Chairman: Mr. VELLODI (India)

Agenda item 3: (continued)

Preparation of the elements of a draft resolution entitled "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade"

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 H, with the aim 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

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.
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Agenda item 5: (continued)

(a) Harmonization of views on concrete steps to be undertaken by States regarding a gradual agreed reduction of military budgets and reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries, noting the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly

(b) Examination and identification of effective ways and means of achieving agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain, in a balanced manner, military expenditures, including adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all concerned

Agenda item 8: (continued)

Adoption of the report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its thirty-fifth session

Closing statements
The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 3 (continued)

PREPARATION OF THE ELEMENTS OF A DRAFT RESOLUTION ENTITLED "DECLARATION OF THE 1980s AS THE SECOND DISARMAMENT DECADE"

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 AIM 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

AGENDA ITEM 5 (continued)

(a) HARMONIZATION OF VIEWS ON CONCRETE STEPS TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY STATES REGARDING A GRADUAL AGREED REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS AND REALLOCATION OF RESOURCES NO LONGER BEING USED FOR MILITARY PURPOSES TO ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, PARTICULARLY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, NOTING THE RELEVANT RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(b) EXAMINATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF EFFECTIVE WAYS AND MEANS OF ACHIEVING AGREEMENTS TO FREEZE, REDUCE OR OTHERWISE RESTRAIN, IN A BALANCED MANNER, MILITARY EXPENDITURES, INCLUDING ADEQUATE MEASURES OF VERIFICATION SATISFACTORY TO ALL CONCERNED

AGENDA ITEM 8 (continued)

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS THIRTY-FIFTH SESSION
The CHAIRMAN: First of all, I should like to draw the Commission's attention to the various documents before it which will be taken up during this afternoon's meeting. First, there is document A/CH.10/CRP.9 which is the draft report of the Commission to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. I am mentioning these documents in the order of the items on the agenda. Next we have two documents, A/CH.10/CRP.11 and A/CH.10/CRP.11/Corr.1, both relating to item 3, that is, "Draft declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade." Then we have document A/CH.10/CRP.9/Add.1, which is the section which will have to go into the report on items 4 (a) and 4 (b). Lastly, we have three documents relating to items 5 (a) and 5 (b). These are A/CH.10/CRP.10, A/CH.10/CRP.10/Add.1 and A/CH.10/CRP.10/Add.1/Rev.1.

Before we start our substantive consideration of these papers, I should like to indicate the method I propose for the speedy completion of our work this afternoon. As most members will have noticed, in the draft report which is A/CH.10/CRP.9, on page 10 under the general heading "Recommendations", in section IV, in paragraphs 19, 20 and 21 there are certain sections to be inserted. Paragraph 19 will have inserted in it the agreed text on item 3, paragraph 20 will have the agreed text on item 4, and paragraph 21, the agreed text on item 5.

I should like to make two small corrections to document A/CH.10/CRP.9. On page 6, in paragraph 9, it stated that the Commission held:

"... a general exchange of views on various items of its agenda, in particular agenda items 3, 4 (a) and (b) and 5 (a) and (b)."

In keeping with the facts and decisions taken, I think we should state that the general exchange of views was on items 4 (a) and (b) and 5 (a) and (b). It is true that some delegations, while talking about items 4 and 5, may have referred to other items on the agenda, but the decision was that we would have exchanges of views on items 4 and 5.
In paragraph 10, in the last sentence it is stated that:
"The Working Group met under the chairmanship of the representative of Nigeria ..."
I should like to insert the words "Ambassador Adeniji". I should like his name to appear there and, similarly, in paragraph 12, I should like to include, after the words "under the chairmanship of", the name of Mr. Sucharipa.

These are the only comments I have on this paper.

What I would now suggest is that we give our attention to those documents relating to the three items, 3, 4 and 5.

As I stated a moment ago, the basic document relating to item 3 is A/CH.10/CRP.11, but there is a corrigendum to it and that corrigendum is a new wording of the paragraph which appears at the top of page 2 of document A/CH.10/CRP.11. On the second page of the corrigendum, it will be observed that there is also a reference to a correction of subparagraph (v) on page 6 of the main document.

As I indicated yesterday afternoon, this document still has a certain number of square brackets on pages 4, 5 and 6. It was my hope - and I am sure that hope was shared by many other delegations - that in informal consultations we might be able to have those square brackets removed. We made a final effort yesterday evening and we worked into the night to see whether these square brackets could be removed. While there was a general desire to make progress, I am sorry to have to inform the Commission that we have not been able to remove any of those square brackets.
In other words, the document on the draft declaration of the Second Disarmament Decade will go to the General Assembly with square brackets. As I have indicated on previous occasions, while we would all have hoped that we could send the draft to the General Assembly for adoption without any square brackets, that has not been possible. It is my sincere hope that between now and the thirty-fifth session of the Assembly, or at least in the early stages of that session, further efforts will be made by the delegations particularly interested to evolve language that can generally acceptable for the portions of the document which are now in square brackets. I am happy that there are not many square brackets, although the portions that are within square brackets are vital parts of the document. We can only hope that during the thirty-fifth session those square brackets will be removed, generally acceptable language found and the declaration adopted.

I should now like to ask delegations to look at documents A/CN.10/CRP.11 and Corr.1. I shall go over document A/CN.10/CRP.11 page by page, rather than paragraph by paragraph. If any delegation has any comments or observations to make we shall consider them, in the hope that we can make fast progress on this document.

Are there any observations on page 1? There are none. It should be noted that the first paragraph on page 2 is replaced by the text appearing in document A/CN.10/CRP.11/Corr.1. With that understanding, I should like to ask delegations whether they have any comments on page 2. There are none. Are there any observations on page 3? There are none. On page 4 there are square brackets, and I hope delegations will not wish to make substantive explanations regarding what is contained in the square brackets. I think most representatives are aware of the difficulties. I would only ask delegations whether they have any other observations to make on page 4. There are none. Are there any comments on page 5? There are none. On page 6 it will be noted that there is a corrigendum, appearing on page 2 of document A/CN.10/CRP.11/Corr.1, with regard to subparagraph (b). Keeping that in mind, I should like to ask whether there are any observations on page 6. There are none. Any there any observations on pages 7, 8 and 9? There are none. If we can make such fast progress I am sure we can finish our work very soon.
I should like to explain that what is contained now in documents A/CN.10/CPR.11 and Corr.1 will be inserted in paragraph 19 of the draft report in document A/CN.10/CPR.9.

We now turn to document A/CN.10/CPR.9/Add.1, which relates to agenda item 4 (a) and (b). I should like to propose that, if it meets with the approval of the Commission, the following phrase be inserted in paragraph 4, after the words "Programme of Action enumerated in the Final Document," in line 8: "including efforts to facilitate the resumption and continuation of the talks that have been interrupted".

With that proposal in mind, I should like delegations to comment on the first page of document A/CN.10/CPR.9/Add.1. There are no observations.

I have to draw attention to a typographical error in the seventh line of paragraph 9 on page 3, where the words "by those States" should be amended to read "by these States". I should now like to ask whether there are any observations on page 2.

Mr. PETREE (United States of America): My delegation would like to present for the consideration of the Commission several minor technical legal points which would involve slight amendments of the wording of paragraph 5 as it exists in the present draft. I might add that the suggested amendments have been presented in brief form on a paper which, I believe, has been distributed to the delegation.

The first change I should like to propose is with regard to the phrase "the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as well as other relevant and generally accepted principles of international law". I should like to propose the deletion of the words "and generally accepted". It is our view that these words are unnecessary and in fact tend to throw confusion into a simple designation of international law. We hope that others will agree with us that nothing would be lost by deletion of those words except possible confusion in the future.
The second change I should like to propose is in reference, further on in the same sentence, to the "non-use or threat of use of force". In place of that phrase, we should like to follow the more standard wording of the Charter principle, rather than use this more casual formulation and say "prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations".

Next, in the immediately succeeding phrase, the present wording is unacceptable to my delegation and we should like to propose a revision, which would in place of "non-recognition of situations created by use of force", read "non-recognition of territorial acquisition created by use of force". It is our view that the present wording is simply wrong. The repulsion of an aggressor, for example, is something brought about by use of force. There are many precedents in the language of the United Nations for this more standard formulation which we have proposed.

Next I should like to refer to the phrase two lines below, which reads "non-intervention and non-interference". We shall have to ask that the phrase "and non-interference" be deleted. "Non-intervention" is the standard phraseology for the legal principle and we therefore cannot accept new and vague wording which appears to set forth a new principle.

Finally in this paragraph 5, I would refer to the phrase in the middle of the paragraph which reads as follows: "the just and peaceful resolution of conflicts and disputes and self-determination of peoples under colonial and alien domination". We believe that self-determination is a right of all people and that deprivation or denial of it are equal in their potentially serious consequences. We cannot accept a partial formulation referring only to some people in the world and we therefore propose that the phrase "under colonial and alien domination" be deleted from the text. Those are the points I should like to make on this particular paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN: The Commission has heard the suggestions made by the representative of the United States concerning certain amendments to the first sentence of paragraph 5. The representative of the United States has explained the proposed amendments and I should like to ask the Commission to comment on these
amendments. If I hear no objection to these amendments I shall consider that they are accepted.

Mr. RABETAFAKA (Madagascar) (interpretation from French): We have heard the submission made by the representative of the United States of the proposed amendments to paragraph 5. I should like to say that my delegation does not agree with any of these amendments.

As far as the first amendment is concerned, we have been told that the phrase "generally accepted" might lead to confusion. I would point out that this is an expression which is in general use and that, given the state of international law, some principles are accepted by some and more or less accepted by others, and that is why we have supported the formulation "generally accepted" to cover all situations.

As far as the second amendment is concerned, the replacement of "non-use or threat of use of force", my delegation maintains that the replacement of that phrase by "prohibition of the threat or use of force" is in no way in accordance with the Charter. If we have to refer to the Charter, then strictly speaking the phrase which is found there is "the non-use or threat of force" and not "prohibition of the threat or use of force" in international relations. I quote this in English, as unfortunately I only have the amendments in English.

As far as the third amendment is concerned, it is proposed that we replace the word "situations" by "territorial acquisition". My delegation maintains that there are other situations in addition to territorial acquisitions which must not be recognized because they result from the use or the threat of use of force.

As far as the fourth amendment is concerned, my delegation is rather perplexed when it is said that "non-interference" is a vague concept that is not recognized. In that connexion, for us as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement the principle of non-interference is a well-defined principle and we do not understand why reference should not be made to it; we cannot see why it should be considered vague and new and not a standard concept.
Finally, as far as the fifth amendment is concerned, we are asked simply to delete the expression "under colonial and alien domination". My delegation cannot accept this amendment for the good reason that this formulation is one that we find in all the resolutions that we have adopted in the First Committee. It is not our job here to go back to the question of the self-determination of peoples, but rather to use phraseology which has already been adopted by consensus in the committees to which we are more or less responsible.

For all these reasons my delegation cannot accept the proposed amendments which have been put forward by the United States delegation.
Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): I would like only to endorse and support the statement made by the representative of Madagascar on the various amendments which have been suggested on paragraph 5, for reasons that are very similar to those he has already advanced.

Mr. PIGREE (United States of America): In response to the statement of the representative of Madagascar, I would like to make a couple of additional comments, if I may.

First, with reference to the phrase "non-intervention and non-interference," this is a technical point, a matter of wording. It has seemed to us that the concept of non-interference, which does not have the same status in all of our documentation as does the concept in law of non-intervention, is really subsumed in the more standard phrase "non-intervention," and it was on this basis that we put forward our suggestion.

With reference to the final suggested amendment, the deletion of the phrase "under colonial and alien domination," if it would assist the representatives of Madagascar and India and others, perhaps we could consider a formulation which inserted in that phrase the words "including those" - "self-determination of peoples including those under colonial and alien domination".

