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The meeting was called to order at 11.00 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 4 (continued)

(a) CONSIDERATION OF VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE ARMS RACE, PARTICULARLY THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE AND NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE NEGOTIATIONS AIMED AT EFFECTIVE ELIMINATION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR

(b) CONSIDERATION OF THE AGENDA ITEMS CONTAINED IN SECTION II OF RESOLUTION 33/71 II, WITH THE AIMS OF ELABORATING, WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRIORITIES ESTABLISHED AT THE TENTH SPECIAL SESSION, A GENERAL APPROACH TO NEGOTIATIONS ON NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL DISARMAMENT

Mr. BOEL (Denmark): Speaking for the Danish delegation, I wish to start by stressing the view that current international tensions underline the added importance of pursuing the dialogue on the vital matters which are on our agenda.

Let us not forget the basic common interests, shared by all nations and transcending national and ideological frontiers, which lie behind that dialogue. In the course of history there have been fundamental conflicts between ideologies and between great Powers. But we have never before been faced with a situation in which a general military clash between the great Powers would have such apocalyptic effects — would, in fact, be tantamount to the end of modern civilization.

That is the fact which confers on the present strategic situation its distinctive character. It follows, in the first place, that there is a common interest in avoiding war — not just a major war, but also local conflicts which may escalate into a major war. In the light of the perspective of nuclear destruction there is, secondly, a common interest in arriving at agreements or understandings which may reduce the risk of conflict. The considerations which I have just adduced are not new, but they remain valid, and it is important to keep them in mind. In short, we can never give up the search for a rational alternative to an unconstrained, dangerous and potentially destabilizing world-wide arms race.

Under item 4 of our agenda we have to deal with "a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament". There is general agreement that curbing and reversing the nuclear arms race in its qualitative and quantitative dimensions is of fundamental importance. Through its statements and its votes in the United Nations the Danish Government has, among other things, demonstrated strong support for substantial limitations on strategic nuclear arms, a complete
ban on nuclear testing, and steps to halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

This last issue will come up for deliberation during the second Nuclear Proliferation Treaty review conference which will be held later this year. By then we shall presumably have the conclusions of the Comprehensive Study on Nuclear Weapons. Criticism has been voiced on some aspects of the implementation of the NPT. That should be discussed at the conference. But such criticism should not be allowed to overshadow the overriding importance of the fundamental goal of non-proliferation. Here let me quote briefly from the memorandum on the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons (Doc. A/C.1/34/4) which was circulated by the Nordic countries during the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly. In that memorandum, the Nordic countries emphasized their conviction that "the development and achievement of nuclear explosive capability by any additional State or States would pose a grave threat to the international community as a whole". They also expressed their strongly-held hope that "no non-nuclear-weapon State will attempt to develop or otherwise acquire nuclear explosive capability and that all States will do their utmost to enhance international confidence and trust so that nuclear weapons proliferation to additional States will not take place". On the basis of those views and the other points made in the Nordic memorandum, Denmark intends to contribute actively to the deliberations during this important conference.

During the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly the Danish delegation expressed the view that issues relating to conventional disarmament should be placed on the agenda of the second substantive meeting of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We therefore welcome the fact that item 4 B of our agenda refers specifically to conventional disarmament.

I should now like to comment briefly on the ideas in the paper which my delegation has circulated on approaches to conventional disarmament within the framework of the United Nations (Doc. A/CN.10/13).

I have just stressed the fundamental importance of the nuclear disarmament effort. What we are saying in the paper is that conventional disarmament too is important and that there is a need for a reassessment of the general problem of the conventional aspect of the arms race.
Indeed, for most nations the most immediate threat to national security stems from conventional arms. In such a reassessment certain basic considerations should be taken into account, including the need to retain a comprehensive perspective, the relationship of conventional weapons to security, the importance of the regional dimension.

The Danish paper does not plead for specific substantive measures. And it does not highlight the question of conventional arms transfers, which is one particular aspect of the general problem. I underline this point because Denmark was involved in some earlier efforts - mentioned in our paper - in this field. The present paper represents a different and much broader approach.

What is needed, we feel, is a consensus-producing process based on generally recognized principles, in particular those contained in the Final Document of the special session on disarmament, but comprising of course also the elements of a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament approved by the United Nations Disarmament Commission at our meeting last year which contains reference to conventional weapons and armed forces. In such a process, studies now in progress on disarmament and development, disarmament and international security, and the regional approach to disarmament will provide conclusions which should be highly relevant. At its next substantive meeting, the UNDC should give further consideration to conventional disarmament. To assist the Commission in its further consideration of this problem, it would be appropriate to undertake under the auspices of the United Nations and with the assistance of qualified experts, a comprehensive study of all aspects of the conventional arms race and of disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces.
There are grounds for believing that such a study might help to clarify the very complicated issues involved and might succeed in defining some degree of consensus. In other cases, studies by groups of qualified experts appointed by the Secretary-General on a balanced geographical basis have proved useful. The combination of a high level of expertise and geographical and political balance, with opportunities for thorough and relatively informal exchanges, together with the tradition of unanimity in reporting which has been established, makes such groups particularly suited for the study of complex and sensitive questions and for seeking out areas where, in time, differing perceptions might converge.

We look forward to comments by other delegations on the Danish paper. We feel that in the report which the United Nations Disarmament Commission is going to submit to the General Assembly something should also be said about the conventional aspect of the arms race.

Mr. SORENSEN-MOSQUERA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is pleased, Mr. Chairman, to see you conducting the proceedings of the Disarmament Commission once again with the same effectiveness and dedication that have always distinguished you. We should also like to extend these remarks to the other officers of the Commission.

We listened attentively to the Chairman's introductory statement at the opening of the Commission's second substantive session, and we cannot but agree with the opinions he expressed at that time when he referred to the crucial and critical stage through which international relations, which have deteriorated alarmingly in recent times, are now passing. As he so eloquently pointed out:

"Practically all bilateral and multilateral negotiations have almost come to a halt... And we do not hear anything more of the negotiations on the comprehensive test-ban treaty. The SALT agreement, which was signed more than a year ago, has not yet to come into force. Negotiations on almost all other issues are at a standstill." (A/C.10/PV.25, p. 2)
We note with regret that the bases for an understanding that can eliminate and reduce tensions and existing conflicts have been weakened, and this is equally true of what little progress has been achieved in the sphere of disarmament. It is not merely a matter of deliberations in various forums, particularly those relating to disarmament, being shrouded in an aura of pessimism, but, as we see it, military alliances and pacts have regained strength. We are witnessing a process of regression in international relations, within which certain areas of co-operation among States are beginning to be neglected in favour of a return to dilatory tactics in negotiations and to the taking of action in the military and defence fields.

In this connexion, we note the danger of the influence exerted by the media in our societies, purveying as they do information that is apparently designed to justify to the conscience of the people the dubious necessity for certain Governments to engage in a new and unbridled arms race. Thus, the mobilization of public opinion in favour of disarmament, for which we have worked so hard, seems to be showing signs of veering dangerously off course.

Although the Government of Venezuela attaches the utmost importance to the need to halt the conventional arms race, it also recognizes that the greatest danger facing mankind is the constant threat of the destructive power of nuclear weapons. It is clear that it is up to the nuclear Powers to make a decisive contribution towards the attainment of the objectives set forth in paragraph 50 of the Programme of Action of the General Assembly's special session on disarmament.

