each stage of the disarmament process.

I should like to emphasize once again the need for a fair balance between measures of nuclear and conventional disarmament, a need which is not reflected as explicitly as we requested in the document we are going to adopt. The disarmament process, to be comprehensive and world-wide, obviously must embrace gradual, balanced and verified measures for the limitation of weapons of every kind, leading to their reduction and, eventually, to their total elimination in a secure and disarmed world.

Mr. LAI Yali (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Mr. Chairman, now that the first session of the Disarmament Commission is drawing to a close, I should like to say that, under your outstanding chairmanship, this session has been a success.

This Commission was established on the proposal and at the initiative of the non-aligned countries. Following the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the current substantive session of the Commission has provided another important international forum in which the entire United Nations membership participated. The two super-Powers' control over deliberations on the disarmament issue has been further broken. This is in itself a highly significant fact.

At this session, the representatives of many countries made a careful analysis of the current international situation. Seriously concerned over the increasingly tense and complicated situation, they pointed out that the confrontation between the two great nuclear Powers and their arms race posed the most serious threat to mankind; they condemned the policies of aggression and expansion pursued by those two Powers and vigorously demanded that they stop their arms expansion and war preparations and be the first to
carry out genuine disarmament. In so doing, the aforementioned representatives have shown the strong will to safeguard the independence and sovereignty of their respective countries and to maintain international peace and security. No doubt this is of positive significance to the struggle of the people of all countries against a new world war and in defence of world peace.

At this session, the overwhelming majority of representatives have carefully considered the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The representatives of non-aligned countries and many other States have exerted great efforts for the adoption of a better document at the session. The recommendations on the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme to be adopted at the session will reaffirm the correct principles embodied in and the contents of the Final Document of the special session and reflect the reasonable demands and just views of the people of various countries on the disarmament question.

For example, they call for the realization of genuine disarmament, stressing "the special responsibility" in this regard of the two "States with the largest military arsenals". They stress the importance of both nuclear and conventional disarmament and the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament; give prominence to the relationship between disarmament and security; uphold the right of all countries to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes; spell out the need for effective and adequate international verification of disarmament and so on. All these are positive elements conducive to the realization of genuine disarmament, and they should be affirmed and supported.

At the same time, we have noticed that the establishment of this broadly representative Commission is not to the liking of the super-Powers. As a result of their obstruction, the document to be adopted at the session may fail to reflect some correct proposals and viewpoints set forth by many delegations, including those of the Chinese delegation. On the other hand, some negative elements may be introduced. Therefore, the Chinese delegation deems it necessary to state our position of principle and reservations on a number of important questions on the basis of the text of the document available to us now.
The principle of asking the two super-Powers to be the first to reduce their armaments reflects the legitimate demand of the overwhelming majority of countries; it is dictated by the need to maintain international peace and security. In their proposals and statements, the representatives of many countries pointed out that the two super-Powers are "completely different" from the other countries, that "an unprecedented gap exists between the two and the other countries", that their military supremacy poses a serious threat to the security of all other countries and that, therefore, any process of disarmament should begin with the reduction of their "super arsenals".
The document has failed to give full expression to this principle, and it has failed to prescribe specific disarmament measures applicable to the super-Powers. Moreover, according to some people, no distinction is made between the super-Powers and the countries that are subjected to their threats, with the implication that the same responsibilities for disarmament are to devolve on all States alike. This is most unfair and unreasonable. We have repeatedly made it clear that asking the two super-Powers to be the first to reduce their armaments does not mean that the rest of the world is free from all responsibilities. Other countries, including China, should join them in reducing armaments according to reasonable ratios and procedures when substantive progress has been made in the reduction of the arms of the two super-Powers. Any unbiased person will see this principle as being fair, reasonable and practicable.

Nevertheless, we have often heard certain representatives say that this is not in conformity with their principle of so-called equal security. One may ask: how will it be possible to guarantee the "equal security" of all the other countries, which constitute the overwhelming majority? Obviously, only by first reducing the armaments of the super-Powers and eliminating their threat to the other countries can international peace and security be maintained. But they have been stubbornly opposed to this principle. Clearly, they are not concerned about the security of other States, still less what they call "equal security". They are only interested in maintaining their own military supremacy and hegemony. The "non-proliferation" and "nuclear test ban" treaties they have concocted and their proposals on the "cessation of the production of nuclear weapons" and "freezing of the conventional armaments and armed forces of the permanent members of the Security Council", et cetera, are nothing but eyewash and are used as a cover for the consolidation of their own hegemonic positions. We have always been opposed to all this. As pointed out by many representatives, the different international treaties and agreements on disarmament concocted by the super-Powers are all deceptive, unequal and discriminatory in nature. It will be futile for them to try to foist these things on other countries.
The facts have shown that the disarmament question is closely linked with that of security, and no disarmament measure should infringe the independence sovereignty and security of States. A number of representatives have pointed out that disarmament measures must fit in with the current situation and that super-Power aggression and expansion threaten the security of other countries. Therefore, relations among States should be based on the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. No State may carry out aggression and expansion against other States, or seek hegemony.

We have no doubt that the establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-free zones according to the desires of the countries in the regions concerned will be conducive to the realization of the above principles. Many representatives have called for the "termination of all forms of foreign occupation and domination", the dissolution of military blocs, the withdrawal of all foreign forces, the dismantling of foreign military bases, the removal of "grey-area" nuclear threats, et cetera. But none of these important principles and urgent questions has been duly reflected in the document of the session. Many representatives have emphasized the urgency of establishing zones of peace and nuclear-free zones, and have called for the removal of all foreign military presence and the elimination of aggression and intervention from the zones of peace. The Final Document of the special session on disarmament contains explicit provisions to this effect, in which all nuclear States are asked to undertake not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States and nuclear-free zones. Yet our document has failed to make any specific reference to the above important points. All this cannot but be regarded as deficiencies of the document.

In our view, nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament should be given equal importance, and the two should be carried out in conjunction. The same point has been made by many representatives in their statements. This has been reflected in our document to some extent, and that is welcome, but we think the document is still deficient in that, for instance, no concrete measures applicable to the super-Powers have been stipulated in the section on conventional weapons under "disarmament measures".
We have always held that in international relations all countries should be equal, irrespective of their size. We have always been opposed to super-Power manipulation of international affairs. This principle is equally applicable in the disarmament field. That is, all States, big or small, strong or weak, nuclear or non-nuclear, have the right to participate in the resolution of disarmament issues on an equal footing. During this session many representatives have pointed out the equality and independence of all countries, which should abide by the principle of equal sovereign rights; they have stressed the need for the disarmament machinery to be truly free from super-Power control, the need for further democratization of its organization and procedures, the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, the need for the United Nations to be kept informed about progress in all bilateral and multilateral disarmament talks, and the need to keep international opinion fully informed and informed in time about the developments in order to mobilize broad sections of the people to take part in the struggle for disarmament and in defence of peace.

The super-Powers have created all kinds of pretexts and resorted to every possible means to obstruct the adoption of these correct propositions. Further joint efforts have to be exerted by various countries in order to improve the disarmament machinery and enable it to meet the above requirements fully.

The document also refers to the convening of a world disarmament conference. China has repeatedly made clear its position on this question. We will not repeat it here.

The Chinese delegation has participated in this session with a positive and sincere approach. During the whole process we have joined the representatives of most countries in a constructive and co-operative spirit in consultations and deliberations about the disarmament questions which are the
concern of the people of all countries. We have put forward a number of positive ideas and proposals. At the same time, we have carefully listened to and studied the resoaeable proposals and viewpoints put forth by the delegations of the non-aligned and many other countries. This is helpful to us. We have been deeply impressed by their positive and serious attitude and their co-operative spirit. All this is conducive to better mutual understanding and closer friendship. Some representatives have described it as "the spirit of the special session of the General Assembly". We hope that this spirit will be carried forward in our Commission and other disarmament bodies. Of course, there are still many obstacles on the road to genuine disarmament. China will join all the other peace-loving countries in making continued efforts to overcome those obstacles and contributing to the maintenance of international peace.
Mr. BUENO (Brazil): It was not without renewed hopes that, following a decision taken by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, this Commission was reconvened and entrusted with a specific mandate. This was done not only as a means of revitalizing the United Nations machinery on disarmament but also to provide all Member States with a deliberative forum in which they could play an active role in questions affecting the national interests of the world community.