Finally, going back to an earlier phrase, "the non-recognition of situations created by use of force" and so forth, in an effort to make possible an agreement on some of these phrases, may I suggest a further alternative for the Commission's consideration. Perhaps the phrase could read: "non-recognition of territorial acquisition or special advantage resulting from aggression". Again, the phrase would read:

"...non-recognition of territorial acquisition or special advantage resulting from aggression..."

That formulation would be acceptable to my delegation, if our first suggestion is not.
Mr. VUKOVIC (Yugoslavia): I also want to associate my delegation with what has been said by the representative of Madagascar on the amendments proposed by the representative of the United States.

Apart from that, I would find it very difficult to accept amendments at this stage, because I do not see any possibility of consulting my Government on these changes. Most of the language we have used here is taken from the Final Document of the special session. The first amendment that has been proposed uses language taken directly from the Final Document, paragraph 26. That Final Document was agreed to by consensus, if I recall.

The last amendment referred to by the representative of the United States is also couched in language that has been taken directly from the Final Document. I feel, therefore, that it would be extremely difficult to enter into changes in the texts of the documents we are considering.

Mr. NOLAH (Australia): My delegation could find the amendments proposed by the representative of the United States acceptable. We listened with interest to the suggestions or comments made by the representative of Madagascar.

On the first amendment suggested by the United States, I wonder whether it would be helpful were the word "accepted" to be retained, so it would read "as other relevant accepted principles of international law". I must say that I find it rather unusual to refer to "generally accepted principles," but if we use just "accepted," I think that this may help to overcome the problems.

On the last point, point 5 of the United States amendments, the suggestion made by the representative of the United States was one I was going to suggest myself. Australia, which is neither under colonial nor alien domination, would like to be included in any reference to the self-determination of its people, and I think the suggestion of adding "including those" would overcome the problems mentioned by the representative of Madagascar.
Mr. CORREA VILLALOBOS (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I would simply like to point out to the Commission that the language in paragraph 5, as stated by the representative of Yugoslavia, is taken almost word for word from the Final Document. Therefore, the words "and generally accepted" in the fourth line appear in paragraph 26 of the Final Document. The words "non-intervention and non-interference" appear in paragraph 26 and in paragraph 12. The reference to the right of peoples under colonial and alien domination to self-determination is taken from paragraph 22 of that document. I feel therefore that it should be relatively easy for us to find a solution to this problem, if we keep to the wording used in the Final Document.

Permit me to suggest that with regard to the reference to non-use or threat of force, we should use the phrase used in these paragraphs, which refers to "refraining from the threat or use of force". That phrase appears in various parts of the Final Document.

Mr. de QUEIROZ DUARTE (Brazil): I do not propose to engage in a discussion of the substance of the amendments that have been proposed, because we have been discussing that paragraph for a few days now, and these formulations have been before us for some time.

I would just like to point out, as have previous speakers, that the language in the document before us also appears in very important documents accepted by the membership of the United Nations by consensus, as is the case with the Final Document to which the representatives of Mexico and Yugoslavia have referred.
To make another point, although I appreciate that the representative of the United States has tried to amend his own amendments to resolve some of the doubts that have been expressed, I also think that the word "aggression" is likely to cause even more grave doubts because it is a concept that has not been as yet defined in international law.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether at some point in this discussion you would give us some guidance on how we should proceed in the face of the submission of amendments at this late stage and the doubts and concerns that have been expressed by some of the delegations.

Mr. AKBAR (Pakistan): My delegation has listened with great interest to the proposals made by the representative of the United States, as well as the various comments on those proposals.

At this stage of our work we consider this document, which will form part of the report, not as a legal document but as a political one and to that extent I think that a legal or technical approach to these various formulations would not be strictly consonant with the general framework of our discussions.

Some of the formulations of language contained in the paper, I must admit, are not to our liking either and we would have preferred to have seen them phrased in some other way but, as the representative of the United States said himself, these are minor technical and legal points. My delegation for one would not stand in the way of the Commission adopting a document by consensus because of minor technical or legal difficulties with some points in the paper. Although my delegation could accept some of those changes, having listened to the views of various delegations, it is our view that that might take some time to work out; a resumption of the Drafting Group might even be necessary to work out the language that would satisfy everybody. May I suggest for the consideration of the United States delegation that, as it has submitted these amendments, they are now on record and perhaps the United States delegation could make a suitable statement of interpretation or of reservation on this part of the report at the appropriate stage and therefore enable the Commission to proceed with its work on the adoption of the report and its conclusions at this meeting.
Mr. HOUSAQUI (Algeria) (interpretation from French): My delegation fully associates itself with the point of view expressed by the representatives of Madagascar, Yugoslavia and Brazil. The reasons mentioned in support of the amendments proposed do not seem to be at all convincing to us, and my delegation would like the proposed text to remain as it is.

Mr. PETREE (United States of America): My delegation is fully conscious of the political content of our deliberations, our purposes and, of this document. But it seems to us that, in a passage of the document which speaks of principles of international law, it is incumbent upon us to be careful of the way in which we phrase these so-called principles.

With reference to the specific points that I have raised, on which a number of delegations have commented, the suggestion that we return to some of the language in the Final Document to solve some of these problems appeals to me in part. For example, in the phrase concerning the non-use or threat of force and my proposed substitution, I could accept, as suggested by another delegation, a phrase which read "refraining from the threat or use of force", which appears in paragraph 26 of the Final Document in at least that one place.

With reference to the word "non-interference", on glancing through the Final Document I find again in the same paragraph that that word appears, but it does so in a total phrase which reads as follows: "non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States". My delegation would be happy to accept that language, which we all accepted previously.

Finally, when it comes to previously accepted language, the proposal that I made ultimately in substitution for the phrase "non-recognition of situations" was "non-recognition of territorial acquisition or special advantage resulting from aggression". That phrase was drawn from the definition of "aggression" to which we all agreed. Therefore, I should like to urge the acceptance of these suggestions as modified in the course of this discussion.
Mr. LATULUIMBE (Zaire) (interpretation from French): My delegation supports the proposals made by the representatives of Madagascar and of other non-aligned countries because it feels that the terms used in paragraph 5 of the document under consideration are taken from the Final Document of the tenth special session, on disarmament, and my delegation would recall that that was adopted by consensus. Those phrases have also been taken from certain resolutions that were proposed in the First Committee of the General Assembly. The text before us does not include any brackets. My delegation believes that to gain time, and since some delegations persist in not accepting the formulation of paragraph 5 as it stands, reference should be made to paragraph 22 of the draft report which offers a way out: that is, to allow the Commission to proceed with its work, reservations could be expressed.
Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria): My delegation was rather surprised that the delegation of the United States could in fact suggest the deletion of the words "under colonial and alien domination" from paragraph 5 of this document.

Self-determination, by its very connotation, presupposes the existence of a subordinate status. The colonial situation in southern Africa is unacceptable and poses a challenge to the international community. It was right that the American delegation was itself able to rectify the error. However, the delegation of Madagascar has stated the position correctly, and I only wish to reiterate the validity of the view just expressed by it on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN: We have before us a set of amendments proposed by the representative of the United States on which other members have commented. Most of them have expressed reservations or objections with regard to those amendments and the representative of the United States himself has modified some of the amendments which he proposed earlier.

So the Commission has to take a decision on them. I would be quite prepared, if it is the general desire of the Commission, to consider the possibility of accepting some of these amendments in modified language that would be acceptable to all the members of the Commission, but as the representative of Pakistan correctly stated, this would require that we go into informal consultations. This can be done, but it could have been done two or three days ago easily. Today we are in our last meeting, with the intention of finishing our work this evening, and it seems to me that it will now be a very difficult task indeed.
However, if there is a feeling in the Commission that an effort should be made to this end, we could consider it.

Before I embark upon such an exercise, one thing has to be quite clear. If after that exercise some of these amendments are still not acceptable to the membership at large, I should like to know whether the representative of the United States would be willing, in a spirit of co-operation, to respond to the suggestion made by some of the representatives to the effect that on parts of this paragraph which are still difficult for the United States delegation to accept that delegation should simply express its reservations in the statement which it will, I suppose, in any case make later today.

I mention this because it seems to me that there is no point in embarking upon extensive consultations to see whether some of these amendments can be incorporated unless there is, at least, that understanding. If, on the other hand, the position of the United States delegation is that, if all its amendments in the form in which it has proposed and amended them itself are not accepted, then it cannot accept the paragraph, then it seems to me that perhaps there is not much advantage in holding further negotiations at this stage. I should therefore like to ask the representative of the United States whether he could react to the point that I have made.

Mr. FLETCHER (United States of America): We, of course, wish to work in good faith and would be willing to consider such an arrangement if some of our requirements are met through this quick negotiation which the Chair is proposing. I think that in my remarks already I have indicated which of these five points are important to us.
The CHAIRMAN: I should still like to ask other members whether they would agree to such a suggestion.

Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): Could we not finish the whole document first and then negotiate whatever is controversial instead of stopping here; in other words, turn to page 3 and so on and leave until a later stage the part that seems to be giving difficulty?

The CHAIRMAN: I would be quite prepared to continue with the consideration of this document and, after we complete that and, possibly, the the consideration of the document relating to item 5, we could hold the consultations, at a slightly later stage.

On that understanding, may I ask whether there are any other observations on page 2?

As I hear none, I turn to page 3. Here there is a small typographical error. The word "States" should be in singular, that is "State", "the right of each State...".

Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): With regard to page 3, as it will be recalled, paragraph 11 is one which gave many delegations a great deal of difficulty.

My delegation is glad to see that the final two lines of paragraph 11 state that the Commission noted that strong objections or reservations had been made from various quarters to a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons.
and armed forces. This is quite true. However, we should like to observe that no consensus has emerged on the proposed study, and we are one among many delegations which voiced serious objections to this study. We are aware of the historical antecedents of this projected study. Its clear object seems to be the imposition of an arms embargo on the shipment of conventional weapons to some parts of the world. Such an embargo would naturally be in favour of States members of military alliances. It would also be in favour of aggressors and Powers that occupy the territories of others. Such an embargo would be particularly to the advantage of Israel, which uses brute force to perpetuate its repression and illegal occupation in the Arab territories occupied since 1967. It is no secret that Israel is not only a recipient of arms but also a leading producer and exporter of arms, particularly to despotic or racist régimes like the one in South Africa and the former régime of Somoza in Nicaragua.

Israel, as is well known, has a large arsenal of nuclear weapons and is a major collaborator with South Africa in the nuclear sphere. It is clear from the aforesaid that a study on conventional weapons can be counter-productive unless it embraces the specific conditions that exist in each region and unless it clearly takes into account circumstances in which arms are acquired and the purposes which they are designed to serve. Furthermore, conventional weapons cannot be considered in isolation from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

We would therefore like our reasoned reservation on paragraph 11 to appear in the record.
Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): My delegation supports the view expressed by the representative of Kuwait that there must be a reflection of the objections in the records of our meetings and that it would be desirable that they also be reflected in the report, noting that there was no consensus in the Commission on the question of a study in the field of conventional weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the statements of the representatives of Kuwait and the Soviet Union. For my part I believe that paragraph 11 as it now stands makes it very clear that there was no consensus among members regarding the need for a study. The views expressed are reflected, for the paragraph does note that while there was wide support in favour of the study, there were strong objections on several grounds. I submit that it is for the General Assembly, taking into account both paragraph 11 and the records of our discussions here, to pursue this matter further at its thirty-fifth session.

Turning now to document A/CN.10/CRP.10/Add.1/Rev.1, members of the Commission will find that there is one phrase at the end of the first paragraph which remains in square brackets. It reads, "keeping in mind the possibility of embodying such principles into a declaration at a later stage". I am aware that agenda item 5 has received intensive consideration during this session; in fact, as most members are aware, informal consultations continued until 10 minutes before we commenced this afternoon's meeting of the Commission, and an earlier meeting was also held this morning.

It is my belief that all delegations which participated in the informal discussions did make every effort to arrive at a compromise text. Many of them made several concessions in trying to arrive at such a text. But I am sorry to see that these efforts have not fully succeeded and that we are thus faced with the problem of a phrase remaining within square brackets. In an effort to rectify this situation and to try to see whether an acceptable wording can be found for this phrase, I should like to propose an alternative text, it being understood, of course, that if that alternative is not acceptable to all the members of the Commission then the portion of the paragraph within square brackets will have to be deleted.
The phrase which I should like to propose is this:
"keeping in mind the possibility of embodying such principles into
a suitable document at an appropriate stage".