Against this rather discouraging background, typified as we have said by serious tensions and conflicts, we are sure that the majority of delegations have an honest and sincere desire to join their efforts in order to find solutions to these common problems that so greatly affect international
peace and security. Deliberations such as those being carried out in the Disarmament Commission can contribute to stimulating a clear awareness of the risks and implications of the arms race in all its various aspects.

My delegation would like in a general way, and in accordance with the guidelines laid down when we organized the work of this session at our inaugural meeting, to mention various aspects related to the Second Disarmament Decade, which is being considered in the working group established for this purpose.

For the delegation of Venezuela, the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was an historic event of particular importance, establishing as it did the framework for co-ordinating andconcerting efforts to achieve specific disarmament measures. The special session set forth the objectives and principles that were to govern negotiations and deliberations in the field of disarmament, it prepared a Programme of Action to be implemented in the next few years, and it established the machinery by which those negotiations would be conducted.

The special session, in revitalizing the Disarmament Commission, assigned to it the functions, among others, of considering the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. This task was fully carried out by the Commission at its first substantive session in May of last year.

This year, it is the Commission’s task, among others, as set forth in General Assembly resolution 34/75, to prepare elements of a draft resolution entitled "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade", in which it is to indicate the major objectives and goals of disarmament to be accomplished during the Second Decade.

In this regard, we should not overlook paragraph 14 of the Final Document of the special session, which, in evaluating the results of the first Disarmament Decade, made it clear that the objectives set forth at that time
by the General Assembly appear as remote today as they did then, and perhaps even more so, because the pace of the arms race has not slackened, but has in fact accelerated; because effective measures for dealing with the cessation at an early date of the arms race and with nuclear disarmament still seem beyond the grasp of mankind; because no real progress that might lead to the preparation of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control has been made; and because it has not proved possible to release for the purposes of development any part of the tremendous resources, both material and human, that are being lavished on an unproductive arms race, one that is constantly accelerating and that is imposing such a heavy burden on both the developing and the developed countries.

Since the General Assembly, in resolution 2602 E (XXIV), declared the Decade 1970-1979 as the Disarmament Decade, every subsequent session of the Assembly has had on its agenda an item on the consideration of the application of the objectives and goals of that Decade. Finally, at its thirty-fourth session, in resolution 34/75, the General Assembly expressed its disappointment that such goals and objectives had not been achieved.
Now, while that may be true, it is also true that in the first Decade partial disarmament measures were adopted, such as the preparation of certain agreements, which are enumerated in the Note of the Secretary-General, in document A/CH.10/11.

However, for the delegation of Venezuela the most important achievement of the first Decade was the holding of a special session of the General Assembly devoted exclusively to disarmament from which resulted a Final Document approved by consensus by all Members of the Organization. It is for that reason that we believe that the Final Document should constitute the fundamental basis of the draft resolution which would declare the Decade of the 1980s the Second Disarmament Decade. This is because in it are clearly laid down the principles, objectives and priorities as well as the necessary machinery and procedures pointing the way for the international community to move towards the ardently desired goal of general and complete disarmament.

Similarly, the Comprehensive Disarmament Programme prepared by this Commission in 1979 constitutes a fundamental element to be included in the draft resolution on the Second Disarmament Decade. To this end, we should not forget the importance of the studies which have been carried out and which are being carried out by the United Nations establishing the link between the two most important objectives of the international community in this decade of the 1980s - disarmament, on the one hand, and development on the other. We are aware that tremendous amounts of human and material resources are being allocated to the arms race - resources which otherwise could be devoted to economic and social progress, particularly for the developing countries.

Similarly, the Comprehensive Disarmament Programme provides measures intended to insure that disarmament makes an effective contribution to economic and social development, and in particular to the bringing about of a New International Economic Order. In the same resolution 34/175, the General Assembly recognizes that
"...a substantial part of world resources, material as well as human, continues to be wasted on armaments with detrimental effect on international security and on efforts to achieve the new international economic order". (resolution 34/75)

We refer particularly to the Report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and military expenditures, prepared and brought up to date in the 1970s, and the study which is now being prepared by a Group of Governmental Experts on the relationship between disarmament and development. Venezuelan experts have taken part in work on both studies.

Both these studies and the one which has been in preparation since 1978 on the relationship between disarmament and international security are valuable sources of knowledge which establish guidelines to be taken into account in negotiations on disarmament, and it is our view that especial reference should be made to them in the draft resolution to be presented by the Commission to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session.

Resolution 34/75 also lays it down that the draft resolution should contain an indication of means of mobilizing world public opinion in favour of disarmament. Paragraph 15 of the Final Document, in the section containing the Declaration states:

"It is essential that not only Governments but also the peoples of the world recognize and understand the dangers in the present situation. In order that an international conscience may develop and that world public opinion may exercise a positive influence, the United Nations should increase the dissemination of information on the armaments race and disarmament with the full co-operation of Member States." (resolution S-10/2)

Further on the same Final Document, in the section on the Programme of Action, from paragraphs 99 to 106, enumerates the concrete measures which should be adopted aimed at increasing the dissemination
of information about the arms race and efforts which are going on to halt it or to turn it back. The delegation of Venezuela welcomes proposals for a programme of information for the second Disarmament Decade, presented by the Secretary-General in document A/CN.10/11. We consider that the programme proposed is sufficiently broad and complete as to contribute, with the necessary participation of Member States and the media of mass communication, to promoting international awareness and universal condemnation and repudiation of arms and the arms race.

My delegation does not claim that we should include in the draft resolution a long list of objectives and goals, and still less that time limits should be imposed for the carrying out of these measures. However, the prompt conclusion of certain agreements which have been under negotiation for a long time, such as the treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests, the treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons, the ratification by the United States and the Soviet Union of the SALT II treaty and the initiation of SALT III, would constitute a stimulus to the performing of the task of achieving other outstanding objectives and an encouragement for restoring the faith of our peoples in their leaders and institutions.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on the next speaker, may I welcome Ambassador Jaipal, Secretary of the Committee on Disarmament, to the meetings of our Commission.

Mr. RIOS (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Panama takes great pleasure in seeing you once again, Sir, in charge of this new round of meetings of the Disarmament Commission. If the results hoped for are not achieved, it will not be for lack of effective guidance in our proceedings.
Once again we are beginning to talk about disarmament—about which so much has been said in the past. We could all fill pages with formulas and theories which have so often been outlined as means of bringing about disarmament. It could be maintained that on this subject everything possible has been said. A great many words have been dramatically and cogently intoned. But what no one can say, unfortunately, is where, when and in what country concrete and tangible disarmament has begun. Since the end of the First World War serious attempts have been made to achieve disarmament, to judge by the pronouncements and proclamations. In the face of the destruction and apocalyptic sufferings brought by the Second World War, the United Nations was born. The horror left behind by that war led to the fact that the first word to be uttered was "disarmament." Determined "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", as stated in the Charter, men found in disarmament a possible means towards that end.
If we review the history of the United Nations up to the present day, we no longer find the disarmament pure and simple proclaimed by the League of Nations. The impact of the Second World War was so overwhelming that the talk was not of disarmament but of 'general and complete disarmament'. A terrorized world saw in this 'general and complete disarmament' its only possible salvation. His Holiness Pope Paul VI speaking before the General Assembly in 1965, summed up the world's horror in his exclamation, which was heard and repeated vehemently: "Never again".