As we come to the end of our work I would hesitate to call this session a complete success. In spite of your untiring efforts, Mr. Chairman, which we whole-heartedly commend, and of a number of constructive initiatives, we are still a long way from meeting the basic requirements to lay out the foundations of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and to stop a trend that continues at a dangerous pace.

The approaches to the main questions for the preparation of such a programme remain as wide apart as they were more than a decade ago. The stalemate on basic issues such as nuclear disarmament and verification seems to explain the gradual shift of emphasis to questions of minor importance. One is even led to believe that for the super-Powers peace has lost its meaning and is now considered as an ideal state of tolerable tensions. By the same token, disarmament negotiations should aim at the establishment of a society in which nuclear weapons represent a permanent guarantee of peace in a world in a tolerable state of poverty.

On these variations we seem to be pursuing something that has become unattainable. Should we abandon the central issues of disarmament for the sake of nuclear deterrence? Are we prepared to accept nuclear weapons as an inseparable part of our environment? While these questions remain unanswered, the absence of political will in the crucial area of nuclear disarmament is only overtaken by the zeal with which attempts continue to be made to shift the emphasis to comparatively minor questions that have a direct bearing on the rights of States to protect their security or that hamper the efforts of developing countries to acquire peaceful technology for their economic and social development.
Thus the prospects of implementing General Assembly resolution 33/62 are dim. We have doubts as to how we can accomplish a comprehensive programme that excludes nuclear disarmament and conforms with the so-called right of States to use nuclear weapons. Nor are we convinced of the advantages of making excessive use of semantics to obtain a consensus without discrediting the prestige of this Organization in world public opinion.

My delegation shared the hopes that with additional efforts the Disarmament Commission could make up for some of the shortcomings of the Final Document.

Whatever the validity of the arguments presented, the main issues continue to be confronted with intransigence by a minority that seems to be unwilling to go beyond the Final Document. We fear that by excessively repeating that document we shall move in circles and curtail the potentialities of a machinery that hardly came into existence.

The document we are about to approve falls short of any modest expectation. The diluted formulations and its significant omissions are self-revealing and give us reason for additional misgivings.

The questioning of certain principles contained in the Final Document and the lack of agreement on the matter at this stage do not contribute to dissipate doubts as to their effective observance in future negotiations. On the other hand, the approach adopted to the question of conventional disarmament is more ambitious and dispenses with some of the basic qualifications one can find in the Final Document. Suffice it to say that every country is made responsible on the same footing for the conventional arms race and is called upon to contribute to its cessation. It is true that disarmament must be promoted on a global and integrated basis, but nuclear-weapon States must accept the undeniable priority of nuclear disarmament and their overwhelming superiority in the conventional field. Concrete undertakings for nuclear disarmament and effective security assurances would then justify more general initiatives for conventional disarmament.

A reasonable list of elements of a comprehensive programme should not fail to identify priorities, if responsibilities are not adequately identified and obligations duly allocated. As a major universal deliberative body the
Disarmament Commission cannot ignore these fundamentals and rely purely on the efficiency of the negotiating body. The enumeration of measures of disarmament without the appropriate necessary qualifications and a clear-cut definition of priorities and responsibilities does not, in our view, justify the amount of work to which we have been subjected.

Given these circumstances, and without prejudice to the deliberations of the Commission, the Brazilian delegation thought it necessary to place on record some of our reflections. At the same time, Brazil will continue to hold out the prospect - dim though it might seem - of closely working for an early agreement on the elements of a comprehensive programme.

**Mr. SUMMERHAYES** (United Kingdom): My delegation trusts that the recommendations on agenda item 3, on which we have worked so hard these last four weeks, will provide a contribution - and I emphasize the word "contribution" - of value when the Committee on Disarmament comes to draft a comprehensive programme of disarmament and, as such, my delegation has supported them in order that the Commission can make a generally accepted report. However, there are certain aspects of these recommendations which we believe should have been reflected differently.

In the first place, there is the question of a feasible sequence of disarmament activities under a comprehensive programme of disarmament. A comprehensive programme will need to take account of the difference in kind between many of the ideas in this paper, which are listed in a rather indiscriminate way in the various sections. We believe that one of the elements recommended should have been an explicit indication that a comprehensive programme of disarmament will need to contain a systematic presentation of disarmament activities according to their relative importance, urgency and feasibility.

We are more concerned, however, that there is no recognition in this report of the fact that for many States in the contemporary world nuclear disarmament can be undertaken only as part of a more general programme of disarmament. On the contrary, paragraph 11 in our paper singles out the
nuclear arms race for first emphasis. On this point our delegation wishes to make an express reservation. The need for a balance between nuclear and conventional disarmament finds expression in the Final Document of the special session, even though this does not come out as strongly as we believe it needs to. My Government made a statement on this point at the conclusion of the special session and has drawn attention to the subject on several occasions since. We supported wording in paragraph 13 which would have made the point clear.

There is another aspect in which paragraph 13 of the paper seems to my delegation to fall short of expressing an important principle of disarmament which, again, has been generally recognized.
We do not consider that the passing reference to the right of each State to security adequately reflects the concept in question. This would have been better expressed by use of language such as that to be found in paragraph 29 of the Final Document, which states that at each stage of a disarmament process the object should be undiminished security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces. We attach much importance to this point.

On paragraph 14 (iv) I wish to record my Government's view that in the reference to a reduction in military expenditures it is understood that these would be conducted on a mutually agreed basis.

My delegation much regrets that the importance of nuclear non-proliferation is not more fully reflected in our paper, in particular since this will be one of the major activities in arms control during the coming year. In accepting the formulation in paragraph 14 (i) 5, therefore, my delegation believes that we should record my Government's view that the paragraphs of the Final Document referred to therein do not fully bring out the importance of current efforts to develop the international consensus on nuclear non-proliferation.

Finally, I should like to express my personal thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Rapporteur for the consideration you have always shown to my delegation and indeed to all of us engaged in the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission.

Mr. Krautzsch (German Democratic Republic): Permit me first of all to thank you, Mr. Chairman, very much for your efforts to lead the work of the Commission to a successful conclusion.

In its first substantive session the Disarmament Commission, in accordance with a mandate of the tenth special session, has begun its work on the solution of an important task - the elaboration of elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The Commission is in the initial phase of achieving a great target. There can be no doubt that the elaboration and the implementation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament must be regarded in connexion with the following basic questions: first, the continuation of the process of détente; secondly, the political settlement of international conflicts,
excluding the use and threat of force; and, thirdly, the immediate initiation of effective measures to end the arms race and of steps for disarmament.

Progress in those fields requires the political willingness and readiness of all States; otherwise there is the danger that the disarmament programme will remain a piece of paper.

The Final Document of the special session on disarmament is, in our view, the basis for the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The core of such a comprehensive programme is without doubt the disarmament measures envisaged. Their elaboration and implementation can and must be based on the principles agreed in the Final Document. Adequate negotiating mechanism exists in the Geneva Committee on Disarmament and the world disarmament conference to be convened. Great importance must be attached to the role of United Nations organs, particularly this Commission.

My delegation holds the view that all the recommendations of the Disarmament Commission to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly must be interpreted according to the letter and spirit of the Final Document. When, for instance, paragraph 13 takes into account the special responsibility of the States with the largest military arsenals, this can only mean, according to paragraph 28 of the Final Document, that the five nuclear-weapon States have the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and, together with other militarily significant States, for halting and reversing the arms race. Even that nuclear Power whose contribution in this Commission was mostly limited to stereotype demands for measures to be taken by others cannot shirk that responsibility. One should also not negate the responsibility of all States to contribute to disarmament.