I would make a strong appeal to delegations - and particularly to those
delegations which have made every effort and worked very laboriously over the
last two weeks to find a solution to this - to consider this proposal
sympathetically. I should like to ask delegations - especially those which
had difficulty with the phrase in brackets - to inform the Commission whether the
alternative phrase I have proposed would be acceptable to them in a spirit
of compromise.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman,
my delegation has listened to your appeal sympathetically, as it has listened
to your previous appeals. We have shown our sympathy during the long discussions
on the draft recommendations on agenda item 5 by the suggestions we made,
all of which were submitted in a real and very sincere spirit
of compromise.

In the opinion of my delegation, it is very difficult to make a
change in this final part of the recommendation because it affects, in my
delegation's eyes - and this is well known - the main proposal, which was
submitted in the joint document put forward by my country and Sweden.

At the present time, it is of course even more necessary to respond
with all due seriousness and responsibility to the appeal which the Chairman
has made. The words "suitable document", which the Chairman has suggested could
replace the word "declaration", are far from having the same value as the word at
present in the draft recommendation. Nevertheless, the Romanian delegation,
in a final effort at compromise, will respond favourably to the Chairman's appeal.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to express my appreciation to the
representative of Romania.
Mr. PEARSON (Canada): I have asked to speak for two reasons. The first is to address this particular point and to say on behalf of my delegation that, as one of the delegations which requested that the bracketed phrase be kept in brackets, we are willing in the light of the changes you have suggested, Mr. Chairman, to drop our objections to that particular phrase.

I should like to say, however, that the reason that we wished to keep those words in brackets was not primarily that we objected to the possibility of embodying such principles in a declaration, but that we have from the beginning of this discussion tried to reflect in this paragraph a balanced series of concepts. We attach great importance to having some reference in the paragraph to the measures or means of comparing military budgets and we had therefore hoped that there would be a reference to the report of the ad hoc panel on military budgeting. We agreed that that reference should be excluded. Having excluded it, however, it seemed to us that the reference to principles in the last part of the paragraph, and the reference to a declaration, should not remain because the balance of the paragraph had been destroyed.

Nevertheless, in response to your appeal, Mr. Chairman, and that of my colleague from Romania, because we attach such importance to the subject of the reduction of military budgets and in the hope that these compromises will lead to real progress on this subject, at the next session of the General Assembly and at following sessions, we will accept your proposal.
The second reason I asked to speak was simply to congratulate you, Sir, on your chairmanship. I had hoped to make a statement later to that effect, but I shall be leaving shortly and I did not want to go without telling you how much we appreciate your goodwill and your efforts, and wishing you all success tonight.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I only wish to say that my delegation would like to associate itself with the statement just made by the representative of Canada. We believe that this amendment will enable useful work to be done in the future and we hope that the concession which we have made will prove a positive gesture to which others will respond.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): I regret that I must give the impression of obstructing the proceedings - something which is far from my intention - but for a number of reasons my delegation finds it difficult to accept the modifications which you have so graciously suggested, Mr. Chairman. In fact, we feel that to continue the recommendation beyond the words "which should govern further actions of States" in this field is actually to prejudge the issue. It is, as we have tried to point out repeatedly in the past, prejudging the situation by speaking in terms of a document which was earlier supposed to be a declaration.

I come from a land where we are supposed to have many sacred cows, but I do not see why we should make a sacred cow out of a declaration or a suitable document at this point in our deliberations on items 5 (a) and (b). My delegation feels strongly that before the identification and elaboration of principles which should govern the further actions of States in this field we should not, even by implication, make recommendations or suggest the possibility of embodying these principles either in a declaration or in a suitable document.
I should also like to add that in the preamble to the recommendatory paragraphs which will be going before the General Assembly more than half a page has been devoted to setting out in some detail the proposal of Romania and Sweden, where the idea of a declaration has found ample reflection. I do not see, therefore, what harm will be done if the reference to a declaration or a suitable document is not reflected in the final recommendatory paragraph. I would suggest that in the absence of a consensus, the representative of Romania might consider dropping his insistence on this sacred cow.

Mr. HATTINGA van't SANT (Netherlands): Perhaps what I was about to say is already out of date, but I should like to say that this recommendation is far from what we had hoped for. I will not go over everything that we had hoped to see in this declaration. I made our points clear yesterday, and those points coincide with what the representative of Canada has just said.

But I think many other delegations also have difficulties with the recommendations and in the spirit that generally prevailed here, we could have supported your compromise suggestion, Mr. Chairman. However, I think we shall have to reflect a little further after what the representative of India has said.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): I should simply like to express the very deep regret I feel at the statement just made by the representative of India. There is no question here of a sacred cow. In any event, this proposal, while not sacred, at least deserves the elementary respect due to all proposals made seriously and with responsibility on any item and by any delegation.
With regard to the words "declaration or suitable document", it seems to me, first of all, that neither during the formal exchange of views nor during the lengthy discussion which ensued in the Drafting Group, has any objection been raised to the idea of such a document, be it a declaration or anything else.

On the other hand, I think I have understood correctly that the idea of such a document, which is based on several principles generally accepted by Member States, could be of undeniable use in the work assigned to our Commission, which involves the identification of effective ways and means to reach agreement in the area of reduction of military budgets.

We continue to believe that the implementation of this proposal, would be an important step in the right direction - that indicated in the mandate of our Commission: namely to solve the important problem of the freezing and recution of military budgets.

But at the same time, I must express my deep disappointment with the text just when we believed that, after so much effort, we had finalized the recommendation on this problem. The difficulty arises precisely from a formulation which, during our discussions in the Drafting Group, was suggested by the delegation of India itself.
It was the representative of India who at a given time made this suggestion, to replace the word "declaration" by the words "a suitable document". Why is it that, in a matter of a few days, this same proposal is no longer valid? In any case, I am more than surprised and I must confess to the Commission that I am quite annoyed by this situation in which we have been working on the basis of a proposal which has been withdrawn two or three days after it was made. I can only conclude by restating what you said in your appeal, Mr. Chairman. I too wish to appeal for the co-operation of all delegations so that we may reach results which may be constructive and useful in our quest for a solution to this important problem.

Mr. de la Gorce (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation attaches great importance to item 5 and, for its part, has made many concessions and understands very well that the sponsors of the text submitted by Romania and Sweden have also made many concessions.

For our part, we feel that the formula you proposed, Mr. Chairman, is excellent for in our view this formula embraces the various points of view expressed and should satisfy the opinions of those who support this proposal as a whole. We consider it necessary to continue work on this difficult and important question within our Commission.

We should also like the action undertaken in accordance with General Assembly resolution 33/67 in the Group of Experts to be continued.
Mr. VENKATACHARAY (India): I asked to speak only to remove any misunderstanding that may arise as a result of the reference made by the representative of Romania to my having suggested, on behalf of my delegation, the alternative phraseology "a suitable document". It is true that this phraseology was suggested in the informal Working Group three days ago, but it is equally true that the Romanian delegation refused to accept this amendment and, moreover, refused to accept in addition a paragraph which had been suggested, at the end of the paragraph as it now exists, and after the substitution of "a suitable document" for the word "declaration". This paragraph, which I read out in the informal Working Group, goes as follows:

"Any such consideration shall be without prejudice to the need for immediate reductions in military budgets through parallel action, based on a policy of mutual example of the six States whose budgets account for 80 per cent of the total global military expenditure."

I am sure that members present in the Working Group will bear me out on this, as will also the Chairman of the Group who appealed for no additions to be made. But that was at a time - if I may reiterate - when no compromise was being considered by the Romanian delegation. I am very pleased that they are today wanting to reach such a compromise. I am fully willing to consider any compromise formula.

Mr. Chairman, we hold you in the very highest regard, as does every delegation in this room, and we shall do our best to seek a compromise.

The CHAIRMAN: May I suggest at this stage that we suspend our meeting for a while.
The meeting was suspended at 5.05 p.m. and resumed at 6.55 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: When we suspended our meeting earlier, it was my intention and desire to see whether informal consultations would help to resolve the problem that had come up in connexion with the amendment to paragraph 5 in document A/CN.10/CRP.9/Add.1 on agenda item 4. I wish to inform delegations that, as a result of the informal consultations, we seem to have reached agreement on a text which I hope will satisfy everybody. It was my hope that this paper could be distributed before we resumed. It has not yet arrived, but I expect it will be here any minute. I would now suggest that, while we will come back to paragraph 5 of document A/CN.10/CRP.9/Add.1 as soon as the revised text is circulated, we take up agenda item 5 first. The situation with regard to that item was that when the Chair proposed revised language for the phrase in square brackets in document A/CN.10/CRP.10/Add.1/Rev.1, objections were raised - or at least, there was no concurrence at that time. I should now like to make one more appeal to all delegations not only to consider sympathetically the phrase the Chair has suggested, but to agree to go along with it, it being understood that delegations which have strong views and reservations will have an opportunity to express their points of view during the statements that will follow the adoption of the draft report.

May I take it, then, that the amendment I suggested, that is, to replace the present text within square brackets in A/CN.10/CRP.10/Add.1/Rev.1, by the phrase "keeping in mind the possibility of embodying such principles into a suitable document at an appropriate stage", is accepted by delegations in a spirit of compromise and understanding, thereby permitting us to complete our consideration of agenda item 5? As I hear no objections, it is so decided.

Documents A/CN.10/CRP.10 and A/CN.10/CRP.10/Add.1/Rev.1 were adopted.
The CHAIRMAN: I wish to express my deep appreciation to all the delegations. We have thus completed consideration of agenda item 5.

In order to save time, we shall now take up the draft report in document A/CN.10/PV.40. As I indicated earlier, there are a few changes in paragraphs 9, 10 and 12 on page 6. I shall repeat these. The end of paragraph 9 will read: "... a general exchange of views on items 4 (a) and (b) and 5 (a) and (b) of the agenda". In paragraph 10, the second sentence will include the Chairman's name and will read:

"The Working Group met under the chairmanship of Ambassador Adeniji, the representative of Nigeria ..."
In paragraph 12, the name of the representative of Austria, Mr. Sucharipa, who was chairman of the informal meetings on item 5, will be included. I should mention that there may be some changes in regard to the exact number of plenary meetings, cf working group or of informal meetings. I am sure representatives would agree with me that that may be left to the Secretariat.

May I now ask representatives to look at document A/CH.10/CRP.2 and indicate whether they have any observations to make in general or on any specific part of this document.

Mr. DUNNEVI (Ghana): I wish to draw attention to a minor point in paragraph 23. It seems to my delegation that the words "in detail" do not reflect clearly what happened in respect of items 6 and 7. I think it would be appropriate, in the light of what actually happened, if the words "in detail" were to be deleted so that the sentence would then read: "Since the Disarmament Commission was unable to consider items 6 and 7". I think that reflects what happened during our deliberations on the two items.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the representative of Ghana is quite correct. We did not really consider those two items, so that there should not be any difficulty in deleting the words "in detail".
A new version of paragraph 5 has been circulated. Does the United States delegation or any other delegation wish to make any comments at this stage? If not, I should like to thank all the delegations that assisted me during the informal consultations, which have produced a result with which we can all be satisfied, I think.

We have thus completed the consideration of the various documents that will be inserted into the draft report under paragraphs 19, 20 and 21. On this understanding, may I consider that the draft report is adopted?

The draft report was adopted.

CLOSING STATEMENTS

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations which have expressed a desire to speak at this stage.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): First of all, may I express the deep satisfaction of my delegation that the Commission has just been able to agree on the report to be submitted to the General Assembly.

Although this result was achieved through the efforts of all the members of this Commission, it would not have been possible without your untiring efforts, Mr. Chairman, and your determined leadership in conducting the work of the Commission. I should like to take this opportunity to thank you for having injected new life into the United Nations Disarmament Commission following its reactivation in 1978. Of course, this should hardly surprise me, since I am in a way an old India hand and knew you so well for a number of years when you served your country as Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs.