I repeat that we all might fill pages with theories and formulas for the achievement of disarmament. But what no one can say is which country has begun disarmament and what quantity of weapons has been destroyed except for conversion into other, more deadly weapons. No one has begun the destruction of weapons, even as a symbolic gesture. Certainly, swords have disappeared, but only because they are of no use in modern warfare and not exactly so that they might be converted into ploughshares, as it is said in the biblical passage engraved on the concrete wall facing the United Nation as a permanent admonition.

Right now the danger of the arms race is so serious that it would be even more serious to fold our arms and wait for the nuclear arsenals to explode and annihilate not only the human race, but the whole of this unfortunate planet.

For these reasons Panama has been enthusiastic in its support for all things pertaining to the struggle for disarmament, even in the most pessimistic atmosphere. As my colleague from Bangladesh said, the prospects are not encouraging. But this cannot be an excuse for inaction; on the contrary, it must be a stimulus for the majority of the Members of this Organization. I refer to those of us who have a great deal to lose and nothing to gain by the proliferation of armaments. The order of the day must be to unite as a matter of priority and to present a solid, united and unshakeable front in the face of the nuclear Powers and similarly in the face of all those who have made the manufacture of conventional weapons one of their favoured resources.

I have already said that the day will come when the peoples of the third world will have to rise up in anger against those who instead of sending them pencils, notebooks, books, medicine and clothing, have sent them guns and, instead of teachers, have sent them military advisers and soldiers to massacre their people, sometimes under the infantile pretext that they were invited. We have seen the case, which would be ironic if it were not tragic, of some of these
guests assassinating even the President and Ministers of the "host country". All this is repugnant. And be aware that the developing world is not dissociated from this repugnance; one of the main forces against the arms race has been the Non-Aligned Movement, ever since its foundation.

The sixth Summit Conference, held at Havana, Cuba between 3 and 9 September 1979, urged in its final report that the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations draft without delay a treaty on the total prohibition of all kinds of nuclear weapons testing. It also called upon its members serving on this Commission to work towards an instrument which would ban the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological weapons as well as all weapons of mass destruction.

In that area at least, progress could be made during this session, especially on the basis of the decisions and measures adopted at the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in June 1978 and at the first session of the Disarmament Commission in October 1978.

It is a matter of particular urgency that at this session we seek for a formula which would allow for progress towards a comprehensive disarmament programme which, among other things, would lead to concrete solutions. Not a word has been heard from any Government opposing disarmament. On the contrary, every one, without exception, wants disarmament, or at least that is what they say in their statements. And if this is the case, as the history of the United Nations would seem to bear out, I wonder what is stopping us. Why do we not put an end to speeches and enter the realm of action?

In this connexion, my delegation is in agreement with the decision to convene in 1982 a second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and to convene a world conference on disarmament. The convening of that event under United Nations auspices should produce an atmosphere in which the leaders of the arms race would accept the following among other things.

First, an international treaty which, with no loopholes, would prohibit all forms of nuclear weapons testing.

Secondly, the gradual destruction of nuclear arsenals under effective international supervision.

Thirdly, the immediate implementation of the decision that establishes that a percentage of disarmament funds be used for aid plans for the developing countries.
Fourthly, the requirement that foreign military forces should return to their countries of origin. The dismantling of foreign bases is an inseparable part of disarmament. Nothing justifies or can justify that thousands or hundreds of thousands of the soldiers of one or more Powers should be stationed in weaker countries. The struggle against the arms race must have as one of its goals the elimination of military alliances and "pacts" which serve only as a constant source of tension and sometimes of armed aggression against those who do not wish to submit to imperialistic and hegemonistic formulas such as spheres of influence and limited sovereignty.
Fifthly, they should declare emphatically that outer space must not be employed on any pretext for the use or stationing of any military device.

Sixthly, they should declare that what are called conventional weapons are also a source of very serious concern. So far as volume and expansion are concerned, those are also dangerous elements, for they have led to limited or regional wars and they have made even worse the lives of peoples that have traditionally been impoverished and devastated.

Seventhly, there must be no credits or loans to poor countries allowing them to buy weapons except those that are indispensable to their national security.

Eighthly, they should declare general and complete disarmament as an indispensable step if we are to achieve the full implementation of the New International Economic Order.

Ninthly, there must be a world-wide educational campaign teaching children and young people that the world is headed inevitably towards disaster unless an end is put to this mad, unbridled arms race which seems to know no limits in terms of the lethal weapons that are involved. The rising generations must be imbued with the belief that there are only two possible courses of action: either disarmament with peace, harmony and development, or an arms race that will inevitably lead to total annihilation. This is a matter that is "pounding on the doors" of the United Nations. It is an obligation, and an unavoidable challenge that we cannot possibly defer.

Tenthly, any attempt by any Power, large or small, to produce nuclear devices for war-like purposes must be viewed as a violation of the Charter provisions.

As far as those who have nuclear weapons already are concerned, their task must be gradually to reduce their arsenals and to refrain from producing these weapons of mass destruction. Those who have not yet joined the nuclear club must also be obliged, by collective sanctions, to refrain from any attempt to produce nuclear weapons.

In conclusion, I wish to say that Panama is devoted to peace as we have so frequently stated. We might also mention in this context that we are parties to two important documents. The first is the Declaration of Ayacucho of 9 December 1974, which states in two of its substantive paragraphs:
"We undertake to promote and support the building of a lasting order of international peace and co-operation and to create the conditions which will make possible the effective limitation of armaments and an end to their acquisition for offensive purposes, so that all possible resources may be devoted to the economic and social development of every country in Latin America.

"We condemn the use of nuclear energy for purposes other than peaceful ones conducive to the progress and well-being of our peoples." (A/10044, annex, p. 2)

The second is the Final Act of the Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Central American Isthmus dated 15 March 1980, which states in one of its essential paragraphs:

"We reaffirm our support for the principles that condemn all forms of colonialism, neo-colonialism and racial discrimination, and we also condemn the arms race and all forms and manifestations of aggression, occupation or foreign intervention. We support the idea of declaring the Caribbean as a zone of peace."
Mr. Victor GARCIA (Philippines): Mr. Chairman, at the outset, allow me to express the satisfaction of my delegation at seeing you once again in the Chair presiding over the deliberations of our Commission. We have every confidence that, with your accomplished diplomatic skills and vast experience, this substantive session of our Commission will achieve fruitful results, in spite of the bleak prospects for peace confronting the international community today.

The Philippine delegation attaches considerable importance to the work of the current session of the United Nations Commission on Disarmament. In the face of increasing world tensions, the Commission is called upon to undertake the arduous task of reaching agreement on constructive approaches to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament. The conflicts and tensions characterizing the present world situation have only served to complicate the multifaceted problems related to the search for concrete measures aimed at achieving genuine and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The arms race, in both the nuclear and the conventional fields, continues unabated and with greater intensity; military budgets and expenditures have increased in irrational proportions and the rapid advancements in science and technology have unleashed a variety of weapons of mass destruction, all of which constitute a serious threat to mankind and its survival.

The Philippines remains committed steadfastly to the evolution of a genuine process of disarmament leading to the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

It is within this context that the Philippines has actively contributed to the implementation of the decisions and recommendations and the proposals on disarmament, particularly those of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. More specifically, as a tangible manifestation of its commitment to the disarmament process, the Philippines has been actively involved in the work of the Group of Experts on the Interrelationship between Disarmament and International Security, of which the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines is the Chairman, the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies which programmes studies in the various fields of disarmament, and the expert group studying the relationship between disarmament and development.
Having explained the basic position of my Government on disarmament, I wish now to make some brief comments on items 3 and 4 of our agenda.