We regard the catalogue of measures contained in the recommendations as the minimum and only the beginning.

It is with satisfaction that our delegation regards the recommendation on nuclear disarmament in paragraph 14 A (i) 2. The German Democratic Republic stands for the cessation of the nuclear arms race and for the nuclear disarmament of all five nuclear-weapon States. Practical steps should be
taken in the form of concrete proposals submitted to the Geneva Committee on Disarmament, as contained in document CD.4. They should be connected with the elaboration of further political and legal measures to strengthen the security of States, according to paragraph 54 of the Final Document. Clearer language in paragraph 13 of the recommendations would have been desirable in this regard.

The régime for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards system should be strengthened; that is how we understand paragraph 14 A (i) 5. But it would also be important to agree not to deploy nuclear weapons in other countries. Furthermore, measures to prevent the development and production of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, the development and production of the neutron nuclear weapon and of new conventional weapons of great destructive power would have a favourable effect on the cessation of the qualitative arms race; otherwise, arms limitation agreements would easily be undermined by attempts merely to replace obsolete weapon systems by new and even more dangerous ones.

Regional disarmament steps, especially in Europe where the greatest military concentration exists, without doubt have a favourable influence on world-wide disarmament and, thus, on the relations between States.

The same objective could serve the realization of -- as stated in paragraph 14 B 3 -- measures aimed at preventing the use of force in international relations, the most effective of them being the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations.
Apart from the measures mentioned before, I should like to underline the following proposals of the socialist States which, to our regret, are not reflected in the recommendations: no build-up of armed forces or armaments on the territories of other States; dismantling of military bases in foreign territories and withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of other States; simultaneous disbandment of the organizations of the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO pact, beginning with the mutual reduction of military activities and the liquidation of their military organizations.

We also miss a formula in the recommendations expressing the expectation that all States accede to the agreements on arms limitation and disarmament.

We feel it is necessary to reach agreement on those and other disarmament measures to be included in the programme. They are in our view more important than the discussions on the institutional requirements of verification.

In the discussions of the past weeks, the problem of verification of disarmament measures has played a role. Permit me to explain the position of my delegation on the question. Verification is important in order to secure the observance of disarmament agreements. It gives all parties the necessary guarantee that their security is not endangered by their accession to a treaty.

Verification provisions are closely connected with relevant disarmament measures. Paragraph 31 of the Final Document of the tenth special session clearly expresses this interrelationship. A departure from that principle would lead to situations where the question of verification could be misused to prevent disarmament arrangements, as has already been our experience, most regrettably, time and again and even most recently.

Two fundamental demands must be strictly observed: first, disarmament arrangements should contain relevant measures of verification; and, secondly, there can be no verification outside specific disarmament measures. Verification measures have to be outlined in such a way that all parties to the agreement can really participate in them, that is to say, only the parties to the agreement. If it is true that there can be no disarmament without verification, then it is even more true that there can be no verification without disarmament.
We agree with the overwhelming majority of the participants in the discussions of the Commission in rejecting all attempts to go back on the contents of the Final Document of the tenth special session. We should continue our work constructively on the basis of that Final Document. We are convinced that the peoples and the overwhelming majority of States will succeed in achieving further progress in halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament.

Mr. HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia): While using this opportunity to join other members of our Commission in praising you, Mr. Chairman, for the really excellent conduct of our deliberations, I have just a few words to say for the record.

The co-sponsors of document A/CN.10/7 agreed that the paragraph drafted by Czechoslovakia be added and that the joint document be reprinted and circulated as an official document of the Disarmament Commission under the symbol A/CN.10/7/Rev.1.

The formulation added to the document at the request of the Czechoslovak delegation concerns the approach to and behaviour of States in disarmament negotiations and pursues the objective of strengthening the climate of confidence and the constructive character of disarmament negotiations. In its drafting, my delegation proceeded from the decisions of the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, notably the introduction and declaration of the Final Document, as well as from the positions of a number of States expressed in numerous forums dealing with disarmament issues, including the sessions of the Disarmament Commission. The importance that my country attaches to the approach of States to disarmament negotiations was emphasized in the recent May day address by the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Mr. Gustav Husak. In that address, from which I quoted in my statement before the Commission on 17 May, the Czechoslovak President advocated the idea that a document be adopted in the United Nations committing States to concerted efforts for the solution of the pressing issues of disarmament and setting forth specific political principles of mutual co-operation among States in the field of disarmament negotiations.
The purpose of the joint commitment of States would be to create a favourable international climate for the speediest possible achievement of progress in disarmament talks. It is our belief that the addition to document A/CN.10/7 I have mentioned will positively broaden the negotiating basis of our Disarmament Commission, namely, the basis for further negotiation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Mr. BOEHL (Denmark): Congratulations, Mr. Chairman. We have succeeded in producing a consensus document after all. To preserve the United Nations Disarmament Commission as a viable deliberative body distinct from the First Committee, I think this was essential. This success is to a large extent your success. Without the talent, intelligence and sense of purpose which you brought to this difficult task, that result would not have been possible.

It was difficult, of course. It was difficult because we had to find a common denominator for the perceptions of more than 150 countries on vital issues which are closely interrelated with fundamental national security considerations.

It is in the nature of a consensus document that not everybody is or can be completely happy with it. This applies also to my delegation. We should certainly have liked to see much more emphasis placed on the vital objective of non-proliferation, for instance.
On the other hand, we feel that the basic requirements underlying the process to be outlined in the comprehensive programme for disarmament, requirements that are outlined in the section on measures, instil a necessary note of realism into our document. They underline the right of each State to security, the connexion between nuclear and conventional disarmament and the need for adequate measures of verification.

We also note with satisfaction the general recognition of the fact that a successful disarmament strategy must also include disarmament steps in the conventional weapons field.

Having said that, I should just like to say a few words on the future role of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

We have now dealt with the subjects specifically entrusted to this body in the Final Document of the special session that was devoted to disarmament— that is, the elements of a comprehensive programme for disarmament. At our next substantive session, a year from now, we shall take up consideration of the two other main items on our present agenda, which we have not had the time to discuss at this session. It must, we feel, be admitted that these items are very general in nature. If the United Nations Disarmament Commission is to contribute more concretely to progress in thinking on disarmament, then we feel that we should try to have a more focused debate. That could mean the inclusion of one or two more specific aspects of conventional and nuclear disarmament in our deliberations, because we are going to discuss that at our organizational meeting in December next. But I should like at this stage to mention the possibility that we might include in the agenda of the next substantive session, a year from now, the general subject of conventional weapons, including international arms transfers.

We know that these issues are controversial. The discussion we have been having shows that very many disarmament issues are controversial precisely because they concern such vital areas of national policy. But it would seem that this body, which comprises all States Members of the United Nations, would be particularly qualified to engage in a broad general debate on the world-wide issue of disarmament steps in the field of conventional weapons. Anyway, I wanted to mention this idea. There is plenty of time to think about it.
Mr. NORBERG (Sweden): The Swedish delegation wishes to express its satisfaction with the results of this session of the Disarmament Commission. By working out, and reaching a consensus on, the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, the Disarmament Commission will prove worthy of its place in the international disarmament machinery. We believe that the report to the General Assembly is an important document which will offer guidance in future negotiations on a comprehensive programme for disarmament.

On the whole the Swedish delegation considers the document to be a balanced product. There are, however, in the text a few subjects which are of a particular concern to my Government. Of these I should like to mention the question of non-proliferation, concerning which we are pleased to see that the agreement in the Final Document has been reflected in the text. We would, however, like to underline the importance we attach to the IAEA safeguards and the further strengthening of these. In this context my delegation wishes to emphasize the obvious importance of resolving the energy problems and meeting the energy needs of the developing countries from appropriate available resources.