It also gives me and my delegation great pleasure to thank Mr. Adeniji, who was so successful, a Chairman of the Working Group on item 3, in preparing the draft resolution entitled "Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade", and our Austrian colleague, Mr. Sucharipa, who conducted so ably and patiently the informal sessions on the reduction of military budgets under item 5.
The consensus reached literally in the last moments of our session has not and could not satisfy all the demands and expectations of the delegations participating in the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. As far as my delegation is concerned, I wish to make a few remarks on the consensus documents before us, followed by some observations of a more general character.

With regard to item 3, on the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, my delegation feels that efforts have been made to arrive at a balanced document. We are sorry that it was not possible to delete all the brackets and that our efforts did not lead to agreement on their deletion taking into account the position of my delegation.

Although it is true that we did not achieve what we had hoped to achieve during the First Disarmament Decade, my delegation is altogether somewhat more positive in evaluating the results during that period. We do not think that the phrase "limited agreements" truly reflects the importance of all that really was done during that Decade.

It is in this context that I wish to mention the following achievements during the First Disarmament Decade: the entry into force of the Non-Proliferation Treaty; the strategic arms limitation agreement of 1972; the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof, 1971; the biological weapons Convention of 1972; the 1977 Convention banning the military use of environmental modification techniques; the signature of the second strategic arms limitation treaty; and the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

With regard to agenda item 4, my delegation holds the view that the debate on this item has in fact shown wide support for a recommendation to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly
to approve a study on aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces. My delegation hopes that the General Assembly will take a decision to this end. Such a study would contribute to a balanced approach to the problems of international disarmament by focusing on the importance of conventional disarmament in this context. We feel that the conventional component of the arms race has in the past been somewhat neglected.

There was an intensive exchange of views with regard to agenda item 5. It became clear that all States realize the importance of the reduction and freezing of arms expenditure. The attainment of the freezing and reduction of military expenditures is closely linked to the elaboration and acceptance of a reporting instrument with a special matrix for different kinds of military expenditures. The availability of a reliable reporting instrument which contributes to the comparability of military budgets is in fact the pre-condition of agreements in this field.

Looking back on the agenda of our meetings and seeing what has been achieved in the limited time available to us, we should first of all compliment ourselves on our good performance. At the same time, however, we must realize that we may have shouldered too heavy a burden. We could not deal successfully with all the items on the agenda.
I think that the success of the Commission's substantive session of last year, when it was able to reach consensus on the elements of a comprehensive disarmament programme, was due to the fact that that was the only substantive agenda item on which we then had to concentrate. We should take the lesson and limit ourselves in our future substantive sessions to what really is feasible. This would only strengthen the reputation of the Disarmament Commission as the deliberative body and a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly, as stated in paragraph 118 of the special session's Final Document.

Mr. de LUCA (Italy): I should like, first of all, to thank you, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Italian delegation for the efforts you have made with a view to reaching positive results in our proceedings.

Our deep appreciation also goes to the Chairmen of the Working Group on agenda item 3 on the declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade and of the informal plenary sessions on agenda item 5 on the reduction of military budgets. Finally, we thank the Secretariat for the excellent support it has given us.

The Italian delegation is fully aware of the difficulties we have encountered during our work. The fact that we are now able to approve by consensus our report to the General Assembly has to be considered as a positive result. We are convinced that the principle of consensus should always constitute the fundamental basis of our work and of our decision-making process.

I should like now to make some comments on the three major items on which the attention of the United Nations Disarmament Commission has been concentrated. We consider that the adoption of a draft declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade is a positive and valuable result. We regret that delegations have not been able to agree on some parts, which are still in square brackets. In this connexion, we hope that the General Assembly, with the contribution of all the parties concerned, will be able to solve the remaining difficulties to which I refer.

Of course, some elements contained in the draft are not fully satisfactory to my delegation, but we can accept them in a spirit of compromise. I should like to single out one particular problem. My delegation would have preferred
to see the question of conventional disarmament reflected in a more specific and accurate manner in the draft declaration. Our views on the matter are well known: we consider that conventional disarmament as a whole should be given a higher priority, paralleling the progress of nuclear disarmament.

On item 4 of our agenda, we have been deeply interested in the questions raised in subitem (b). On this point we noted with particular attention the proposals made by the delegations of Denmark and Spain. In our view, their proposals were very useful and can constitute an excellent basis for our future work in this field. In particular, we have taken note with satisfaction of the wide support received by the proposal made by Denmark for a study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces. We therefore hope that the General Assembly will be in a position at its thirty-fifth session to approve this proposal without delay.

On the question of the reduction of military budgets, my delegation reiterates its deep satisfaction that the occasion was offered to us, practically for the first time, to discuss this important subject.

We have already expressed our view on the proposal put forward by Romania and Sweden, whose working paper constitutes a contribution which could be most effectively utilized only at a later stage of our work within the United Nations.

I should like also to recall the position of my delegation that, as a preliminary step, we need to conclude the elaboration of an instrument capable of determining in an objective and verifiable manner the expenditures actually made for defense. Once the elements to be included in this instrument have been agreed upon, and testing carried out, we may then proceed with good prospects of success to further negotiations on the reduction of military budgets.

We have joined the consensus on the recommendations to the General Assembly on this item we have just adopted in a spirit of compromise. We think that, for our part, we have made important concessions and we therefore hope that at the next session of this Commission we will be in a position to take up again the question of the reduction of military budgets with a more balanced approach and that more positive and constructive conclusions will be reached.
Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): My delegation is glad that it finally has been possible to adopt the report of this Commission by consensus, although in doing so we have had to make a number of difficult compromises. I should just like to mention a few points to which my delegation attaches importance.

Our report quite rightly lays emphasis, in the section dealing with item 4 of our agenda, on the importance of measures of nuclear disarmament. In our view, the attempt to lay stress on this aspect of the arms race has led to an inadequate reflection of the need for a balanced approach to arms control, including the pursuance of arms control measures in the conventional field. We are disappointed that the useful discussion we have had on conventional disarmament and on the Danish and Spanish proposals for a United Nations study has not led to a more positive recommendation. We very much hope that it will be possible at the next session of the General Assembly to take such a study in hand.

In connexion with another section of the report also dealing with item 4, I should just like to make clear that my delegation is among those that expressed strong disagreement with the view that the withdrawal of foreign military forces and the dismantling of foreign military bases would make a contribution to arms control, and we emphasize that Article 51 of the United Nations Charter specifically provides for States to take collective measures of self-defence.

With regard to the section of the report dealing with military expenditures, my delegation finds it unsatisfactory that the recommendations take no direct account of the work which has been continuing in the United Nations for some years on the development of a standardized reporting instrument for military expenditure. My Government supports this work and believes that it offers the only reasonable basis for pursuing measures to reduce military expenditure on an agreed and verifiable basis.

Our mandate was to prepare the elements for a declaration on the second Disarmament Decade, and, although it obviously would have been useful to have completed our work on agenda item 3 with the adoption of a consensus draft, I think we have largely fulfilled the task we were set. As we indicated in our reply to the Secretary-General on this subject, we would, however, have preferred a different kind of declaration, but we have been willing to accommodate our views to those of others.
Nevertheless, the draft we have prepared will provide, after further work at the General Assembly session, the basis for action during the Decade. We must recognize that the achievement of the goals of the Decade will depend essentially on the international climate which prevails. In this connexion, with the recent occupation of a non-aligned State, the second Disarmament Decade has begun rather inauspiciously. We therefore welcome the emphasis in our draft on the need to strengthen international security and confidence and to reduce international tension.

As a general point, we found it strange that in a year in which a major review of nuclear and non-proliferation arrangements is taking place there should be no recognition in the draft declaration of the importance of the non-proliferation treaty. We continue to believe that the Treaty provides the corner-stone of an acceptable international non-proliferation régime for the forthcoming Decade, and we would have liked to see this explicitly recognized in the draft. References to appropriate paragraphs of the Final Document of the special session are not, in our view, an adequate way of dealing with this.

As regards the reference in the section of the report which mentions the international conference on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, I should like to refer to our view that, within the United Nations system, the International Atomic Energy Agency provides the most appropriate forum for the consideration of these questions.
(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

In the section dealing with priority items to be dealt with outside the Committee on Disarmament, we particularly welcome the reference to effective confidence-building measures in Europe. In the view of my Government, in order to be effective such measures must be binding, militarily significant and verifiable, and should apply to the whole continent of Europe. If agreed, they could help to create conditions conducive to limitation and reduction of arms in some geographical areas. In addition, we welcome the reference to parity in the second clause on this subject. Military imbalances are responsible for much of the current feeling of insecurity and tension. The United Kingdom believes that efforts to reach a lower level of military confrontation in Europe should be concentrated on the Mutual Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) negotiations in Vienna.

Finally, I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my own warm appreciation to you as our Chairman for the great efforts you have exerted to bring this session of the Disarmament Commission to an agreed conclusion. Without your patience and skill, and that of Ambassador Adeniji and of Mr. Sucharipa, we should not have achieved what we have. I wish to thank you all very much.
Mr. OKAWA (Japan): First of all, like previous speakers, my delegation would like to express its deep appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, as well as to Ambassador Adeniji and Mr. Sucharipa, for your efforts as presiding officers who guided our work and helped us to produce the various documents that form our report.

Without your dedication and your very patient but effective powers of persuasion, I am sure that the report we have just adopted for submission to the General Assembly would not have been completed.

I should also like to thank all members of the Secretariat for their faithful and very efficient work, which has supported us during the past four weeks. On this occasion, my delegation would like to state its position on some of the questions mentioned in the report.

First, on agenda item 3, regarding a draft declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, I should like to state that the position of my Government remains unchanged with regard to a number of matters touched upon in the draft declaration, such as the New International Economic Order. In particular, I wish to reiterate my Government's view, which I expressed in my statement on 16 May, that it would be unrealistic to try to fix target dates for the specific disarmament measures which we hope can be realized during the Second Disarmament Decade.

While regretting that we have not been able to produce agreed texts on a number of paragraphs in Conference Room paper 11, my delegation strongly hopes that every effort will be made at the coming session of the General Assembly to reach agreement and to adopt the declaration by consensus.

As regards agenda item 4 a and b, my delegation continues to entertain the conviction that the most realistic and effective way of promoting nuclear disarmament is to try to implement step by step such disarmament measures as are feasible in the real world of international relations today. In the field of conventional disarmament, my delegation supports the recommendation in paragraph 11 of document A/CN.10/CRP.9/Add.1 that the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly approve in principle the proposal for the study of disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces. My delegation hopes that the general approach to be followed by the study, its structure and its scope, will be further examined and agreed upon at the coming session of the General Assembly.
May I also take this opportunity to express my delegation's appreciation to the delegations of Denmark and Spain for the very helpful working papers they took the trouble to submit to remind us of the importance of this subject.

For progress to be made in the field of the freezing and reduction of military budgets under agenda item 5, it is essential to be able to obtain a fair assessment and to make a fair comparison of the military expenditures of the various countries, based on a standardized reporting system. My delegation continues to believe that at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly the Secretary-General should be requested and authorized to study further the problems connected with the freezing, reducing or otherwise restraining of military expenditures based, in particular, on a standardized reporting system and adequate verification.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): In the first place, I wish to congratulate you Mr. Chairman, on the excellent way in which you have conducted our proceedings and on a very good report, which touches on all the points that need be touched upon at this stage of the work of the Disarmament Commission.

I wish particularly to emphasize that at the very beginning of the report on agenda item 4 (a) and (b), the Commission has noted with great concern that despite the consensus reached at the tenth special session devoted to disarmament steps to halt the arms race have not been taken and proceeds then to quote from the Final Document, saying that "The Commission recalled that the special session of the General Assembly had declared that enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry, and that
"genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces". (A/CN.10/CRP.9/Add.1, para. 3)

The document further states that

"the arms race, in all its nuclear aspects, runs counter to efforts to achieve further relaxation of international tension, to establish a viable system of international peace and security ...". (ibid., para. 2)

-- the system we have already mentioned.