The Philippines was one of the co-sponsors of General Assembly resolution 34/75 which declared the decade of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade and directed the Disarmament Commission at its substantive session of 1980 to prepare elements of a draft declaration entitled "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade", to be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session for its consideration and adoption.

The elements of a declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade should contain references to the significant but limited results registered during the previous decade and should recognize the priority of nuclear disarmament and the central role played by the United Nations in its attainment.

The main disarmament measures that have to be achieved during the Second Disarmament Decade should focus on the early conclusion of negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban, a more relevant nuclear non-proliferation régime, the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons, the freezing and reduction of arms expenditures, the prohibition of radiological weapons and a chemical weapons ban. The social and economic aspects connected with these disarmament measures also deserve serious attention.
Today we are witnesses to the ever-increasing nuclear-arms race. The existence of nuclear weapons and of the continuing nuclear-arms race pose a direct threat to the survival of mankind. Nuclear disarmament is thus the priority item in the field of disarmament. The primary responsibility for attaining that objective rests with the nuclear-weapon States.

My delegation is aware that owing to the complex nature of nuclear disarmament there exist divergent views on the most practical and feasible steps towards achieving it. However, my delegation is of the view that the most effective approach to nuclear disarmament would be to halt the nuclear-arms race first. That in turn would be followed by an actual reduction in existing nuclear arsenals. The qualitative and quantitative improvement of nuclear weapons should also cease. Further steps in that direction would be a ban on nuclear-weapon testing and the prohibition of the production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices.

Effective measures to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should also be intensified. My delegation therefore has supported the idea of an international convention to ensure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. We also urge a ban on the use of nuclear weapons and to that end we support initiatives aimed at the elaboration of an international convention codifying such a ban. We also support the development of international instruments for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

My delegation is hopeful that appropriate conditions conducive to the early ratification of SALT II will be created. That could then be followed by further agreements leading to a more balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery.

During the course of our exchange of views, references have been made to the interrelationship between conventional and nuclear disarmament. My delegation supports an urgent reassessment of the problem of conventional disarmament. We feel that the proposals of the Danish and Spanish delegations therefore deserve further consideration.

It is only with the exercise of political will by all States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, that genuine disarmament negotiations in all their aspects can be truly achieved. We reiterate this appeal as we cross the threshold of the 1980s.
Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, before I begin my statement I should like to congratulate you on your second term as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. Undoubtedly your experience and wisdom will contribute to the success of the work of this session.

We are meeting today in extremely complex international circumstances, when all the principles and rules governing international relations are undergoing difficult and stringent tests. The world has recently witnessed flagrant violations of the principles which we have sought to establish in the United Nations, especially the principles of the non-use of force in international relations of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States and of the abandonment of the policy of hegemony.

The international situation at present raises two important questions. The first concerns bilateral détente, which has undergone considerable strain, and that is a matter which impels us to lay down the principles which are necessary in order to turn that détente into international détente. The second question is that the deterioration of the international situation has affected the momentum which we are attempting to maintain in halting the nuclear arms race and the constant increase in the quantity and quality of arms of mass destruction, of conventional weapons and incendiary weapons.

The items we are discussing today represent the mainstay of the processes of disarmament. My delegation maintains that one of the most urgent questions that could be dealt with is the halting of the nuclear-arms race, including the halting of the production, development and stockpiling of nuclear weapons and the thermal substances necessary for military purposes.

If we agreed, during the special disarmament session, on the priorities, especially the highest priority given to nuclear weapons, that matter should not prevent us from taking into account the factors standing in the way of an agreement being reached. It is for instance possible to consider that nuclear disarmament should be paralleled by an agreement on reducing other military capabilities in certain areas under efficient international control.
What could be done would be to embark on certain measures aimed at the gradual and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction, taking into account the military capabilities of conventional weapons and armed forces for the nuclear States and States with great military capabilities. It is possible that those measures could include a reduction in those weapons by a small annual percentage — for example 5 per cent of the various types of arms in the first year, then 5 per cent of the rest in the next year and so on. Those percentages would actually fall within acceptable and balanced limits so that they might not be detrimental to the principle of preserving the integrity and security of the parties and their right to protect their security, nor be detrimental to the present balance between all the parties.

There are collateral measures embodied in the necessity of completing the comprehensive test-ban treaty and of concluding a treaty to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons and a treaty on the strengthening of security and of guarantees for the non-nuclear States and the establishment of nuclear-free zones and zones of peace. It is also imperative to agree on an annual reduction in military budgets by certain percentages to be agreed upon after having completed the standardization of the form and elements of military budgets.

The study prepared by the United Nations on the relationship between disarmament and development and the possibility of turning military production into civil production is a matter that should be given attention, especially concerning the process of directing the resources resulting from disarmament and earmarking a certain percentage of them for financing a fund for purposes of economic development.
What we hope for at the present time is that wisdom will prevail and that our efforts will continue to move from the stage of discussion to the stage of the actual implementation of disarmament and strengthening of international security: this is an issue which requires also international political will and a clear practical approach to the problems, because it is now more necessary than at any time in the past to understand these facts.

Mr. Lidgard (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, I should like to begin my statement by expressing our great satisfaction at the fact that you have agreed to continue as Chairman of this second substantive session of the Disarmament Commission. Your skill, experience and judgment augur well for its successful outcome.

A number of important statements have been made at this session drawing our attention to the aggravation of international relations and to the accelerated arms race in the world today. I am not going to repeat what others have said, nor do I think that any additional observations are needed to underscore the seriousness of the situation. The Swedish Government has appealed to the super-Powers to consider their responsibility for this development and to keep up their dialogue. As my Foreign Minister stated at the opening meeting of the Committee on Disarmament in early February this year:

"Sweden has always given the policy of détente its wholehearted support. This has never meant that we have accepted attacks on freedom and justice carried out in the name of peace and friendship. We have always reacted sharply against the tendencies of the super-Powers to divide the world into spheres of interest and to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations in order to further their strategic and economic interests". (CD/PV.53, p. 42)

We hope that the meeting in Vienna last Friday between the Foreign Ministers of the two leading military Powers will indicate new efforts to find solutions to the current world problems, for which those Powers bear the main responsibility but which thoroughly affect all of us. The meeting
today between Presidents Brezhnev and Giscard d'Estaing is, of course, another very significant element in the efforts to maintain a dialogue between East and West.

My intention is now to address myself to item 4 on our agenda, and in particular the two working papers which have been presented to us by the delegations of Spain and Denmark.

With the tremendous and senseless build-up of nuclear weapons and with their power to threaten mankind with virtual extinction, it goes without saying that, in a general approach to disarmament negotiations, the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament must have the highest priority in our efforts. That fact has been taken into account in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament and in numerous other resolutions of the General Assembly. It is also reflected in the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament for this year.

That so little has been achieved so far in the field of nuclear disarmament negotiations is a matter of the greatest disappointment. It is inconceivable and also unacceptable that the Governments of the nuclear Powers continue to disregard the anxiety so clearly shown by the overwhelming majority of the world's peoples.