I should also like to refer to a subject on which my delegation has expressed its views on various occasions at the meetings of the Commission – namely, the institutional question. We believe that when the long-term programme of disarmament is considered, the institutional requirements for the full implementation of this programme must be taken into account. We cannot expect existing structures to take on all the new needs that will make themselves felt once the process of real disarmament gets under way. The Swedish delegation would therefore have preferred a wording that clearly spelled out the need for consideration of future international requirements, including the establishment of an international disarmament organization. We shall continue to work in this direction.
Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Regarding the comprehensive programme of disarmament, the Government of Mexico, in its reply to the Secretary-General on 15 March, said, inter alia, that:

"the elaboration of the programme must be continuously guided by the provisions of General Assembly resolution S-10/2 and the Final Document incorporated in it, which constitutes the most complete instrument on the question of disarmament which the United Nations has thus far been able to adopt and which, furthermore, was adopted by consensus at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament." (A/CN.10/1, p. 39)

In the statement I made in this chamber two months later, when the exchange of opinions took place, during the first week of our work, I expressed the view of my delegation that it was imperative that

"at the end of this session the Commission be in a position to transmit, incorporated in its report to the Assembly, the elements whose preparation has been entrusted to us." (A/CN.10/PV.10, p. 31)

As this session is about to come to an end I note with profound satisfaction that the first two purposes to which I have referred have been fully attained. In the report we shall be adopting shortly, there will be included recommendations adopted by consensus which, with three exceptions on which it has not yet been possible to agree, cover all those elements that can be considered as basic to a comprehensive disarmament programme.
(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In addition, these recommendations, as is shown by a consideration of these elements, are strictly in line with the provisions of the Final Document adopted at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The fact that it has been possible to achieve this result and to do so in the four brief weeks that we have devoted to deliberations and negotiations is due largely to the wise leadership provided by Mr. Vellodi, to whom I now pay a tribute on behalf of my delegation. But it is also due to the spirit of conciliation and international co-operation which unquestionably has prevailed throughout our debates and of which all members of the Commission have often given proof. My delegation ventures to hope that the same spirit will prevail both in the General Assembly, which will doubtless be considering our recommendations before transmitting them to the Committee on Disarmament, and in the Committee on Disarmament itself, when it begins to consider the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

My delegation believes that that programme was defined in paragraph 109 of the Final Document as a programme

"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 in a world in which international peace and security prevail and in which the new international economic order is strengthened and consolidated". (General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 109)

Mr. van DUUREN (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, we are coming to the end of four weeks of deliberations under your able chairmanship, Mr. Vellodi, with the assistance of the other officers of the Commission - and in this context I should like especially to refer to the Rapporteur, Mr. Otegui, who presided over the drafting group - and we have been able by consensus to arrive at certain conclusions for inclusion in our report to the General Assembly. This is cause for satisfaction. Furthermore, we have agreed to record in the report those points on which we could not agree.

The mandate of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, namely, "to consider the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, to be considered as recommendations", ab initio circumscribed the task before us, since it meant that it had to take place within the framework of the Final Document adopted at the tenth special session devoted to disarmament. As a result - and we have all been aware of this - in our deliberations many points have been made that had also been advanced
during the special session devoted to disarmament and during its preparation. This is also reflected in our report where wording is taken from the Final Document or refers to certain of its paragraphs.

Since, however, we have been dealing with "elements", it has in the nature of things not been possible to include all the various ideas and qualifications that are contained in and together make up the balanced whole of the Final Document. As a result, discrepancies are inevitable. Wherever these may have arisen, I should like to make it clear that, as far as the Netherlands is concerned, the text of the Final Document will carry more weight. We would not want the present document to serve as a kind of authorized interpretation of the Final Document for the purpose of formulating the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Having said, my delegation will join in the consensus on the document before us:

Mr. PISHER (United States of America): I believe this may be the most appropriate occasion to put on record the appreciation of the delegation of the United States of the work done here and, when necessary, at Geneva over the past 10 years by Assistant Secretary-General Rolf Bjornerstedt. We are sorry to learn that Mr. Bjornerstedt - who, at the request of the Secretary-General, extended his United Nations service once more in 1977 - will be returning to Sweden this summer. Under his able direction, the Disarmament Division of the United Nations Secretariat has grown from a small facilitative staff to what is now, in fact as well as in name, a United Nations Centre for Disarmament.

As a nuclear physicist and the first Deputy Director of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), Mr. Bjornerstedt came to the United Nations with an unusual combination of technical expertise, political perspective and management skill. A moral commitment to progress in arms control tempered with a realistic appreciation that the wheels of this august institution, the United Nations, grind as slowly as those of any national bureaucracy has made of Mr. Bjornerstedt an international civil servant in the highest tradition of his countryman, Dag Hammarskjöld - patient, but ever purposeful. We shall miss him.

The United States delegation wishes to make two observations with respect to the recommendations on the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament that we now have before us. First, the treatment of non-proliferation
in the document is, in the judgement of the United States delegation, quite inadequate in view of the critical importance of halting the further spread of nuclear weapons. The United States delegation is disappointed that, for example, no reference is made to the principles contained in paragraph 36 of the Final Document adopted at the special session devoted to disarmament. In view of the limited time available today, I shall recall, but shall not now repeat, the remarks made on this subject by Mr. Leonard on 30 June 1978 at the special session devoted to disarmament. We shall most certainly return to this point in the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva.

Secondly, the United States views the treatment of disarmament and development and the reduction of military expenditures as inadequate. Clearly, there can be no basis for negotiation on the reduction of expenditures or the reallocation of that expenditure to development without reliable information about what States are actually spending or adequate methods for comparing expenditures internationally and verifying compliance with whatever reductions are agreed to. The absence of any reference to these conditions as well as to their relationship to the general question of disarmament constitutes a serious gap, especially in the light of the extensive and valuable work already under way and undertaken in this area by the United Nations.

But, notwithstanding these two negative notes, which are observations, not reservations, I should like to end up on a positive note and express to you, Mr. Chairman, the warm appreciation of the United States delegation on the masterful fashion in which you have conducted the work of the Disarmament Commission at this, its first, substantive session since its reconstitution. The document that, I hope, we are just about to adopt by consensus - a consensus in which the United States will happily participate - stands as a tribute to your patience, skill and determination.
Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): We are about to conclude our work, and the French delegation feels that we have achieved good results. You deserve considerable credit for this, Mr. Chairman, and we wish to express our gratitude for your leadership and talents.

We consider the results satisfactory because we have largely been able to complete our primary task. The recommendations that we have adopted include all the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme, and the list we are proposing appears to me to be comprehensive, especially if we refer to the text we have adopted. I quote from paragraph 14:

"The comprehensive programme of disarmament should encompass the following measures as envisaged in the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document of the special session." (A/CN.10/II/CRP.1/Rev.2)

In fact we adopted this set of measures unanimously. Other proposals have been presented which do not appear in the Final Document. We were unable to reach agreement on them. There is no reason for surprise at this, especially if we bear in mind the general considerations which should guide the disarmament enterprise. The President of the French Republic, speaking last year in the General Assembly, set forth the fundamental ideas on which our approach is based. As he said, every State has a legitimate right to security, and disarmament must be the business of all. That is the justification for and the task of our Commission. The disarmament which lies ahead should take into account regional situations. Finally, disarmament should be of benefit to everyone -- whence the link between disarmament and development. The absence of a consensus on the first of the points set forth in paragraph 19 of our document has arisen because of unfamiliarity with the conditions and requirements of security of regional conditions. In one part of our world nuclear weapons constitute an element making for balance and security. The problem posed by the use or the threat of use of these weapons is a problem which must be answered by nuclear disarmament, as stated in paragraph 56 of the Final Document.
The French delegation regrets that the compromise we proposed on this subject - we suggested the use of the language of paragraph 57 of the Final Document - was not adopted. That was a notable concession which we made, because that paragraph had been the subject of a reservation on the part of the delegation of France at the tenth special session. On the second point mentioned in paragraph 19, the proposal made implied further commitments which we felt were unjustified, bearing in mind the existence in our document of a general provision on the limitation and reduction of conventional weapons. On the third point, finally, the measures proposed were to be finally put into effect during the last stage of general and complete disarmament. That was the general thrust of the proposal put forward by my delegation in the interest of reaching a compromise.