This, to my mind, is the core of the problem that has to be dealt with by the Disarmament Commission. I think it was pertinent and very important that those statements should be made by the Commission at this stage. But the purpose of my statement now is to say that at the next session the Commission must proceed to what should be done to stop the arms race. It is not enough to say that the arms race involves great evils. We have to proceed to devise the means for stopping the arms race, and in this connexion it might be recalled that the Commission has been given a continuous function as a deliberative body with a wide mandate and with time allotted to it every year in order that it might seek the ways and means to break the long deadlock in the disarmament process, particularly since we now face the approaching threat of confrontation as a result of the unhindered escalation of the arms race and the qualitative development of nuclear weapons. These things should be stated, but surely we must seek the means of stopping the arms race.

The Commission has a special duty to adopt a broad and imaginative approach to the whole problem and carry out its serious responsibilities. Its primary target is to seek to halt the arms race. To halt the arms race it must explore the main cause that generates and perpetuates that arms race; and that cause, as I have already explained before, is the balance of deterrence or balance of weapons. As long as the security of nations is still based on the outmoded concept of the balance of deterrence or balance of weapons and disregards the requirements of the Charter for international security it will be impossible to stop the arms race.
I know it is very difficult to change an approach from reliance on competition in armaments to international security, as provided in the Charter. But, as mentioned in the document that I have referred to, the Commission is firmly convinced that there can be no progress in disarmament or in the maintenance of international security unless we adhere closely to the purposes and principles of the Charter; and we do not adhere to the Charter if we violate the very vital and important provision of the Charter which forms the very purpose of its existence, its raison d'être, that is, the effective implementation of the Security Council's decisions by enforcement action so that there can be legal order in the world and international security which will make the disarmament process possible.

I understand that such a course is fraught with many difficulties relating to vested interests, military-industrial complexes, preconceived notions on a momentum from an obsolete past and other matters which make it almost hopelessly hard to overcome. But still, there is hope of a change of approach and adjustment to the needs of our times in a nuclear age, in an interdependent world, with common dangers and common needs that call for common action. But to stop the arms race without replacing the balance of power concept by collective security through the United Nations and its Charter is an actual impossibility, as long experience of futile efforts has amply demonstrated.

We cannot act as if we were in the previous world, where there was only an enemy on the other side. Here, the enemy is the nuclear bomb which will destroy the whole of humanity, and there will be neither conqueror nor vanquished. Hence the existence of the escalation of the arms race, the continuance of the balance of deterrence which implies enmity to such an extent that neither side has any confidence that the other side will not attack if it has a small advantage, prevents detente and all progress on disarmament. A balance is never reached; it is hypothetical. It is there to generate the arms race.

Therefore I submit that at the next session the Commission must set a goal and make a bold move forward by emphasizing the need for compliance with the Charter in its vital provisions for international security, so that disarmament may be made possible. Thirty-five years of failure of every disarmament effort are enough, and it is not sufficient to say, "Go and negotiate a reduction of armaments" or "a cessation of the arms race" or "a cessation of underground tests", when the arms race is still continuing on the basis of the balance of power.
Therefore, I express the hope that at the next session the Commission will deal more concretely, determinedly, and effectively, with the actual means of halting the arms race, so that disarmament becomes possible.

Mr. BLOMBERG (Finland): First of all, on behalf of the Finnish delegation, I wish to express our sincere thanks and, indeed, our admiration to you, Sir. Chairman, for the work that you have done as Chairman of the Commission, in securing the completion of the task given to the Commission.

Equally warm thanks are due to the other officers of the Commission, and here I wish to mention particularly the representative of Austria, Sir. Sucharipa, for the invaluable contribution he has made in clearing an especially difficult issue.

In the view of the delegation of Finland, the text of the elements for the declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade provides a solid basis for the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly in drafting the declaration. We wish to thank and congratulate the Chairman of the Working Group, Ambassador Adeniji of Nigeria, for the outstanding job he has done so far, and we look forward to completing the work under his leadership next autumn.

I have four brief comments to make on particular points of the text of the elements.

First, my delegation is particularly satisfied with the way in which European disarmament problems are dealt with in the text. Europe is in the process of actively searching for ways and means to check the accelerating arms race. These efforts, to which my Government is also actively contributing, have been adequately reflected in the text.

Secondly, we are also satisfied with the way the confidence-building measures have been included in the priorities set for the decade of the 1980s.

The third observation relates to the regional aspects of disarmament. A considerable part of the disarmament measures listed in the elements for the declaration are regional in character. During the 1970s several regional disarmament initiatives were put forward. That is also likely to be the case during the 1980s. In the drafting stage, my delegation made some suggestions to the effect that the declaration on the second Disarmament
Decade would give particular encouragement to the regional approach, not only to the initiatives already made but also to the creation of new ones. We hope that this aspect will be further developed when the work on the declaration again resumes at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

Finally, in the view of my delegation the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons has been covered in the text in a way which does not adequately reflect the danger to international peace and security which a further spread of nuclear weapons would bring about. We also doubt the appropriateness of including in such a disarmament document extensive statements on the promotion of international co-operation in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy, without at the same time expressing clearly the requirements of effective international safeguards. This seems to imply that there is a contradiction between peaceful uses of nuclear energy and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

While strongly supporting international co-operation in this field, taking into account in particular the needs of the developing countries, which in the present energy situation are more in need of it than ever, we believe that there is no such contradiction; rather the opposite is true. In the view of my Government, international co-operation in this field can best, indeed can only, be promoted if it is accompanied by effective international arrangements against diversion to military use. We agree, therefore, that there is a link between disarmament and development but in our view it should have been spelled out more explicitly.

Mr. FREDERIK (Poland): The Polish delegation is pleased to state that, in our assessment, this session has brought positive results. It has been possible, thanks to the generally prevailing constructive approach on the part of the majority of the delegations. We all owe much, Mr. Chairman, to your deep personal commitment, tireless work and able guidance which enabled us, wherever possible, to overcome the difficulties and to bridge the existing gaps between the different points of view.

My delegation wishes to emphasize again, at this plenary meeting, the position of the Government of the Polish People's Republic on the
disarmament issues. It is reflected in the documents that my delegation had the honour to submit for circulation as an official document of this Commission: the statement and the declaration of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty adopted at the meeting held recently at Warsaw.

The constructive proposals put forth in these documents prove once again the consistent policy of the Warsaw Treaty countries aimed at the consolidation of peace, the strengthening of international security and the halting of the arms race. There is a strong wish expressed for the continuation of the policy of détente in the interest of all peoples of the world.

The new initiative concerning the convening of a world summit meeting is the proposal for a broad, top-level dialogue. It confirms once more the socialist States' readiness to overcome tensions and solve difficult problems by way of peaceful talks and negotiations. The recent meeting in Warsaw between Edward Gierek, Leonid Brezhnev and Valery Giscard d'Estaing has proved once again the importance and the vitality of such a dialogue.
We are sure that further meetings of that character will take place. We are sure they will bring about also a better atmosphere for stopping the arms race, which is the main source of international tension.

At the beginning of the session my delegation stated that it intended to make its contribution to the work of the Disarmament Commission in a spirit of constructive co-operation and that we would count on a similar approach by other delegations. Such a spirit has prevailed in our work. The results achieved testify to that. They strengthen the prestige of our Commission and that of the United Nations.

Ms. Pawthorpe (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, the New Zealand delegation is pleased to be able to congratulate you on having once again guided the Disarmament Commission to the adoption of a consensus report. Many delegations will recall the suspense felt in the later stages of last year's session as to whether a final consensus would be possible. This year again your efforts have played a large part in the successful achievement of that goal. In addition, we believe full recognition is due to the work of both Mr. Adeniji and Mr. Sucharipa for their skilful chairmanship of the Working Groups on items 3 and 5. Furthermore, we acknowledge the compromises and concessions made by a number of delegations at various stages of our work. We continue to see one of the Commission's chief merits in its consensus basis in approaching the sensitive and complex issues it considers.

This year's agenda was a very full one; in fact I should like to suggest that the Commission adopt a slightly less ambitious task at its next session. My delegation cannot pretend to be overjoyed at the results of four weeks' discussion as reflected in the final report. We wonder whether there is yet a full appreciation of the Commission's role and mandate - and its consequent value - as a deliberative body providing us with a unique opportunity to consider the broader objectives and general scope of disarmament
activities. A number of representatives have offered useful reminders, at various stages of our work, that there is less need for adopting firm positions of policy in this forum because it is not a negotiating body. We would oppose any move to change this official mandate.

My delegation would naturally have been better pleased to see a full consensus on item 3, which has obvious significance for the Second Disarmament Decade which is now beginning. However, our major concerns are covered in the draft declaration. In particular, we support the priority attached in the draft to the submission to the General Assembly of an agreed text on a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. The conclusion of an effective comprehensive test ban is, in our view, a key element in progress towards nuclear non-proliferation. We are also gratified at the flexibility displayed by delegations on the question of non-proliferation itself, as manifested in section IV of the third list of priority measures in document A/CN.10/CRP.11, although we should have preferred to see here a specific reference to the existing Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The formulation that has finally been agreed upon on military budgets, under item 5, represents, in our view, the bare minimum of what might realistically be expected, given the existing legislative mandate for its discussion within the General Assembly — in particular, resolutions 33/67 and 34/83 F. My Government has undertaken to participate in the pilot study on which the Ad Hoc Panel on Military Budgets will report at the next session of the General Assembly. We hope this report will attract interest and support for the matrix from other Governments and thus increase the practical co-operation which can do so much in the building up of trust among nations.

**Mr. SHUSTOV** (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In the view of the Soviet delegation, the Commission has by and large carried out the mandate entrusted to it by the General Assembly. It has been able to agree upon the fundamental elements of a draft resolution
proclaiming the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade and it has been able to prepare the sections of a report to the General Assembly on the items on its agenda relating to disarmament questions in the field of nuclear and conventional armaments and also the reduction of military budgets.

An important result of our session is that, as has been shown by the statements of delegations, the overwhelming majority of States have been in favour of the urgent carrying out of effective measures to slow down the arms race and bring about disarmament. The socialist countries came to the Commission and its work with specific and far-reaching proposals, which are contained in the declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty adopted at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee held at Warsaw on 14 and 15 May this year (A/CH.10/21). We should like once again to draw attention to that important document, which was circulated as an official document of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Disarmament Commission. The position of the Soviet Union on the question of the Disarmament Decade was also set forth in the letter from the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In putting forward these initiatives, the socialist States in the course of the Commission's session have supported also all the constructive proposals of the non-aligned countries. As a result the draft report on the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade came to include important measures which, if put into effect, could lead to a cessation of the arms race.

We cannot but draw attention to the fact that during the Commission's session essentially no new proposals were forthcoming from that group of countries which produces the largest quantity of armaments - the United States and other members of NATO. It would appear that they have nothing to say now about the question of disarmament, which is of such vital importance to all peoples. In this regard, at the same time, we cannot fail to note with regret that, because of the position taken by Western delegations,
the ten-year disarmament programme failed to include certain important provisions on questions related to slowing down the arms race: such questions as the elimination of foreign military bases, the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean and certain other points.

I should like to say a few words about some specific questions. Among the problems of disarmament, the Soviet Union, like many other States, attaches primary importance to nuclear disarmament. We believe that the task of the gradual reduction and total elimination of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons can be most effectively carried out with the participation of all nuclear Powers. We also favour the reduction of conventional armaments, and in this regard we have put forward our own proposals. However, we should not like to see the solution of this important problem replaced by studies which serve no useful purpose, and therefore we did not support the proposals of the Western delegations on this subject.

We also support a genuine reduction of military budgets, primarily on the part of the major States. Therefore my delegation in principle was in favour of approving the proposal made by the Socialist Republic of Romania and Sweden. At the same time, we are against the idea of studies - which again serve no useful purpose - on the comparability of military budgets, the verification of those budgets and so on. What we need is not comparative tables of the military budgets of various States but a practical reduction of the ruinous military expenditures. What we want to see in the newspapers is not figures showing the growth of military budgets but information on how much is being spent on the works of peace - and this of course includes assistance to developing countries.
In the light of this position we wish to reconfirm our position on the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 33/67 and 34/83 F, referred to in the Commission's recommendation on the question of reducing military budgets.