Steps towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race, such as the ratification of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) and the adoption of a comprehensive test ban treaty, certainly are elements which we urge should be included in an immediate disarmament programme, not least with a view to contributing to the creation of an atmosphere propitious to a successful consideration of the Non-Proliferation Treaty at the forthcoming Review Conference in Geneva. The representative of Yugoslavia made a similar statement here the other day, with which we entirely agree. It is, however, obvious that the nuclear disarmament process must take place in the context of a comprehensive approach, which also includes conventional weapons. In Europe, which is in the unfortunate situation of having the world's largest concentration of both nuclear and conventional weapons, it appears to be necessary that a regional disarmament effort should take place which embraces both kinds of arsenals.
It must also be recalled that four-fifths of the world's military expenditures are now being devoted to conventional armaments. Thus conventional disarmament plays an important role also in the conversion of resources used for military purposes to productive uses in the civilian sector.

One particularly disquieting aspect of the conventional arms build-up is that its pace has been greatly increased by the rapid advancement of military technology. The increasingly sophisticated weapons, apart from raising the risk of armed conflicts, have contributed to the soaring costs of the acquisition of arms. In view of the important impact of conventional armaments on national and international life, we think that this pattern must now be given greater attention than it has received in the past. It is therefore encouraging that an increasing number of countries express their concern over the conventional arms race and that this trend is reflected in the Final Document of the special session. We welcome the fact that the Disarmament Commission is now considering this question, and we think that the Danish and Spanish working papers are valuable contributions to this discussion and will serve to deepen our insights into the matter.

We find the treatment of the regional aspects in the Danish working paper of great interest. The reasons for dealing with conventional weapons on a regional basis are well presented. In some areas of the world the arms build-up is not directly linked to the development of the relationship between the major military alliances. Initiatives within such regions to undertake disarmament measures should be encouraged, such as, for example, the efforts by some Latin American countries in accordance with the Ayachucho Declaration. But also in a region like Europe it is obvious that conventional disarmament measures will have to take into account primarily the regional characteristics. The relationship between such regional disarmament efforts and the over-all long-term process leading towards general and complete disarmament is also well demonstrated in the Danish paper.

Actions which have been taken in the past concerning conventional weapons, as has quite rightly been mentioned, include the efforts to adapt and expand the humanitarian laws of war by the prohibition or restriction in use of certain conventional weapons which are deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects.
We agree with the Danish delegation that progress in this field has been slow and utterly inadequate in view of the rapid development of modern warfare. We want, however, to recall the promising progress in this field at the first session of the United Nations Conference on particularly inhumane weapons which took place in September last year at Geneva, and we sincerely hope that the second and final session this year will result in limitations on the use of certain types of such weapons including, for instance, incendiary devices.

Finally, in the context of possible future approaches regarding disarmament of conventional weapons and reduction of military forces, I should like to stress the importance we attach to confidence building and associated measures. We think that such measures play a very useful role, both as preliminary steps leading to actual disarmament measures and as parallel steps in order to support and reinforce the other measures. For the same reason, we think that among the United Nations studies which are mentioned in the Danish paper and which are expected to provide insights, perspectives and conclusions of high relevance and usefulness in the context of conventional disarmament, the study on confidence building measures should also be mentioned.

The role of the arms trade and arms transfers is extensively dealt with in both the Danish and Spanish papers. Since annual export orders for new conventional weapons approach $20 billion, and 75 per cent of current arms transfers in major conventional weapons go to developing countries, it seems urgent that this question should receive increased attention. The Swedish Government considers it essential to study ways and means of bringing about a reduction of the arms trade and arms transfers and also, of course, the broader problems relating to conventional disarmament. We hope that the Disarmament Commission can play a useful role in this context.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to make this statement in the Disarmament Commission under your chairmanship. Indeed, to us, your chairmanship is one of the best guarantees that this Commission can have that it will conduct its work in a pragmatic and constructive fashion. We are equally pleased to see the other officers of the Commission in their places.
Now that the Disarmament Commission has embarked on its second substantive session, it has already established itself as an integral part of the international disarmament machinery. While having a clearly defined mandate of its own, it also performs specific tasks as requested by the General Assembly. As we see it, the thrust of the Commission's work should be in its deliberative role, through which it can enhance actual disarmament negotiations conducted in other forums. A pragmatic, action-oriented approach is fully in line with the wording of the substantive items on the Commission's agenda.

Obviously, the Commission cannot work in isolation, apart from the real world. While my delegation believes that a general appraisal of the state of the arms race and disarmament does not fall within the purview of this body, I cannot but join a number of speakers in voicing concern over the sharply deteriorated climate of international relations and the recent disappointments in the field of disarmament.

The world has been kept waiting for the ratification of SALT II, signed almost a year ago. A number of bilateral and multilateral negotiations have almost come to a standstill. At best, progress - if progress there has been - is marginal.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, as you appropriately said in your opening statement last Monday, this is not the time to sit back and let events take their course. You continued:

"... notwithstanding the realities of the world situation - possibly even because of them - it is important that we should strive even harder to explore ways and means of preserving and strengthening international peace and security." (A/CN.10/PV.25, p. 2)

Disarmament negotiations are the lifeline of international security. They have survived other international crises. We believe that they will also survive the present one.

It is true that the Committee on Disarmament has hardly been engaged in its actual task of negotiating. Yet work continues on issues that the General Assembly has identified as priority areas.
Despite the present uncertainty concerning SALT II, there is agreement between the negotiating parties on the framework for SALT III, which should hold some promise for the limitation and decrease of nuclear weapons in Europe. Recently, particular attention has been paid to so-called intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe, where new qualitative developments in weapons technology seem to be taking place. Whatever the merits of the claims and counterclaims concerning balance or imbalance in this field, the sum total of the existing situation seems to be increased insecurity for all, including the neutral and non-aligned countries. As in most cases, there is only one way out: negotiations in good faith, the sooner the better.

Clearly, the most pressing task in general is to continue efforts to curb the nuclear arms race and in particular to complete SALT II and proceed to SALT III in accordance with the framework already agreed upon. It is urgent to reach a comprehensive test ban. The difficulties encountered serve but to underline the intrinsic importance of the dialogue between the leading nuclear Powers. This is not a matter in their exclusive interest: it is a matter which concerns the basic security interest of all States.
The international régime aiming at the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons has remained largely unaffected by the increased international tension. We believe that non-proliferation efforts will be successful if they are pursued with determination and vigour. The emergence of additional nuclear-weapon States could bring about a serious threat to international peace and security. The forthcoming Second Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty takes place at a time of standstill in nuclear disarmament. Yet we do not see any viable alternative to the present non-proliferation régime. Because this is in the interest of the whole international community, we believe that the Review Conference could promote international consensus in questions of non-proliferation and access to peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

In Europe, the increased global tension tends to endanger the results achieved in the field of détente. The Vienna talks on force reductions in Europe have not yielded the expected results. A certain advance seems to have been made, however, and it would be unfair to say that the talks have come to a halt. Also, a number of far-reaching proposals have been made concerning disarmament in Europe or parts of Europe. Further, it is the understanding of my Government that there is still readiness for talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons deployed in and aimed at Europe.