These considerations lead me to mention once again the general considerations which should orient a comprehensive programme of disarmament. The French delegation and a large number of other delegations attach the utmost importance to those considerations, for they must guide a comprehensive programme and put it into perspective. Without such conditions being met, the disarmament enterprise is inconceivable. We put forward these considerations in the statement we made on behalf of the nine member States of the European Community on 16 May 1979. The considerations are as follows:

"The disarmament measures making up such a programme should be balanced in such a way that the right of every State to security would at all times be guaranteed; an equal security can be assured at a lesser level of armaments;

"The criteria for security for States vary according to their geographical position. A global programme must therefore, to be realistic, bear in mind the needs of a regional approach;

"In addition to that regional balance, we believe that it would also be desirable to maintain a balance between the measures to be adopted, particularly between nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament.

"Adequate verification measures, making use of the progress of the most modern technology, should be provided in order to strengthen security and confidence and to ensure respect for disarmament measures by all the parties concerned." (A/CM.10/PV.12, p. 17)
Together with a number of other delegations, we have tried to put these proposals into our document. Paragraph 13 reflects them to some extent but not to a sufficient extent, in our opinion. The French delegation in particular was somewhat surprised that the primary and paramount idea of balance is not reflected in this paragraph. Our surprise clearly will be shared by all Governments that have any experience at all of disarmament negotiations or arms control. The French delegation has accepted the language of paragraph 13 in the interest of compromise, but it was a concession which we were very reluctant to make.

I would add that the same desire to bring about an understanding guided my delegation during the adoption of the point on the halting of nuclear tests. The silence of the French delegation on that point does not mean that my delegation has changed its attitude to this problem. We believe that the halting of nuclear tests can be part of an effective nuclear disarmament process, but because that process has not yet begun the halting of tests does not make a significant contribution to the problem of nuclear weapons and their proliferation.
We are pleased that the same spirit of compromise has prevailed throughout our debate and that our debate has been marked by calm, restraint and courtesy. We are convinced that the very substantial conclusions which we have reached and the very serious commitment that we have made to the objective of comprehensive disarmament are a good omen and confirm the momentum provided last year by the General Assembly to the disarmament enterprise under the sponsorship of the United Nations.

Mr. EDMONDS (Canada): Mr. Chairman, upon this, the final day of the first substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, I should like, first of all, to congratulate you for the capable and skilful manner in which you have chaired our meetings and, most particularly, for the remarkable feat you have accomplished in producing a draft text on a comprehensive programme of disarmament which has proved capable of adoption by consensus. I should also like to congratulate the other members of the Bureau - and particularly, our Rapporteur, Mr. Ortegui of Argentina - for their notable contribution to the successful end result of our strenuous efforts and negotiations. I would be remiss in not mentioning also the ever-efficient services provided to us by all members of the Secretariat who have been working with us in this Commission.

The fact that we have been able to draft and adopt by consensus - albeit with certain national reservations - the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, has justified the hopes of those who participated in the special session devoted to disarmament that this revived Commission might play a useful role in the deliberative process so necessary to the ongoing task of disarmament negotiations. I am sure that this document will prove helpful in providing guidance to the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva and to the other negotiating bodies in establishing work programmes over the long-term. I make this comment because the Canadian delegation interprets this document as being a framework outline of the tasks to be accomplished before the millennium goal of general and complete disarmament can be achieved. Specifically,
I think we have been wise not to attempt to establish any time-frames for particular measures of disarmament and it was also prudent that we did not delineate any priorities apart from those recorded in paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the special session. We all realize that these various disarmament measures must be negotiated and implemented in a phased, balanced and equitable manner, but it is perhaps better to let the negotiators in Geneva establish the most appropriate time-table for putting into effect particular arms control measures in the fields of nuclear and conventional weapons.

On particular parts in the text, we have noted with satisfaction that included in the measures related to nuclear weapons was a reference to the "cessation of ... the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes". As delegations will be aware, this idea, put forward by the then Canadian Prime Minister at the tenth special session, was approved in concrete form by the General Assembly through its adoption, by a preponderant majority, of resolution 33/91 H. On the other hand, the Canadian delegation greatly regrets that more concrete language concerning the need to strengthen both the existing non-proliferation régime and the existing international safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) were not included. The absence of any specific reference to "effective international safeguards" is particularly regrettable because explicit reference to the IAEA safeguards system was included in resolution 33/3 adopted last year, without a vote, by the General Assembly and, of course, in resolution 32/50 to which reference was made by my delegation this morning.

On other points in the text, we would merely wish to reiterate the views of a number of Western delegations concerning the items which have been specifically excluded from the consensus nature of this document by virtue of their having been mentioned in paragraph 19. Their inclusion in the main part of the document would not have been acceptable to the Canadian delegation. Further, while mention has been made, in paragraph 16, to
possible negotiations on disarmament being conducted on a regional basis, we would have preferred explicit mention of them under the sections entitled "Related Measures" or "Other Measures", as we believe that regional disarmament negotiations are perhaps the ones most likely to succeed in the near-term. Again, to reiterate a point made by the Canadian delegation on a couple of occasions during the informal drafting sessions, we should like to have seen the reference to "peacekeeping operations under the auspices of the United Nations" appear in that form in the document. Peacekeeping operations - an activity in the field of maintaining international peace and security not envisaged in the United Nations Charter - is currently the only successful activity of the United Nations in this general domain and it is slightly misleading to refer to these operations - as has been done in this document - as "United Nations peacekeeping in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations".

With these specific comments, Mr. Chairman, I should like to conclude my delegation's statement with congratulations to you and all the other participants in the endeavours of these past four weeks for their signal accomplishment in producing a consensus document. My comments should thus be considered as remarks rather than reservations on the text of this paper which has outlined the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

Mr. MESHARRAPA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, at the end of this session of the Disarmament Commission, I am very happy to convey to you my appreciation and thanks for your tireless efforts in preparing this meeting and for your attempts to reconcile differing points of view. I should also like to thank the Rapporteur, Mr. José María Ortegui of Argentina, for his tireless efforts in his work as Chairman of the Drafting Committee. I should also like to thank the members of the Secretariat who have helped us so much in the performance of our task.
My delegation wishes to explain its views on document A/CN.10/PV.21, on the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. With respect to the part on nuclear weapons, we should like to achieve a consensus on the need for affirming the total prohibition of the use or the threat of the use of nuclear weapons, because that is the best guarantee of saving mankind from mass destruction.
I should like to express, therefore, the regret of my delegation at the failure to arrive at a clear-cut agreement on this subject. We do hope that, following some developments in the thinking of nuclear Powers, we will succeed in bringing about an agreement which will be binding on the various parties.

With regard to the question of proliferation, the document has avoided mentioning the term "non-proliferation", the need to affirm non-proliferation, vertical and horizontal, the need to stress the balance of responsibilities between the nuclear Powers and the non-nuclear Powers, the need to respect the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and also the need to consolidate the various concepts contained in that treaty as a fundamental basis for international security and security in different regions, particularly delicate regions such as the Middle East and Africa, whose geographical situation makes it necessary for all the different elements of the region to adhere to the treaty and to commit themselves scrupulously to apply its provisions.

However that may be, my delegation will be presenting new detailed and specific ideas on the subject at the second session in 1980, particularly with regard to the need to differentiate between countries that have signed the treaty, like Egypt, and countries which have refused to do so, like Israel.

With regard to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, my delegation hoped that the document would clearly reflect the importance of creating such zones and the need for the nuclear Powers to respect their status, as well as the role of the Security Council in this matter as mentioned in paragraph 62 of the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly.