Noting that the United Nations Disarmament Commission, on the whole held a successful session, and because of the readiness of the majority of delegations to co-operate, on the whole the Commission carried out the mandate of the General Assembly, but we are not inclined to overestimate the importance of the results of its work. As everyone knows very well, there is a sizeable quantity of various programmes in the disarmament field and resolutions and other documents on this question. In fact you could fill a whole library with them and if we were to add one more volume to that library, that would do nothing to change the actual state of affairs in the disarmament field.

Now the whole question of what to do and what must be done to curb the dangerous process of the arms race is perfectly clear. The fundamental task is to set about the actual work of carrying out the programmes in question. From words we must move on to deeds. In the circumstances of the current complicated international situation we must not slacken but actually step up our efforts towards disarmament. It is precisely for that reason the Soviet delegation has always - as indeed at this present session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission - opposed attempts to divert the attention of participants in the discussion from the problems directly concerned with disarmament in order to discuss other international political problems. Nor should we forget, while we are busying ourselves with hollow debate, that the manufacturers of military hardware are feverishly expanding the military production which is so profitable to them. While this is happening military expenditures are growing. The danger of war is growing, both by design and war that is the result of accident and miscalculation. I am sure that everyone has seen the reports in today's American newspapers that, as a result of a computer failure, the entire defence system of the United States was placed on a military alert footing. This is a most alarming fact and the danger of it is apparent to all.
Disarmament is the most reliable obstacle to the slide towards war. The Soviet Union, like other socialist countries, is ready to do everything in its power to bring about a slackening of the arms race. We believe that in the course of the 1980s we must achieve a radical breakthrough in resolving the questions of limiting and calling a halt to the arms race, and the carrying out of concrete disarmament measures, particularly concerning nuclear disarmament. The declaration of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty confirmed that "...there are no types of weapons which they would not be willing to limit or to reduce on a basis of reciprocity." (A/35/237, Annex II, page 10) This is our position of principle.

Mr. Chairman, your role at this session, where we have discussed such difficult matters, and where at the same time there were three working groups functioning, was not an easy one, but you have discharged your functions brilliantly and we should like to express to you on that account our profound gratitude. It was most pleasant to work under your chairmanship and the greatest praise is deserved by Ambassador Adeniji and Mr. Sucharipa, the chairmen of the working groups. Our delegation would also like to express our gratitude for the effective co-operation of the Secretariat of the United Nations and the interpreters who have helped us in our work.

Mr. DE LAIGLESIA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): We have now reached the conclusion of the work of the second substantive session of our Commission. I should therefore like first of all to record my delegation's appreciation of the work which you yourself have accomplished, since to a great extent it is to your skill and devotion that we owe the work done here pursuant to the mandate given to us. I do not want to dwell on the specifics of our report, because many delegations have already made comments and will continue to make comments which we share. I shall therefore confine myself to mentioning the point concerning the study on disarmament as regards conventional disarmament and armed forces.
We would have preferred a recommendation to the next General Assembly indicating that it should approve the realization of such a study; nonetheless we believe that the fact that it has been mentioned is positive. We believe that the text adopted, though it reflects the broad support given it, since the number of delegations that have made favourable comments on it has been large, stresses some objections which really have been presented by few countries. We still believe that the carrying out of this study may be a valuable contribution to the cause of disarmament, in a field which is practically untried.

We hope that we will soon have the results of the work related to disarmament and security and the regional aspects of the issue; this work is now under way. In our view, if in the future further work were to be done on conventional disarmament, that would supplement the two issues I have just mentioned. I wish to stress once more that studies should precede measures and that these do not prejudge any decisions that may be reached subsequently. Although we do believe that it is important that this study be prepared, we feel that the question should not be placed out of context. We feel that this work should be entrusted to a group established in accordance with equitable geographical distribution.
With this in view, all aspects of the problem of conventional weapons should be reflected, taking into account, as is logical, the interests of all members of the international community.

Lastly, I cannot but regret that the modus operandi of our Commission has somewhat diverged from the consensus that I believe to be important with regard to the work before us. We understand that it is very difficult to reconcile certain antagonistic approaches, and that therefore it may be inevitable that such differences be reflected in our report. However, the strength and indeed the raison d'être of the Disarmament Commission is derived from the employment of a procedure different from that used by the First Committee of the General Assembly, which is the other deliberative body provided for in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament.

Mr. WESBARARAFA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Now that we are coming to the end of this session of the Disarmament Commission, I should like to express our thanks for and appreciation of the efforts which you have made, Mr. Chairman, to reconcile divergent viewpoints in conducting the work of this session. I should also like to thank the Rapporteur, Mr. Otegui, and to wish him every success in his new office. I should like to pay a tribute as well to Ambassador Adeniji and to our colleague Mr. Sucharipa. Our thanks go equally to the Secretariat and particularly to the interpreters, who have helped us greatly in our work.

During this session, the Disarmament Commission has worked in a very difficult international situation, characterized by tension. Its agenda has been a very heavy one with important items requiring detailed study over and above mere discussions or series of consultations. In spite of the difficult circumstances in which our work has been carried out we should not underestimate the result that has been achieved, for we have succeeded in drawing up the elements of a declaration that will make the 1980s a disarmament decade. Furthermore, the way in which we dealt with agenda items 4 and 5 concerning conventional and nuclear weapons and military budgets is, we believe, an excellent step in the right direction.
My delegation would like to clarify its position on certain of the matters that have been touched upon in connexion with the declaration of the 1980s as a disarmament decade. My delegation would have liked us to agree on the various stages in which certain measures would be applied, particularly before the end of the first half of this decade, so that we could properly evaluate what has been accomplished and decide what still remains to be done. We had also hoped that a consensus might be reached on the measures to be undertaken to strengthen the general prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, because this is a matter that affects the entire future of mankind. We had also hoped that the declaration would record the need for an agreement to be concluded to strengthen security guarantees for non-nuclear States. Furthermore, we regret that the declaration did not deal in precise terms with the question of the prevention of the vertical or horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this connexion, the provisions in the declaration are too vague and indecisive with regard to the obligations of nuclear States and also with regard to the strengthening of the role of the Security Council in the creation of nuclear-free zones. This is, directly or indirectly, part and parcel of the whole problem of disarmament.

With regard to agenda item 4, dealing with nuclear and conventional weapons, we would have liked the section dealing with this topic to make express reference to the responsibility incumbent upon military blocs and systems of military alliances and on those States with major military potential to reduce their stocks of nuclear and conventional weapons. Specific mention should also have been made of the need to resolve international political problems, which would undoubtedly make an important contribution to disarmament. My delegation believes that the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces by States should go hand in hand with gradual progress towards general and complete disarmament. My delegation believes that the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces by States should go hand in hand with gradual progress towards general and complete disarmament.
With regard to agenda item 5, my delegation is quite pleased with what has been accomplished, since the points which we raised were in fact included in the part of the text that deals with the freezing and subsequent reduction of military budgets. The points we made referred primarily to the responsibility borne by the nuclear States and States with major military potential with regard to the necessary reductions. We also referred to the obligation to respect the principles of the United Nations Charter and to resolve international problems in an equitable way in order to ensure that in future the countries of the third world can themselves gradually reduce their military budgets. And we referred to the need to respect the principle of balanced reduction, which will not threaten the security of States or give any country or group of countries an advantage over others. Agreement must be reached on uniform structures of military budgets, and effective control and verification will have to be achieved in this regard.

My delegation regrets that the Disarmament Commission was unable during this session to discuss agenda item 7, dealing with the question of nuclear weapons in South Africa. This is an issue of extreme importance, because South Africa, relying on its nuclear capacity, is trying to impose its racist régime on the peoples of that country. Furthermore, it is flouting the wishes of the African continent and threatening the security of African States by introducing nuclear weapons into Africa. This situation is impeding the efforts being made by the African countries and the whole world to bring about the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. What is now occurring in South Africa represents a threat to the security of the entire international community and jeopardizes the success of the latter's efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation, particularly if nuclear weapons are in the irresponsible hands of that racist régime, which is defying the will of the international community as a whole. We must shoulder our responsibilities and counteract this danger by putting an end to any co-operation with South Africa in the nuclear field, and by completely isolating it internationally. All this should be done immediately.

Those were the few points my delegation wished to emphasize at the conclusion of this session of the Disarmament Commission.
Mr. PETREE (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, first
I should like to pay tribute to you for your patience, your understanding and your leadership of the Commission during the past four weeks. To preside over the deliberations of a body of this size which operates on the principle of consensus is no easy task at any time; it is even more demanding when the issues being discussed are ones of such fundamental importance to the security of States and, indeed, to international peace and security. The present unsettled international situation, about which we have all expressed our views, added to the difficulties. My delegation would also like to thank Ambassador Adjeniji of Nigeria and Mr. Sucharipa of Austria respectively for their untiring efforts as chairmen of the working group on the Disarmament Decade and the informal group on military budgets.

The fact that we had considerable difficulty in arriving at consensus on agenda items 4 and 5 and have a draft of the elements of a Declaration on the 1980s as a second Disarmament Decade which will be presented to the General Assembly with several bracketed portions should not be surprising to any of us. Arms control and disarmament questions are inherently difficult ones, involving the very security of States. We must continue to seek progress in every debate, every opportunity for honest exchange, if we are to realize progress towards our common goals.

Our exchanges during this session of the Commission have been serious and frequently intensive, but they have not produced texts with which we can be satisfied or that seem to us realistically to mark new steps in the progress that we all seek. Even beyond the specific points that I shall shortly review, a number of sections on the disarmament decade and on nuclear and conventional disarmament are unbalanced in terms of the issues they treat and those they neglect. They establish goals not likely to be realized in the 1980s and they will not enhance but rather may detract from the status enjoyed by the Final Document of the special session on disarmament. The United States delegation would have preferred this body not to have engaged in a rehash of the work that has already been accomplished or is being carried out in other forums. Indeed, one may ask whether our deliberations over the past four weeks have served to promote our shared objectives in the field of
disarmament and arms control. We feel strongly that it is incumbent upon all of us to examine the role this Commission should play in our common search for practical and effective arms control and disarmament measures. While the United States agrees with the desirability of many of the specific undertakings and studies proposed for the United Nations, it must be remembered that there will be financial implications. We must point out, therefore, that in the light of the zero net programme growth policy which the United Nations Secretary-General has adopted, we would expect any additional costs resulting from the implementation of those proposals to be met through the reprogramming of existing resources.

I should now like to make a few specific comments on the Declaration of the 1980s as a second Disarmament Decade. The principal priority measures we have all agreed to, even though the chapeau language remains bracketed, are laudable goals and my delegation sincerely hopes that it will be possible to accomplish each of them in the shortest possible time. However, given the limited time available to the Committee on Disarmament and its very full agenda, it would be irresponsible if we were to promise more than we can deliver. In this regard the even longer list of priority measures to be pursued during the decade is an extremely ambitious one, especially so since at the present time no agreement exists even in principle on the commencement of some of these negotiations. Reaching that agreement will require more than just a declaration; it is to be hoped that additional consultations will be able to resolve our differences regarding the chapeau language of this section of the Declaration during the First Committee session next fall.

This is a very long document, indeed much longer than my delegation feels is desirable or necessary. Nevertheless, there is an important area which is not mentioned and that is the conspicuous lack of any explicit reference to the solid achievements of the 1970s. It is important that we move beyond these earlier milestones and, as I said in my opening statement, intensify and broaden the search for effective measures in the field of arms control and disarmament. But it is also important that we recognize the earlier agreements for what they are - solid international achievements. With regard to the last paragraph of the
declaration, my delegation has certain reservations about whether it is altogether appropriate for this body to decide that the General Assembly should undertake a review and appraisal of the progress in the implementation of this declaration through the Commission. That decision is best left, in our view, to the General Assembly itself.