As a small, neutral country which has a vested interest in détente and disarmament, Finland has endeavoured to devise ways and means by which it could continue to make its contribution to these ends, particularly in the region closest to us, the Nordic area, and in Europe in general. It was with this purpose that the Government of Finland took the initiative last October by suggesting the idea of working out a disarmament programme for Europe. At that time, the international situation had not yet reached the degree of tension that it has reached now. Despite the present aggravation of the international climate – or, conversely, because of it – we have continued to pursue this idea actively. Finland has submitted to the Governments concerned a working paper in which the initiative is further elaborated. We have initiated a series of consultations in order to define the possible role of such a comprehensive approach in European disarmament talks. The response so far has been encouraging. We will continue our efforts, keeping in mind the approaching meeting in Madrid of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) countries.
(Dr. Pastinen, Finland)

The forthcoming 35th session of the General Assembly will provide an opportunity for an overall appraisal of arms limitation and disarmament efforts. At a time of deteriorated international relations, the United Nations disarmament machinery should continue its research and information functions in the field of disarmament. Although the political climate at the moment is hardly conducive to steps towards the goal of disarmament, it is essential that preparedness for advance be maintained and even increased. The ongoing research programme deals with a number of questions, such as disarmament and development, regional aspects of disarmament, confidence-building measures and nuclear weapons. Given the proper conditions, their results may eventually enhance actual political decisions involving these aspects of disarmament. In this perspective, my delegation welcomes the proposal by the delegation of Denmark concerning a study related to various aspects of conventional disarmament, and we also welcome the working paper submitted by the delegation of Spain. This very morning the Commission has received another working paper that stands in the name of the delegations of Romania and Sweden, and concerns the freezing and reduction of military expenditures. My delegation will study that working paper with the greatest care, and welcomes the spirit in which it has been submitted.

The General Assembly has requested the Commission to prepare the elements of a draft resolution on the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. My delegation wishes to take this occasion to pay a tribute to the delegation of Nigeria, which in the General Assembly proposed the idea of a Second Disarmament Decade. The Commission is requested to report on this item to the General Assembly so that it can take action on the subject at its 35th session. In view of the limitations of time, my delegation considers that a major part of our work during this session should be devoted to this item, and it will, for its part, at an appropriate stage, put forth its views on the elements of the declaration.
Mr. PETREE (United States of America): The United States shares the hope, so ably expressed by many other speakers, that the deliberations of this Commission during the next few weeks will make a positive contribution towards the goals of international stability and the reduction of the risk of war. We all realize that the task of achieving balanced and verifiable arms control agreements is a formidable one.

Because it is, we all need to intensify and broaden the search for effective measures which can strengthen international peace and security. The United States hopes that declaring the decade of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade will help provide additional impetus to these vital efforts. We regret that the new decade did not begin on a very auspicious note. The use of force by the Soviet Union in Afghanistan in violation of the basic tenets of the United Nations Charter — an act condemned by the overwhelming majority of nations — can only complicate efforts to achieve negotiated measures of mutual restraint.

As a consequence of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, debate in the United States Senate on the SALT II Treaty has been deferred. Nevertheless, the Administration remains firmly committed to securing ratification of the Treaty and continues to believe that mutual restraint on United States and Soviet nuclear forces is in the interests of both countries and of the world at large.

The delegation of the United States looks forward to participating actively in the work of the Commission under your experienced leadership. In addition to working with other interested delegations to elaborate the elements of a resolution on the second disarmament decade, my delegation welcomes the opportunity for an intensive exchange of views on conventional arms, military budgets and other important topics on our rather extensive agenda.

In this regard I would note that the international community has already reached general agreement on the objectives and priorities for the period ahead. We should attempt to build on, but not seek to duplicate, the work of the tenth special session and last year's meeting of this body. Moreover, given the direct relationship between arms control and the security of States, progress can result only from careful and deliberate negotiations. Setting arbitrary deadlines would not expedite the process.
This Commission, concerned about all arms control and disarmament questions, would seem to be a proper forum in which to express the continuing concern of my Government over the repeated reports of the use of lethal and incapacitating chemical weapons in Laos, Kampuchea and Afghanistan. The United States Government is already on record in other multilateral forums, namely the United Nations Human Rights Commission and the Committee on Disarmament, as favouring an impartial international investigation of all reports of the use of chemical weapons. I should like to emphasize that the United States is not making any accusations or charges. However, in our view, the emerging pattern of evidence clearly warrants an impartial international investigation.
I will not take the valuable time of this Commission to reply to the charges made by others that the United States and its NATO allies are responsible for the present unfavourable international climate. We all know that this is not the case. I would comment only that the review of recent history which we have heard from several delegations in the past few days is selective, inaccurate and distorted.

It is important that we use our time wisely and work diligently in this Commission to do what we can through our debates and discussions to promote respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to promote conditions which will lead to enduring progress in achieving balanced and verifiable arms control and disarmament measures.

For its part, as President Carter has made clear — and I quote: "The United States remains deeply committed to the process of mutual and verifiable arms control, particularly to the effort to prevent the spread and further development of nuclear weapons."

Mr. MIDKONWEB (Ethiopia): Many of us, including the Chairman in his opening statement, have already noted that this second substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission is taking place at a crucial moment in the history of contemporary international relations.

When mounting tension prevails in the international atmosphere, the cause of disarmament appears to be the first to suffer. This is particularly true in an atmosphere of tension which is pointing in the direction of a dangerous confrontation between the major Powers. An outstanding example of the recent setbacks in the field of disarmament is the fact that the Second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II), which was signed nearly a year ago and which had brought with it so much hope and so many prospects for a better world, has been shelved indefinitely. While it is encouraging to note that the
limitations and restrictions agreed upon in SALT II are observed by both the
Soviet Union and the United States, Ethiopia is convinced that an early
ratification of SALT II would go a long way towards defusing the present
tension and towards paving the road to a new round of negotiations on SALT III.

Another disturbing development which Socialist Ethiopia is following with
the utmost anxiety is the growing escalation of the military presence of the
nuclear-weapon States in the Indian Ocean area. Far from the objectives of
the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, and contrary to the
repeated demands by the States of the region to keep the area free from the
arms race, particularly in its nuclear aspect, existing military bases are
being expanded while the search for new and similar bases in the same area
is being intensified.

The general situation has thus steadily and sharply worsened, resulting
in ominous new developments which are detrimental to over-all world politics
and, in particular, to the cause of détente and peaceful co-existence. This
is the time, therefore, for the Disarmament Commission to evaluate the situation
as objectively as possible, to seek the necessary remedies, and to revitalize
its best efforts in the right direction. That the task of the Commission
has been rendered difficult is indeed a common perception that cannot be
denied. That there is a great need for renewed determination to accept
the ever-growing challenges realistically and to press resolutely towards
the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament should also be the
other common perception.

In these endeavours, the Commission has the advantage of being guided by
the remarkable achievements of the first Disarmament Decade, namely, the
Declaration and the Programme of Action embodied in the Final Document of the
tenth special session of the General Assembly. The report of the Commission
to the General Assembly will, we believe, be judged not by how much it adds to the Final Document, but rather by how faithful it remains to it.

The agenda items which are now being considered by the Commission are, indeed, very elaborate and extensive. While short-term disarmament objectives such as those reflected in the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament should continue to receive the maximum possible emphasis, the highest priority should, in our view, be accorded to the halting of the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, as stipulated in the Final Document. As the representative of Cyprus noted last week, the security concerns of States will continue to depend closely on armaments for as long as the arms race continues. The early cessation of the arms race in all its aspects and progress towards genuine disarmament would, therefore, greatly contribute to the international order envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations, and thus to the strengthening of alternate means of security, thereby facilitating the adoption and implementation of further disarmament measures and the solution of pressing economic and social problems.

As a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Ethiopia has consistently held the view that an early conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty would constitute a very important step towards the cessation of both the vertical and the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. In view of the forthcoming Second Review Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, therefore, we hope that the Commission would find it possible to emphasize the important connexion between the need for a speedy conclusion of the treaty on a comprehensive test ban, and the continued effectiveness of the non-proliferation régime.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my delegation’s satisfaction at seeing you preside over the deliberations of the Commission, and to assure you of our full co-operation.
Mr. ADEWILJE (Nigeria): My delegation is very happy, Mr. Chairman, to see you preside once again over the Disarmament Commission's current session, and we pledge to you our support.