With regard to conventional weapons, the view of my country on paragraph 2 of the section regarding conventional weapons is that a reduction of weapons and armed forces should be brought about within the framework of general and complete disarmament. Similarly, reference should have been made to the responsibility of countries possessing powerful armed forces with regard to the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces.
My delegation wishes to express its disagreement with regard to the language on the arms race in outer space, particularly in the matter of defensive and offensive arsenals. My delegation would have liked to see the paragraph contain assurances that measures will be extended to space weapons. What we have achieved in those meetings is relatively much less than what we achieved at the special session on disarmament, and we hope that the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva will be able to continue its efforts to conclude work on the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme and to enter the executive phase of that programme.

After all these efforts, we need to ensure the political will of States, particularly the nuclear States, so that we can indeed enter the executive phase of disarmament under effective international control.

Mr. OGISO (Japan): Mr. Chairman, I would like to express the appreciation of my delegation to you for your excellent conduct of the work of the Commission. Without your able chairmanship it would have been extremely difficult for the Commission to reach the consensus on the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament.

My delegation would like to make the following statement on the draft recommendations before us, which are soon to be adopted by a consensus in which my delegation is prepared to join.

Paragraph 19 of the draft recommendations refers to three items on which consensus was not reached. I wish to state the position of my delegation on these items for the record.

With regard to the "Prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", referred to in paragraph 19.1, my delegation has pointed out on several occasions that the inclusion of such an element in the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament under the present political and military realities of the world would risk destabilizing the international military balance in a way which might bring about results directly contrary to the goal of strengthening international peace and security.
My delegation, therefore, has expressed, and still maintains, its opposition to the inclusion of this element in the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

As to the "Dissolution of military alliances and the dismantling of military bases", as referred to in paragraph 19.2, my delegation considers that this could only be envisaged after general and complete disarmament under effective international control is obtained, and that, in the present international situation, it will weaken rather than strengthen the security of some States.

My delegation, therefore, cannot accept the inclusion of the element in the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

As to the prohibition of the emergence of new conventional weapons of great destructive power, referred to in paragraph 19.3, my delegation shares the view of other delegations that the concept of "conventional weapons of great destructive power" is vague and gives rise to confusion in its implementation.

My delegation therefore cannot agree to its inclusion in the comprehensive programme of disarmament.
As to the element contained in subparagraph 14 A (i) 5, "Further steps to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 65 to 71 of the Final Document", my delegation would have preferred to have a clear-cut reference to the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime, including International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, in the comprehensive programme of disarmament. However, my delegation accepted the present formula as a compromise.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in the general statement I made on 16 May I proposed that some reference be made in the document to be adopted to the need for avoiding political propaganda when formulating the comprehensive programme. I regret that that proposal, which I am sure would meet the desire of the general public outside this building, was not adopted. I cannot help but feel that our experiences over the past four weeks have only verified the point I made. I hope that future deliberations and the implementation of the comprehensive programme of disarmament, the objective of which is "to open a process of genuine disarmament" (A/CN.10/II/CRP.1/Rev.2, para. 8), will not be hampered by the practice of political campaigning.

It is the hope of my delegation that in the future work on the formulation of the comprehensive programme of disarmament due consideration will be given to the points I have made in the present statement.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): Let me begin my short statement by saying that my delegation approves of the content and the spirit of the recommendation which the Commission is going to adopt today. I am sure that these recommendations, when considered and possibly further improved by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth regular session, will assist in an appropriate manner in the elaboration of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament by the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva.

I should like at this time, Mr. Chairman, to commend your personal efforts and the expertise demonstrated in the working out of the recommendation of the Commission. My delegation is also grateful to the Rapporteur for his efforts in narrowing the differences among delegations.
I should like also to express my delegation's satisfaction at the fact that a number of the provisions in the proposal in document A/CN.10/7/Rev.1, of which Bulgaria is a sponsor, were found to be an appropriate basis in the formulation of the recommendation of the Commission.

At the same time, I should like to deal briefly with some points on which I think we could have better formulations.

The Bulgarian delegation is of the opinion that under the subtitle covering the prohibition of the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction a reference should be made to the prohibition of nuclear neutron weapons. The neutron weapons issue has undoubtedly become one of the most important and complex issues in disarmament negotiations. There are many good reasons for this, which I do not feel it appropriate to enumerate now. In this connexion I should like only to recall the communiqué adopted at the meeting of the Committee of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Warsaw Treaty Member States held in Budapest on 14 and 15 May 1979, which states that "of particular danger" to détente is "the revival of the plans for development and deployment of neutron weapons" (A/34/275, para. 4).

As is well known, the socialist countries have submitted in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, deployment, proliferation and use of nuclear neutron weapons. In this respect, my delegation would have welcomed eagerly the inclusion in the comprehensive programme of disarmament of a specific reference to the prohibition of neutron weapons. However, in a spirit of compromise we accept the broader text aimed at preventing the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, on the understanding that this includes neutron weapons also.

We had a lengthy and very useful discussion on the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and the progressive reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery. My delegation would like to point out that the recommendation of measures in this field with the goal of averting the danger of nuclear confrontation should be supplemented by provisions aimed at strengthening the international legal guarantees of the security of States.
In a number of United Nations documents of recent years States Members of the United Nations have stressed the link between the issues of the non-use of nuclear weapons and the security of States. Particularly eloquent in this respect are resolution 32/155, the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which was devoted to disarmament, and resolution 33/71 B.

The bilateral agreement on measures to reduce the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, and the similar agreements on the prevention of the accidental outbreak of nuclear war between the Soviet Union and France and Great Britain respectively, have undoubtedly contributed to the establishment of an atmosphere conducive to the continuance of the process of strengthening the security of States. However, those measures, important as they are, do not solve the whole problem of the security of States. Moreover, not all nuclear States are ready to accept the obligation of preventing the outbreak of a nuclear conflict.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the process of nuclear disarmament, prone, as it is, to numerous complications, should be backed up by effective and comprehensive measures to strengthen the security of all States. One appropriate way of reaching that goal is by concluding a world agreement on the non-use of force in international relations. In the statement of my delegation on 17 May we made the following suggestion:

"Concurrently with effective measures which can lead to gradual progress in disarmament, it is also necessary to accelerate the elaboration of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. Such a treaty will give additional, firmer political and legal guarantees to the security of all States." (A/CN.10/PV.15, p.7)

Another point of concern to the Bulgarian delegation is the tendency observed in some delegations to request the establishment of new international institutions and bodies on disarmament. The position of my Government on this issue is one of principle. My Government took an active part in and fully endorsed the work of the General Assembly at its first special session.
devoted to disarmament. We are satisfied with the United Nations
disarmament machinery which has been created in accordance with the decisions and
resolutions of the special session. We are convinced that the United Nations
can play its role in disarmament matters quite efficiently within the
framework of the existing machinery given the existence of the political
will of all States. To embark on a new track — that is, to suggest new
disarmament institutions — would only distract the attention of Governments
instead of concentrating it on some practical lines in the sphere of
disarmament, and would impede the achievement of real progress in disarmament.
Mr. ANDERSON (Australia): My delegation has been pleased to participate in this first substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, during which the Commission has, despite difficulties, fulfilled its role as a deliberative body in producing a list of elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament, to be elaborated later in the negotiating forum of the Committee on Disarmament.

Congratulations are due to you, Mr. Chairman, for the very important contribution you have made in the achievement of a consensus paper. We pay a tribute also to the efforts of the Rapporteur and the other officers of the Commission. We likewise appreciate the contributions that have been made by many delegations in the achievement of this result.

Turning to the paper, I shall not at this late hour attempt a comprehensive commentary but simply note that there are some formulations which do not fully meet Australia's position. These include some references to nuclear issues. The most important of these is that concerning the vital issue of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, to which we should have wished to see much greater weight given in our deliberations. The view of my delegation, which is well known, is that the most authoritative agreed language on non-proliferation and that which enjoys the broadest support of the international community is the language contained in the Final Document of the special session. We greatly regret that specific reference to the non-proliferation régime has not been made in the present text, but we interpret the formulation in new paragraph 14A (i) 5, with its reference to paragraphs 65 to 71 of the Final Document, as recognition of the role already played by the existing non-proliferation régime. We fully endorse the paper's call for the further strengthening of these arrangements.