The draft declaration, as is always the case in documents of this kind, drafted on the basis of consensus, contains formulations, words and phrases which we would not have used. For example, we interpret the phrase 'certain identifiable elements' in the section on general activities to mean those mentioned in the first listing of priorities only. In the section on goals and principles, we believe the word "substantial" in subparagraph V should be eliminated.

On the agenda item on "nuclear and conventional disarmament", we have taken part in wide-ranging discussions that touch on virtually all aspects of international peace and security. In attempting to reflect this discussion in a consensus report, we have taken on a task that is truly ambitious. Our report touches indirectly on issues of great international concern.

We must note that paragraph 4 of this portion of our report still provides a misleading impression of the history of arms control efforts during the two years since the special session on Disarmament. There have been significant achievements in a number of areas such as strategic arms limitation, the joint United States-Soviet initiative to ban radiological weapons, and the conference on conventional weapons causing unnecessary suffering or having indiscriminatory effects. In other areas, such as the comprehensive test ban and chemical weapons, negotiations have been proceeding and progress has been made.

When we examine those areas where arms control progress has been interrupted, it is not too difficult to discern specific causes. For example, the invasion of a small non-aligned country by a neighbouring super-Power cannot fail to affect the climate for negotiations dealing with certain arms control issues or to alter the priority within governments for efforts to promote regional and international security. Therefore in agreeing to include in our document a reference to "efforts to facilitate the resumption and continuation of talks that have been interrupted", we understand this phrase to mean efforts to eliminate the conditions which in fact caused the interruption.
Because our report on agenda item 4 has ventured so broadly into matters far beyond the scope of arms control, we have also found it necessary to call for amendments in paragraph 5, which enumerates the purposes and principles of the Charter and international law. We much appreciate your patience, Mr. Chairman, and that of the Commission in dealing with this matter, which we believed necessary in order to ensure that our document was consistent with recognized and agreed legal precepts in other United Nations documents, and to avoid misunderstandings about these precepts in the future.

With regard to paragraph 5, my delegation is able to go along with the phrasing that is now presented, since we are dealing with what is a summary of the discussion, a distillation of general views rather than a document that could give rise to questions of the rights or duties of States. We could not accept any suggestion that the right to self-determination or the prohibition of the use of force to deny the right of self-determination is limited to some people or some some situations. The Charter and the Declaration concerning friendly relations remain the authoritative sources for the relevant principles of international law.
In our view, paragraph 8 on this agenda item should be viewed as hortatory in nature, since neither the United Nations Disarmament Commission nor the General Assembly are in a position to instruct the Committee on Disarmament as to what its precise responsibilities may be or as to how the Committee on Disarmament should discharge those responsibilities. Such decisions must, of course, be taken by the Committee on Disarmament itself.

My Government welcomes all efforts to promote progress in arms control, and we are grateful for the hard work and dedication of the authors of the Swedish and Romanian working paper on military budgets. We have reservations about some details of the proposal embodied in that paper. Nevertheless, in our view it contained elements on which to base a compromise consensus.

Several delegations showed great flexibility during the consideration of the Commission's report and recommendation on this agenda item. We recognize that the Commission's recommendation may not go as far as some delegations would have preferred, but we believe that the consensus gives us a viable basis for future work on this subject. As we have noted during the Commission's deliberations, progress in this field requires not only thoughtful initiatives, but a continuity based on the recognition of the essential value of preparatory work now going on and on the need to build on the foundation that has been laid.

The United States continues to support a systematic approach to limitation of military expenditures. We remain convinced that adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties concerned and the availability of a satisfactory instrument for standardized reporting of military expenditures remain essential to such a systematic approach. We remain optimistic that work in these areas can help create conditions in which it would be possible to halt and reverse the disturbing rise in world military expenditures which deprives our peoples of economic and social progress.
Mr. GONZALEZ (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like, first of all, Sir, to express my delegation's appreciation for the very intelligent way in which you have been guiding the intensive work done by this Commission. We also wish to convey our gratitude to Mr. Adeniji and Mr. Sucharipa for the great assistance that they have given us. All this, together with the flexibility and co-operation demonstrated by the delegations during our work, have brought us to this successful conclusion.

In our view the basic aspects of peace, disarmament, and international security and development have been given adequate attention. We believe that the Commission has fulfilled its mandate as regards the preparation of elements to declare this decade as the Second Disarmament Decade. The international climate in which it is beginning has been the subject of exhaustive consideration, and this is reflected in the document adopted in a realistic way and in acceptable dimensions.

We also take a favourable view of the main goals which have been decided upon. We feel that priority has been given to the right area, that is, nuclear disarmament. We recognize the undeniable importance for the coming years of a comprehensive test ban treaty and the prohibition of chemical weapons and of new weapons of mass destruction.

In this connexion we should like to stress once more the importance that we attach to the ratification of the SALT II agreement and to the unhampered beginning of the SALT III talks. We should also like to express again the responsibility incumbent upon all nuclear States in disarmament negotiations, especially those on nuclear disarmament.

Since the Second Disarmament Decade coincides with a new Development Decade, we must stress the link that exists between peace, disarmament and development because, as stated by President Fidel Castro in his address to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, "If there are no resources for development, there will be no peace." (A/34/PV.31, p. 56)
Therefore, we attach basic importance to the section devoted to disarmament and development and in particular to the initial statement made on the indivisible nature of peace and development.

We are also very pleased that in our report many of the ideas actively fostered by the non-aligned countries have been reflected as they appeared in the working document submitted by them. I have in mind in particular sections regarding item 4 (a) and 4 (b), which in our view represent the agreement reached during the consideration of that item.

Of course, we would have wished to have seen reflected in the document references to military escalation in certain regions of the world, and in particular in the Caribbean area, our own region. None the less, we wish to say that we are struck by the attempt to justify the continuation of military bases under article 51 of the United Nations Charter. While we respect the right of any delegation to express its views, we should like to state for the record our complete disagreement with that view. I wish to reaffirm the position that our country and many other countries have expressed through the years, that is, that the dismantling of all foreign military bases is fundamental for the achievement of disarmament goals.

In defence of that principle, in the specific framework of Cuba, recently more than 5 million persons demonstrated.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): We have all recognized that this session of the Disarmament Commission has taken place in international circumstances which are quite adverse for the prospects of disarmament. Our evaluation of the present international situation is the result of compromise, and our texts are perhaps less clear and specific than my delegation would have wished, but our conclusions do reflect
quite clearly the objective situation, where international peace and security is threatened by the use or threat of force, military intervention and occupation of States and denial of the right of self-determination of peoples.

My delegation is particularly satisfied that our Commission has underlined that the withdrawal of military forces of occupation is important for the achievement of the goals of disarmament.

An important achievement of this session has been the formulation of the draft declaration of the 1980s as a Disarmament Decade. On some points of the draft declaration it has not been possible to reach agreement despite intense negotiations. My delegation is firmly of the view that the declaration should contain an unequivocal commitment on the part of all States to reach agreement on the priority items identified in the draft declaration before the second special session on disarmament.

Any formulation which is adopted by the General Assembly should, in our view, in no way prejudice the primary responsibility of the Committee on Disarmament to conduct negotiations on all the items rather than be confined to the role of a conduit for agreements concluded in restricted talks between certain great Powers.

Similarly, with regard to the measures identified for accomplishment either in the first half or in the whole of the decade, the most important point is whether or not States are still prepared to live up to the commitments which they made in the First Document of the first special session on disarmament to implement the disarmament measures contained in its Programme of Action "in the next few years." The imperative of fulfilling this commitment has been enhanced rather than eroded by the present dangerous international situation.

There should have been no difficulty in accepting the goal of concluding a binding international legal instrument to assure the non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons among the four priority measures that were identified as the responsibilities of the Committee on Disarmament.
This formulation does not exclude either an international convention or the alternative modalities for giving security assurances which have been proposed. But we believe that the wide and general support for an international convention cannot be ignored. Indeed, the report of the 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament states that there was no objection in principle to an international convention within the Committee on Disarmament.

It is a matter of particular satisfaction to my delegation that agreement has been reached that among the measures to be achieved during the Decade is the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document. The provisions concerned refer specifically to measures to be taken for the establishment of such zones in Africa, the Middle East and South Asia.

Despite the differences in political perception arising from the present international situation, the Commission has succeeded not only in agreeing on an evaluation of the situation, but also in discharging its responsibility to recommend a general approach to nuclear and conventional disarmament. This was made possible largely, Mr. Chairman, by your own contributions to these negotiations.

The recommendations of the Commission on this question rightly focused on the urgent need to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race, and especially on the danger of a new spiral in the arms race due to the current confrontation between the major military blocs. It also recommends that efforts must be pursued in the field of conventional disarmament, for which, also, the major military Powers bear the primary responsibility.

My delegation concurred with the appraisal, on both nuclear and conventional disarmament, contained in document A/CN.10/20, submitted by Cuba on behalf of the non-aligned countries. We would, however, have been prepared to say more on the subject. My delegation was among those which supported the proposal for a study of conventional disarmament but we believe that it would have to take into account the complexities of the global situation, as well as various regional situations.

On the one hand, the onus for conventional disarmament rests with the major nuclear Powers and other militarily significant States. On the other hand, Pakistan believes that in other areas besides Europe, a balanced regional approach to disarmament could be most efficacious in ensuring the security of the States of the
regions. We feel that significant acquisitions of armaments by some States and the
denial of a level of forces essential for their security to other States would
exacerbate instability and threaten peace and security in the world.

In conclusion, I should like to express our gratification at the work that
has been accomplished at this second substantive session of the Disarmament
Commission. We reaffirm our deep appreciation for the efficient and effective way
in which Ambassador Adeniji of Nigeria steered the Working Group entrusted with
preparing the draft declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade.
Similarly, we believe that the agreement which evolved on agenda item 5 relating
to military budgets was due in substantial part to the dedicated endeavours of
Mr. Sucharipa of Austria.

But we feel, Mr. Chairman, that none of the accomplishments of this session
would have been possible without your own untiring efforts and unceasing
contribution on all facets and at every stage of our deliberations at the current
session. Indeed, thanks substantially to your stewardship during the last two years,
the Disarmament Commission has already made a substantial advance towards discharging
its high responsibility as the multilateral deliberating body.

Mr. WU zhen (China)(interpretation from Chinese): Mr. Chairman,
thanks to your guidance and the joint efforts of the representatives here, the
present session of the Disarmament Commission has basically completed the tasks
entrusted to it by the General Assembly. It has succeeded in drafting resolutions,
recommendations and reports on various items such as the second Disarmament Decade,
nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament and the reduction of military
expenditures, to be presented to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.
The content of these documents is by and large a reflection of the views and
aspirations of the numerous third-world countries and other peace-loving countries.

These documents correctly pointed out that the first Disarmament Decade ended
without accomplishing its goals, and give a fairly objective analysis of the present
international situation, asserting that international peace and security are
threatened by, inter alia, the use of force against the sovereignty, national
independence and territorial integrity of States, military intervention and
occupation, hegemonism and interference in the internal affairs of States.
They make clear the special responsibility of the States with the largest military arsenals regarding disarmament and the reduction of military budgets. They also lay down some reasonable goals for future work in the field of disarmament. All these are, no doubt, beneficial to the people of the world in their efforts to defend international peace and security, guard against wars of aggression, oppose super-Power military expansion and war preparations and further the cause of genuine disarmament.

On the other hand, we cannot but point out that there are deficiencies in these documents, including quite serious ones. The Chinese delegation had already addressed itself to these questions and presented its views on them when the relevant documents were drafted. First, we maintain that, be the subject nuclear disarmament, conventional disarmament, the reduction of military budgets or the realization of other disarmament goals, it is always necessary to ask the two countries with the largest nuclear arsenals, the largest conventional arsenals and the largest military expenditures to undertake special responsibilities. This is the fundamental principle in the field of disarmament at the present moment. No progress was made towards disarmament in the last decade, and the underlying reason is that, while paying lip-service to disarmament, the two super-Powers were engaged in frenzied military expansion. If real progress is to be made in disarmament in the coming decade, they should be forced to disarm first. Once we deviate from this fundamental principle, all the regulations and measures we formulate, no matter how numerous and specific they are, will inevitably become dead letters.