In emphasizing once again the deep interest of my delegation in halting and reversing the arms race, I should like to state what seems obvious to us, but apparently not so obvious to the proponents of increased military preparedness. We see disarmament as contributing more to the purposes of peace, happy existence and the orderly development of nations, than the mindless waste implicit in the unproductive arms race. We are aware, of course, that the driving force behind the arms race has been ascribed to the differing perceptions of national security and national interests, including economic interest. Unfortunately, we are also aware that national security in most countries retains strong military overtones, a factor which implies the necessity to arm oneself to a level consistent with the perceived need of the nation. Although every nation is, to a greater or lesser extent, trapped in this basic perception of defence requirements, nevertheless the greatest concern has been focused on the accumulation of nuclear armaments, which constitute the single gravest danger to human existence.
The United Nations Disarmament Commission is holding this second substantive session at a time when the danger of the nuclear arms race is more menacing than ever. The decade of the 1970s, proclaimed by the United Nations the First Disarmament Decade, has turned out, ironically, to be a decade of increased armament, especially in the nuclear field. The facts are incontrovertible in terms of the quantity and quality of arsenals as well as in the expenditure being lavished on armaments.

The decade of the 1980s has started, unfortunately also, with gravely disturbing signs, which leads one to conclude that if greater efforts are not made towards disarmament the arms race is likely in this decade to be intensified, international tension will be further exacerbated and the danger of war involving nuclear weapons will be much greater than even the pessimistic though realistic assessment made during the special session devoted to disarmament foresaw.

It is not necessary for me to take the time of the Commission by going into a detailed discussion of the various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. No single delegation, in my view, can summarize the situation with greater vividness than we all did collectively in the Final Document of the special session devoted to disarmament. The new element since the special session has been the almost total disregard of that realistic assessment. It is to be recalled that it was indicated in the Final Document that

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority."

(resolution S-10/2, para. 13)

What we have witnessed over the last few months gives very serious cause for concern. An intensification of the arms race has been most brazenly pursued through an almost daily announcement of commitments to increase military expenditure, to build and deploy new nuclear-weapon systems, to modernize existing nuclear arsenals and to acquire new military facilities in other countries and areas while consolidating existing ones, even including encroachment on the sovereignty of other countries in the scramble for greater spheres of influence.
In the atmosphere of distrust created by these developments the tentative steps towards negotiations aimed at effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war have virtually been abandoned. SALT II is in cold storage, so to speak. The multilateral negotiating body energized with such fanfare last year is being paralysed by interminable procedural wranglings, and the top-priority items on the disarmament agenda are therefore hardly being negotiated. The Disarmament Commission cannot be oblivious of the failure of the Committee on Disarmament to take even the basic step of setting up a working group on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. Yet it is clear, particularly at this time, that the issue of a comprehensive nuclear test ban has assumed an added significance because of the impending Second Review Conference of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The pledge contained in article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty to the effect that the nuclear-weapon States would pursue negotiations relating to nuclear disarmament has not been fulfilled. From all indications it appears that the Second Review Conference will come and go without a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The negative effect of this on the non-proliferation régime is obvious. It will be a great disservice to the cause of non-proliferation, both vertical and horizontal.

Of course, we are all aware that horizontal non-proliferation, in spite of the existence of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, has been under a severe threat of erosion. Last September it was reported that South Africa, either alone or in collusion with Israel, had exploded a nuclear device. Neither Israel nor South Africa is a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and neither is likely to be a signatory. Yet those two countries are supplied with nuclear materials by some nuclear-weapon States without a care as to the use to which such sensitive nuclear materials are diverted. The frequent alarm sounded and adequately documented in the communication which is the subject of item 7 of the Commission's agenda has not, unfortunately, been heeded.
One vital element in nuclear non-proliferation in the 1980s should, in our view, be a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Such a treaty, we are convinced, would present itself as being a less discriminatory and more egalitarian instrument than the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and would, therefore, we hope commend itself to those who are at present outside the Non-Proliferation Treaty. This is a weighty reason why the nuclear-weapon States, especially the trilateral negotiators, should place no further obstacles in the way of the Committee on Disarmament's setting up an ad hoc working group to work out a universal and comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. It is only logical that if such a treaty is to be an effective multilateral treaty the Committee on Disarmament must have an early and important role to play in it. It is a happy augury for the Committee that the five nuclear-weapon States are now all participating in its work.

If the Disarmament Commission's task is to expedite negotiations aimed at effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war its recommendations should focus on the causes of delay in negotiations. I say this because the framework for negotiations which was established during the special session is still to be fully explored. The principles that should govern negotiations and the priorities have been well set out in the Final Document.

The priority accorded to nuclear disarmament presupposes that action on this category of weapons would be expedited in the various negotiations envisaged—mainly in the Committee on Disarmament and the bilateral SALT process. The Commission cannot help but note with regret the disproportionate amount of time spent by the Committee on Disarmament on procedural matters, particularly on the question of participation in its work by non-members. The single multilateral negotiating forum is no preserve of its present members. Thus, participation by non-members ought not to be seen as a favour bestowed on the friends of some of the members but denied to their adversaries. The procedure for participation by non-members laid down in paragraph 120 of the Final Document should enable the Committee to take quick decisions on this procedural matter without converting it to the subject of high negotiations, taking up valuable time that ought to be employed more profitably.
In addition, the Commission, in our view, should seek to make appropriate recommendations to the General Assembly on the need for the multilateral negotiating body to set up as a matter of course working groups on priority items which have been so identified, especially in the Final Document of the special session.

Among the priorities for disarmament negotiations mentioned in the Final Document is the subject of conventional weapons. In approaching this category of weapons - that is, conventional weapons - several elements should be borne in mind.

First, there is a need to avoid the complication that has been created in nuclear non-proliferation through a certain duality: States that can keep nuclear weapons on the one hand and others that should not develop them on the other. The ability to manufacture conventional weapons should not confer an advantage; nor does the inability to manufacture them imply denial of access. A general rule must be envisaged for all.

Secondly, the link between conventional weapons and other elements in the disarmament plan must, of course, be kept in mind. It is significant in this respect that the area of greatest concentration of armed forces and conventional weapons is the same main theatre of nuclear weapons. It is also noteworthy that the same countries that lead in nuclear weapons are the greatest repositories of conventional forces and conventional weapons. Therefore, it is realistic to expect primary action in the field of conventional weapons by States with the largest military arsenals, such that a more stable situation - for instance, in a place like Europe - can be achieved at a lower level of military potential.

Thirdly, the main concentration of effort should, in our view, be directed at how to control the production of conventional weapons. If it is estimated that 80 per cent of conventional military production is retained by the producers, then it is clear that effective disarmament steps in the conventional sphere should focus on this fact.

Fourthly, the secondary area of action, of course, should be the international transfer of conventional arms. In this respect, paragraph 85 of the Final Document has laid down some of the relevant factors: namely, the undiminished security of the parties, the need of all States to protect their security, the inalienable right to self-determination and independence of peoples under colonial and foreign domination and the obligation of States to respect that right.
It is opportune that the delegations of Spain and Denmark have introduced two documents on this important area of disarmament. We do appreciate their efforts and hope that the Commission, at this session and perhaps also at its next session, can devote time to the discussion of these major contributions by those two delegations. My brief comments on conventional weapons may perhaps have shown some divergence of approach; this, of course, further emphasizes the need for thorough discussion of this aspect of our work.