I should add that Australia fully appreciates and supports the need for strengthening international co-operation for the promotion of the transfer and utilization of nuclear technology for economic and social development, especially in the developing countries, in accordance with the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document, which, of course, provides inter alia for such co-operation to go forward under agreed and appropriate international safeguards applied through the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on a non-discriminatory basis.
Ms. PEACLE (New Zealand): The New Zealand delegation shares the general satisfaction at the fact that we have been able to reach agreement on recommendations to the General Assembly concerning agenda item 3. That we have been able to do so is in large part due to your efforts, Mr. Chairman, and we wish to pay a tribute to the way in which you have conducted this session. We were especially impressed by the way in which you produced the draft report last night in very trying conditions. We wish also to express our appreciation to the Rapporteur, particularly for his work as Chairman of the Working Group.

We must, however, express some disappointment at the lack of debate in this Commission, which was, after all, established as a deliberative body. As we said in our opening statement, we had hoped that the Commission would hold a reflective discussion of the constituent elements of a comprehensive programme. Instead, we began to negotiate almost immediately - sometimes without pausing for much reflection.

I turn now to the recommendations in A/CN.10/II/CRP.1/Rev.1. There are a number of paragraphs of which we would have preferred different formulations, but which we are prepared to accept in a spirit of compromise. However, we wish to express one specific reservation on the question of non-proliferation. We do not believe that this important subject has received the attention it deserves. It is a matter of regret to my delegation that in a list of measures to be incorporated in a comprehensive programme of disarmament it has not been possible to mention the word "non-proliferation". For us the provisions of paragraphs 65 to 71 of the Final Document of the special session represent the minimum as an acceptable formulation. We look forward to a full discussion of this subject at a future session of the Commission, at which we expect that particular elements of the comprehensive programme will be subjected to detailed examination and debate.
Mr. PFIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): First and foremost, I should like to express the great satisfaction of my delegation at the fact that the Commission will be able to agree by consensus on a report to be submitted to the General Assembly. I think it is of crucial importance that we have been able in our deliberations to stick to the mandate given us in the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament.

This result certainly reflects on the efforts of all members of the Commission, but it is in the first place due to your untiring efforts, Mr. Chairman, in guiding the Commission's work, your patience and your almost unlimited resourcefulness. But these are characteristics of your personality which are by no means new to me, as I had the privilege to enjoy close and for me very helpful co-operation with you during my assignment to your great country. Allow me to put on record the sincere gratitude of my delegation for your work. We should also like to thank the Rapporteur, Mr. Otsuji, for his contribution to the success of this session.

The document which we shall be adopting today contains the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament on which the Commission has been able to achieve consensus. In my view, this area of consensus is very large. It encompasses virtually all aspects to be dealt with in the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament and it is a good rendition of the fundamental agreement reached at the special session. I am certain that it will provide a good contribution to the work of the Committee on Disarmament on this issue, work which, I hope, will begin in the near future.

The consensus reached today involves a give and take, in which not all aspirations could be fulfilled. As far as my delegation is concerned, the text falls short of our own expectations on a number of points and, as we have heard, this feeling is shared by others.

The position of my Government has been laid down in working paper A/CN.10/8, which my delegation, together with a number of States, introduced during the work of the Disarmament Commission. We are satisfied to note that this working paper, together with the other working papers, has been included in the annex to the recommendations. These documents will form the basic material for the further action to be taken by the General Assembly and, subsequently, by the Committee on Disarmament.
I now turn to some points which, in my delegation's view, need additional comments in order to place our position on record.

First, the concept that in the disarmament process measures in the various fields are interrelated, particularly between the nuclear and the conventional fields, and must be balanced so as to ensure undiminished security for all concerned and the stability of the disarmament process itself has not been adequately reflected in the recommendations.

There are two other points. The definition of disarmament as a term covering all aspects of arms control and disarmament has not been retained. We regret it, because we fail to see how we can agree on disarmament measures if we are not also making efforts to reach arms control measures in the first place, whenever they seem within reach. They are important and their usefulness should not be underestimated. Likewise, we find that a reference stating that the order in which the measures are listed does not prejudice either their priority of substance or their priority of treatment is necessary and should have been included for the sake of clarity.
As far as the agreed text is concerned, we find the wording on non-proliferation quite weak. We would have preferred the formula suggested by us on the "strengthening of the non-proliferation régime, including the strengthening of IAEA safeguards". We deplore that this Commission could not find a way to give the policy of non-proliferation the clearest and unambiguous expression that it deserves.

My delegation, together with others, has not been able to accept certain other proposals, and I feel in duty bound, particularly towards the delegations which made these proposals, to point out briefly the reasons for that.

First, the prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons does not seem to us a conceptual approach likely to contribute in a useful way to solving the problem arising from the existence of nuclear weapons while these weapons still exist, as they do, in the context we all know.

As far as the legal aspect is concerned, we think that the best guarantee against their use is the Charter of the United Nations and its general prohibition of the use or threat of use of force. And by "force" we understand all and any kind of weapons.

As far as the political aspect is concerned, the best way to assure non-use of force seems to us to be responsibility, co-operation and restraint in international relations. As far as the disarmament aspect is concerned, we think that nuclear arms control and disarmament measures should address the core of the problem and we think that that avenue is more likely to lead to practical results. In the prevailing conditions we see no usefulness for steps that would impair the right to individual and collective self-defence as enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

Secondly, much the same reasoning prevented us from agreeing to the proposed dissolution of military alliances and other measures contained in that proposal. We consider that security and stability are not only a necessity in themselves but that they are even more necessary during a dynamic process of actual progress towards general and complete disarmament. For us, in our given situation this stability and security are achievable only in the framework of a collective self-defence alliance; other countries or regions may
be in a different position. At the same time, we and the other members of the
alliance are co-operating in the effort towards disarmament and we do not share
the view that an alliance hinders disarmament; quite to the contrary, it is
the basis from which we seriously consider and carry out disarmament measures
as a practical political reality.

Thirdly and finally, a word on the conventional weapons of what have
been called "great destructive power". It has rightly been pointed out before
that most modern weapons - and I might add some quite old-fashioned ones -
have great destructive power. We can deplore that state of affairs. But
when we negotiate on disarmament in an international forum we must first define
the subject of our negotiations in a clear and practical way. There
is no such definition, nor have attempts been made to elaborate and introduce
one. In these circumstances, I have not found it possible to recommend
acceptance of the proposal to my Government.

Having said that, I should like to renew my Government's commitment
that it is ready, as before, to explore every avenue in making progress towards
disarmament. However, we think that it is in the interest of businesslike
and successful negotiations to discuss not only the subjects of easy agreement
but even more so those points on which each of us faces real difficulties and
problems. Such an exchange can only help to pave the way for more far-reaching
understanding.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for the outstanding efforts you have
undertaken to keep things moving to an altogether successful end. You made
it possible for the reconstituted Disarmament Commission to have a good start.

Mr. SOULIOTIS (Greece) (interpretation from French): I should like
to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your efforts in preparing the document before
us and to congratulate you on it.

Animated by a spirit of compromise and co-operation, as we said in our
first statement, we shall participate in the adoption of this document by
consensus. However, I must state that my delegation would have preferred
a more comprehensive formulation of the texts of paragraphs 11 and 13. In our
view, paragraph 11 as now drafted does not reflect the balance between nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament. The same remark goes for paragraph 13, the text of which does not adequately reflect the right of States to security. My delegation has repeatedly stressed that in the past, and attaches great importance to it.

Mr. HAIDAR (India): Although it might sound somewhat unusual, I feel I should join with the other delegations in expressing to you, Mr. Chairman, our deep gratitude for the manner in which you have conducted the work during this session. Needless to say, it is a matter of great happiness for my delegation to listen to the views expressed by other delegations present in the room in appreciation of your chairmanship of the Disarmament Commission.