The level of expenditure on armaments keeps on increasing every year. It is currently said to be about $450 billion, while annual expenditures on official development assistance is only $20 billion. Thus, the time is ripe for effective action aimed at reduction of military expenditure, particularly by nuclear-weapon and other militarily significant States. This will be taken up in detail under item 5 of our agenda.

The present international situation, the level of armaments, the prospect of further escalation in military spending and the overall effect on international peace and security makes the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade most opportune. First, there is the need increasingly to ginger up public awareness of the dangers of the arms race and of the urgent necessity for effective measures for disarmament as a means both towards increased security and towards facilitating the concentration by Governments on the social and economic improvement of their peoples.

It also seems appropriate to us that a Disarmament Decade should be proclaimed simultaneously with the declaration of the third United Nations Development Decade for the 1980s. Further, the disheartening failure of the first Disarmament Decade should logically strengthen our resolve not only to declare a second Disarmament Decade, but also to envisage activities for the new decade which would make it an effective period for disarmament.

As is reflected in the views of the Nigerian Government communicated to the Secretary-General, the proclamation should note the failure of the first Disarmament Decade to obtain its objectives and should also take account of the escalation of the arms race. The modest achievements made - the arms control agreements such as the partial test ban treaty, the non-proliferation treaty, the biological weapons convention and the environmental modification convention - pale into insignificance when compared with the more concrete and urgent
disarmament measures that the nuclear weapon States are unwilling to conclude. We should also draw attention to the fact that concomitant to the arms race there is heightened international tension and threats to international peace and security.

Certain disarmament measures should, in our view, be attainable before the second special General Assembly session devoted to disarmament. Such measures include a universal and comprehensive test ban, a ban on chemical weapons, an international convention guaranteeing the security of non-nuclear weapon States, a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons, the ratification of the SALT II agreements and initiation of negotiations on SALT III agreements. These are some of the subjects we should expect to be concluded in the course of the Decade, but in particular before the second special session.

Other disarmament measures, especially those dealing with other aspects of nuclear disarmament, will also have to be undertaken during the course of the Decade. Activities for the Decade should include measures on the link between disarmament and development, measures on disarmament and international security, and measures that would, as we have said, ginger up public awareness.

We believe that in the course of the Decade, and in the preparation of the draft resolution requested of the Commission by the General Assembly, no attempt should be made to duplicate all the work done during the special Assembly session. Nor should any attempt be made to duplicate the work which the Commission undertook last year. Such duplication would occur if we were to seek merely to catalogue all the disarmament items that have been deemed desirable. We envisage that, in the course of the Decade - which is a specific period of time - we should seek to highlight those measures which ought to be concluded during the ten-year span.

Mr. LEBL (Canada): Canada approaches this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in a positive spirit. The Commission provides an opportunity for all States to exchange views on what might be called the medium-range future, in contrast to the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament, which are both oriented towards current issues. Moreover, the absence both of draft resolutions and of draft agreements gives our deliberations a certain weight; we can focus on the background factors which influence the subject. Canada therefore supports proposals and initiatives here which are
comprehensive, either by treating a particular category of arms as a whole or by their linking the various aspects of disarmament together in a programme. We believe that the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, the Second Disarmament Decade and the concept of agreed reductions in military budgets are all subjects which fit this general approach.

We have therefore noted with interest and approval the two papers before us on aspects of conventional disarmament, the working paper introduced by Spain, entitled "Limitation and control of the production and transfer of conventional weapons" (A/CH.10/12 (Annex)), and the paper introduced by Denmark, entitled "Approaches to conventional disarmament in the framework of the United Nations" (A/CH.10/13 (Annex)). It is especially noteworthy that these papers deal with a subject which has not been given the attention it deserves by the Committee on Disarmament. It is a subject, moreover, of direct interest to all States, whatever their level of armaments or defence expenditure.

My delegation hopes that the Commission will be able to formulate conclusions on the basis of these papers that can be acted upon by the General Assembly. Our own preference is that the General Assembly should authorize a study of the problems of conventional arms control and reductions, as Denmark has suggested.
Such a study would be a natural complement to the United Nations study on nuclear weapons, which is to be completed this year. It would take this study into account, as well as the work being done on regional disarmament, disarmament and development, disarmament and international security, the reduction of military budgets and on confidence-building measures. It would be a step towards implementing the measures outlined in Part A-3 of the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament adopted by the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 1979 and entitled "Conventional Weapons and Armed Forces".

Nevertheless, my delegation also believes that study of this subject is not enough. Practical steps towards control need to be taken as well. My Government has welcomed the initiatives by Sweden and Romania to begin work on reducing military budgets and has filled out the matrix on defence expenditures distributed by the Secretary-General in September 1979. A common reporting instrument is clearly a prerequisite for negotiations on this subject, and unless that instrument is tested with the co-operation of States from all regions, we are unlikely to make concrete progress. My Government is also engaged in the negotiations for the mutual and balanced reduction of forces in Europe, negotiations that admittedly are making slow progress but which nevertheless continue. We support the view that the regional approach to conventional arms reduction deserves further exploration and that the co-operation of the major military powers is essential to the success of such an approach. No country or group of countries is likely to restrict its freedom of action on defence policy unless there is some assurance against the threat of military intervention by outside powers.

We also wish to draw attention to the concrete measures suggested by Spain in document A/CH.10/12 relating to the regulation of arms transfers. It is an unfortunate fact that no negotiations or even consultations are taking place on this aspect of arms control at the present time, although important initiatives were taken in the mid-1970s both in respect of Latin America and of the policies of the United States and the USSR. The idea of a United Nations register of arms transfers has not yet been found acceptable. Yet, in the case of reductions of military budgets and of the mutually balanced force reduction (MBFR)
negotiations in Europe, an agreed data-base is crucial to the building of confidence and thus the establishment of a basis for agreement. The same need exists for agreed and public data if negotiated limits are to be placed on the transfer of arms.

We should not overlook, in our deliberations, the other side of the coin of disarmament policies - that is, international security policies. The comprehensive programme of disarmament includes as a major element the heading "Disarmament and International Security". Twenty years ago there were elaborate plans for security in a disarmed world. These were abandoned as Utopian, although the goal of general and complete disarmament remained. Nevertheless, the United Nations still performs indispensable functions in keeping the peace, despite lack of agreement on the political management of peace-keeping operations. It would be useful, in the view of my Government, for the Disarmament Commission to keep this subject in mind, both in relation to the Second Disarmament Decade and to conventional disarmament. The United Nations study on disarmament and international security is nearing completion. Once it is available, the Commission could with profit turn its attention to this element of the comprehensive programme.

In conclusion, I might mention that we have not spoken in this statement about the current international tension or about the issues before the Committee on Disarmament. The views of Canada on these matters are on record. We cannot but agree that the manufacture and deployment of new weapon systems, the rise in global military expenditures and the transfer of offensive arms to regions of conflict, are deeply disturbing. Yet these trends represent the inevitable reaction to the use of armed force to violate the territorial integrity and political independence of States, especially by great Powers which are capable of threatening the security of all other States. We have no guarantee - quite the reverse - that ever-increasing global military expenditures will bring nearer the prospects of global security. Only by strengthening international procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes, for keeping the peace and for distributing equitably those resources which are basic to human society, can we hope to bring about conditions that may lead to real security and peaceful disarmament.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.