My delegation also wishes to express our admiration of the able and skilful manner in which our Rapporteur, Mr. José Crtegui, presided over the meetings of the Working Group and the Drafting Group. We also thank the members of the Secretariat, in particular Mr. Alem, Mr. Corradini and their associates, for their unfailing co-operation and assistance.

The deliberations in the Commission during the past four weeks have clearly confirmed the wisdom of the establishment by the special session of the General Assembly last year of this deliberative body in the field of disarmament. My delegation was among those which felt, even during the meetings of the Preparatory Committee of the special session, that it was essential for the United Nations, which has the central and primary role in the field of disarmament, to have a forum where all Members of the United Nations have the opportunity to express their views on the problems in the field of disarmament, which is of deep concern to the whole of mankind.

This session of the Commission in which a very large number of delegations, including all the nuclear-weapon Powers, participated actively, has vindicated our stand, and I am certain that even those delegations which were not very enthusiastic with the establishment of a deliberative forum at the United Nations to deal with disarmament will have now realized the great utility of this forum. We are also particularly happy that this the first session of the Disarmament Commission has been able to adopt its recommendations to the General Assembly by consensus.
Having said that and in no way trying to minimize the importance of the recommendations that we have adopted on the comprehensive programme of disarmament, my delegation wishes to place on record our regret that on several crucial and important questions the recommendations of the Commission fall short of our expectations. With the Commission's permission I shall refer to some of them.

In the view of my delegation, it is deeply regrettable that we could not reach consensus on the prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It will be recalled that my delegation brought up that issue at the special session last year. It was clear even at that time that it had the solid support of a very large majority of the Members of the United Nations, and it was only because of the severe resistance we had from some of the nuclear-weapon States that we could not get this issue adequately incorporated in the Final Document. However, the General Assembly, at its last session, adopted by an overwhelming majority the need to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons. We continue to believe that in the area of nuclear disarmament, and particularly when there is no progress whatsoever in this field, the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons assumes vital importance.

My delegation must therefore express our strong reservation at the non-inclusion of that measure in our document. At the same time, we are happy that the document contains a reference to that measure and, like other delegations, we intend to raise this issue at the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly when the First Committee will take up the report of the Disarmament Commission.
Much has been said on the question of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is, perhaps, not accidental that when some delegations refer to non-proliferation they refuse to concede the vertical aspect of non-proliferation. Furthermore, while nothing real is being done to check vertical proliferation, attempts continue to be made to impose various discriminatory measures, on the pretext of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, but in reality to put obstacles in the way of the utilization of peaceful uses of nuclear energy, particularly by the developing countries. India's opposition to the development or acquisition of nuclear weapons is total, as our Prime Minister clearly indicated when he addressed the special session of the General Assembly last year. We are for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, but we attach equal importance to the vertical as to the horizontal aspect of it and we shall not permit undue importance to be given to one aspect at the cost of the other. During the discussions in our Commission, many references were made to the so-called strengthening of the non-proliferation régime. My delegation has never understood what this phrase really means. As far as we are concerned, there is no real non-proliferation régime existing at the moment, and it is only when the implementation of adequate measures is under way in the area of nuclear disarmament that we can speak of such a régime.

The document we are to adopt today contains a reference to nuclear-weapon-free zones. I wish to reiterate the position of my Government on this issue. We have consistently held that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones has relevance only in the context of making the whole world free of nuclear weapons, a concept clearly brought out in paragraph 61 of the Final Document, and that the establishment of such zones in different regions of the world can only be considered, as paragraph 60 of the Final Document makes very clear, "on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned".
It is a matter of deep regret to my delegation that consensus could not be reached on the very important measure concerning the dissolution of military alliances and the dismantling of foreign military bases. As a committed member of the non-aligned movement, India is convinced that military alliances pose serious problems to the ensuring of international peace and stability in various regions of the world. Events during the past few years have clearly indicated that the concept of military alliances is no longer accepted even by those who were at one time members of such alliances. The same applies to foreign military bases, and we do not believe that one can justify continuance of foreign military bases on the ground that these were established and continue in existence with the approval of the Governments of the countries concerned. As in the case of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, my delegation would certainly reserve its right to raise this issue at the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly.

We should also like to indicate very clearly that the reference in the document to the establishment of zones of peace should be, as far as the Indian Ocean is concerned, interpreted in the context of the United Nations Declaration on the Establishment of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

The document clearly reflects the universal opinion regarding the highest priority to be accorded to nuclear disarmament. We are also happy that in paragraph 11 of our recommendations on the comprehensive programme of disarmament, it is clearly stated that nuclear disarmament should have special attention during the first stage of the implementation of the comprehensive programme of disarmament. However, we deeply regret that the document does not reflect the proposal contained in the document submitted by the non-aligned countries regarding the need to complete nuclear disarmament within a decade.

There are several other points in the document on which my delegation would have wished to comment but, in view of the time constraint, I shall conclude by saying that we approve the consensus document, but our approval should be interpreted in the light of the observations which I have made.
Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): Austria was among those countries which already at an early stage of the preparation of the Final Document of the special session on disarmament supported the proposal to establish or re-establish, as it were, the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations as a deliberative body, supplementary to the First Committee of the General Assembly, in which all United Nations Member States would discuss in more detail certain important disarmament questions.

The Disarmament Commission has, during this first substantive meeting, conducted a thorough discussion of the elements which will have to be included in a comprehensive programme of disarmament. My delegation was glad to have this opportunity to participate actively in deliberations on this important subject.

My delegation welcomes the fact that it will prove possible for this Commission to adopt its recommendations on the comprehensive programme of disarmament with consensus and we should like to join all those delegations which have expressed their sincere thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, and to our distinguished Rapporteur, for your untiring efforts to ensure a successful outcome of this meeting. Although our recommendations will also reflect the fact that it was not possible to arrive at complete agreement on some important issues, my delegation still maintains that this Commission, under your experienced guidance, has indeed evolved during these four weeks into an important body for disarmament deliberations at a universal level and we are looking forward to our next substantive meeting in 1980. We are confident that the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on a comprehensive programme on disarmament will benefit from the fact that in our deliberations here, we have arrived at a generally agreed concept of such a programme.

It is obvious that, in a paper of the kind we have prepared, the various national positions cannot be reflected in full. Austria, for its part, has given its views on the comprehensive programme of disarmament in the relevant reply to the Secretary-General. We are glad to note that the recommendations of the Commission are to a considerable extent in conformity with these views. In this connexion, I should like to recall the basic tenets of my Government in accordance with which all disarmament steps have to be
carried out in a balanced way and must not jeopardize the security of any State or, for that matter, the existing balance of power. On a number of issues, such as, for instance, the question of verification, including relevant organizational and institutional aspects, the reduction of military budgets, nuclear-weapon-free-zones, IAEA safeguards and the question of the regional approach to disarmament, we should certainly have preferred more precise language, although we realize that the more general formulations we find in our recommendations are the expression of the existing consensus. On the issue of nuclear proliferation, both vertical and horizontal, we appreciate that it has been possible to safeguard the agreements reached at the special session. We would, however, like to express the hope that future negotiations in the framework of the Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation (INFCCE) and elsewhere, will lead to a broader basis of agreement. In this connexion, I have again to express my delegation's keen interest in effective measures of nuclear disarmament.

These considerations should in no way detract from my delegation's support of the recommendations we have jointly elaborated. We are certain that they will provide a firm basis for further common efforts to proceed urgently with concrete and effective disarmament measures.

I could not conclude this statement without paying a very special tribute to Mr. Björnerstedt for the invaluable services which he has lent to our various disarmament efforts during the last 10 years. All those who have had the most pleasant opportunity of benefiting through personal contacts from his vast experience know of his commitment to the cause of disarmament and his constant disposition to give us his advice and counsel. For that, and for his kindness, openness and special kind of humour, we shall miss him in the United Nations.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.