Secondly, the Chinese delegation has stressed on many occasions that nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament should be of equal importance and that one should be carried out in conjunction with the other. Nuclear disarmament is no doubt important, but conventional disarmament is also something not to be ignored.
The super-Powers have often carried out aggression and expansion on the strength of their powerful conventional armaments. The fact that hegemonism and regional hegemonism are both engaged in frenzied military aggression and occupation at present is further proof of this point. We should maintain our vigilance and not allow the hegemonistic Powers with ulterior motives, who are engaged in unbridled aggression abroad, to exploit the opportunity.

Finally, on the question of the so-called comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty, the Chinese delegation has stated many times that in order really to eliminate the danger of nuclear war it is necessary to achieve the complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons, that the two countries with the largest nuclear arsenals should be the first to destroy large amounts of nuclear weapons, and that other nuclear countries will only join them in the destruction of all nuclear weapons after the gap in nuclear arsenals between them and other nuclear countries ... eliminated.

This position of ours is open and above board, and fair and reasonable. In the wake of countless nuclear tests carried out in all environments by the two super-Powers, the mere cessation of nuclear testing cannot prevent them from further developing and improving their nuclear weapons. Therefore, a comprehensive test ban alone cannot eliminate the danger of nuclear war. It can only tie the hands of those countries with weaker defence capabilities, allowing the super-Powers to consolidate their nuclear monopoly and pursue the policy of nuclear threats and nuclear blackmail, thus actually increasing the danger of a nuclear war. For this reason, the Chinese delegation has reservations about the content of the comprehensive nuclear test-ban in the Second Disarmament Decade.

These are the views of the Chinese delegation on the various documents produced by this session.
Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): As this second substantive session of the Disarmament Commission is about to conclude, our assessment of the results of the work carried out in the course of the last four weeks is in general a positive one. The Commission was in a position to elaborate a meaningful draft declaration on the Second Disarmament Decade, although, of course, it will be up to the General Assembly to find appropriate solutions in the case of those phrases where, in spite of strenuous efforts on the part of all delegations, square brackets could not be removed.

The Commission’s recommendation under item 4 constitutes, in the opinion of my delegation, a forceful expression of the concern of the membership of the United Nations in the light of the current setbacks in bilateral and multilateral disarmament efforts.

The second half of these recommendations under item 4 represents the beginning of a search for a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament. My delegation has always stressed the need for the development of such a comprehensive approach and we believe that the relevant paragraphs in our report will facilitate further work in this area.

Under item 5 we had a constructive debate on the problems posed by the ever-increasing magnitude of military budgets as well as on appropriate ways and means of arriving at agreements to reduce military expenditures. This debate revealed a considerable amount of consensus on the basic issues involved, but also, of course, the existence of divergent views on the future course of action that would have to be followed in order to arrive at agreed reductions of military budgets. Our recommendations on these items will be a solid basis for further efforts to harmonize views on this subject, and the concrete recommendations which we will submit to the General Assembly will provide for a somewhat more action-oriented debate next year.
The Austrian delegation thus considers that this session of the Disarmament Commission under your experienced guidance, Mr. Chairman, has shown that, after only two years of existence, the Commission has indeed evolved into an important body for disarmament deliberations on a universal level.

At the same time, the proceedings during this session should make us all aware of the difficulties we face if we entrust the Commission with too many tasks to be carried out simultaneously. Therefore, we should take care during the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly not to overburden the Commission with a mandate that might be too broad to be carried out successfully.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to make a few specific points with relation to the draft declaration on the Second Disarmament Decade. The call for the "Achievement of an agreement on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments and associated measures in Central Europe" contained in paragraph (d) on page 5 of document A/CN.10/CRP.11 might have been worded in a more precise language by making an explicit reference to the current negotiations now under the title that has been reflected in paragraph (e).

I should also like to say that Austria, which, together with the other European neutral and non-aligned countries, has for a long time actively supported the development of confidence-building measures in Europe, appreciates the specific reference made to this issue in paragraph (e).

Secondly, under the section "Disarmament and International Security" on page 7 of the same document, we find the phrase:

"Significant progress in nuclear disarmament would be facilitated both by parallel political or international legal measures to strengthen the security of States".
This phrase is taken, of course, from paragraph 54 of the Final Document of the tenth special session. At the time of the adoption of the Final Document my delegation recorded its reservations on this phrase, which we consider to be unclear and ambiguous, and we wish to maintain those reservations.

Finally, may I be allowed to thank all those delegations which, in their statements today and on Wednesday last, addressed kind words to me in connexion with our work on agenda item 5.

Mr. KAHN (German Democratic Republic): The Disarmament Commission has met in a complicated international situation for which the main cause is the further acceleration of the arms race. In this situation efforts to stop the arms race and to initiate steps towards the limitation of armaments and towards disarmament become particularly irksome.

My delegation can state with great satisfaction that the great majority of States participating in the work of the Commission shares this attitude. This created the possibility of approaching the elaboration of concrete tasks for disarmament negotiations in the coming years.

The Commission succeeded in achieving results under your able guidance, Mr. Chairman. The draft worked out by the Commission on a declaration on the Second Disarmament Decade finds our recognition, although it is our opinion that some questions are still left open and not all tasks have been defined in the best possible way. My delegation would particularly like to underline the statement of the draft which calls for the earliest possible conclusion of the most urgent measures to further advance the process of disarmament with the early achievement of concrete results. We can state with satisfaction that the draft contains a number of measures the inclusion of which was particularly supported by my delegation. These concern steps towards military détente in Europe as well as the convocation of a world disarmament conference.
We can look back to a number of positive results achieved in earlier years when we envisage the purposes of the second Disarmament Decade. We would consider it a good beginning to the second Decade were further States to decide to accede to existing agreements in order to implement their universal effectiveness.

The draft declaration rightly underlines the necessity of taking specific steps towards nuclear disarmament. Therefore these problems play a major role in the report of the Commission on the results of its deliberations on questions concerning nuclear and conventional disarmament. There exists a programme of the socialist States which contains comprehensive solutions as well as partial measures. The paper which my delegation introduced on agenda item 4 on behalf of the socialist States makes reference to this programme. Its elements proved capable of substantially enriching the report of the Commission. Effective steps towards conventional disarmament in all its aspects must be taken simultaneously with measures of nuclear disarmament. Such measures, like the achievement of concrete results in freezing and reducing military budgets, require nothing more than the political will of the States concerned. We regret elements of delay which could be further increased by the elaboration of lengthy and expensive studies.

We consider the results of the difficult deliberations as an essential starting point in planning the second Disarmament Decade. We hope that it will advance us on the road to the liberation of the world from the burden of the arms race and threats to peace. At their last session, the States members of the Warsaw Treaty reaffirmed their preparedness to do everything possible towards the implementation of the proposals on disarmament which had already been presented. At the same time it submitted new far-reaching proposals.

My delegation recommends the thorough examination of these proposals to all members of the Disarmament Commission and is certain that they can decisively contribute to the realization of the purposes of the second Disarmament Decade and to the achievement of progress in the field of nuclear and conventional disarmament.
Mr. Chairman, please permit me in conclusion to express my delegation's thanks to you personally, to the chairmen of the working groups and to the ladies and gentlemen of the Secretariat.

Mr. VUKOVIC (Yugoslavia): The second substantive session of the Disarmament Commission has confirmed once again the merits of the decision of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, on Disarmament, to establish the Commission.

At its first substantive session last year, the Commission adopted elements of the comprehensive programme on disarmament that the Committee on Disarmament was to transform before the second special session on disarmament into a package of interrelated measures in the field of disarmament which should lead the international community towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

At this session the Commission has adopted, also by consensus, a no less important document - the draft declaration of the 1980s as the second Disarmament Decade, the adoption of which by the General Assembly will constitute a further contribution to blazing a trail towards implementation of the decisions of the tenth special session on disarmament, contained in its Programme of Action.

At the second session, the Commission has devoted special attention to the consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, in order to expedite negotiations aimed at effective elimination of the dangers of nuclear war. In this connexion, efforts have been made to elaborate a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament. The results achieved in this connexion, although modest, especially if we bear in mind the urgent need to halt the arms race and initiate a process of genuine disarmament, nevertheless constitute in our view a positive step towards the fulfilment of the mandate which was entrusted to the Commission by the General Assembly. The same could be said with regard to the attempts to consider the problems of military budgets and military expenditure.
The session took place in a complex and deteriorating international situation characterized by a dangerous aggravation of international relations, threats to international peace and security, ever more frequent cases of use or threat of use of force in international relations, military interventions and interference in the internal affairs of States, violation of sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of States, and the prevention of peoples from freely taking decisions on their social and political system.

All this has found expression in the statements of delegations in the course of the general exchange of views and also in the recommendations which we are sending to the General Assembly.

In spite of the differences which have clearly manifested themselves and which reflect the deterioration of international relations, we have succeeded, thanks to the efforts of all delegations to achieve consensus on the greatest number of issues under consideration. This has given cause for satisfaction to all of us. Some important questions have unfortunately remained unsolved and the General Assembly will have to adopt decisions with regard to them. We hope that it will be possible to achieve agreement on those issues before the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

During the consideration of the draft declaration, as well as other questions on the agenda, some disturbing tendencies emerged. If these tendencies persist, they could seriously jeopardize the efforts of the United Nations to halt the arms race and achieve the objectives of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

It is understandable, in the view of my delegation, that in the present aggravated international conditions it is not realistic to expect that disarmament measures will be undertaken soon. Consequently, efforts should be exerted by all States – and in particular by the countries bearing the greatest responsibilities – to overcome the present state of tension in international relations and to eliminate the causes of the present tension.

However, we have to express our grave concern at the acceleration of the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, the increases in military budgets, the concentration and confrontation of military forces of the leading nuclear Powers in certain areas, the rises in tension and the interruption or slowing
down of negotiations on disarmament, which have become the first victim of the deterioration of international relations. In this regard, my delegation views with concern the reluctance of nuclear-weapon States to fulfil the obligations assumed by them at the tenth special session with a view to halting the nuclear arms race and bringing about nuclear disarmament. Such behaviour, if not changed, may have an extremely negative impact on the measures of arms control in the nuclear field already achieved.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, my delegation wishes to congratulate you on the successful completion of the work of the second session of the Commission. Your experience and diplomatic skill, your persistence and dedication to the goals of disarmament set by the United Nations, your tireless efforts to find solutions to extremely complex and difficult problems with which the Commission has had to deal - at least at the previous and current sessions - have greatly contributed to the success of our work.

I wish also to pay particular tribute to Ambassador Adeniji of Nigeria, to whose efforts we owe the successful completion of the draft declaration on the second Disarmament Decade, and also to my friend Ernst Sucharipa, for his significant contribution to the successful outcome of the work of the Commission.
M. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): Mr. Chairman, last year, when we concluded the deliberations of the first substantive session of the revitalized Disarmament Commission, my delegation expressed its deepest appreciation of your efforts and the innovativeness you introduced into the meetings, thereby helping us to adopt the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. It is a matter of little surprise, therefore, that this year too the Disarmament Commission has successfully concluded its deliberations with the adoption of the draft report. I should also like to pay a tribute to Mr. Adeniji and my good friend, Mr. Suchariya, for their adept handling of the meetings on items 3 and 5 respectively.

The draft report we have just adopted does not meet all our expectations. Concessions have been wrested from us, even on those subjects on which final agreement was reached at the special session devoted to disarmament. Because of the time constraint, I do not intend to deal with those areas specifically or at any length. The fact that my delegation, together with other members of the non-aligned group, accepted document A/CN.10/CRP.11 and Corr. 1 is but clear testimony to our desire to demonstrate our spirit of accommodation and understanding.

My delegation attaches the utmost importance to the question of disarmament and development. It is in this context that we made certain amendments to the draft declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. I refer in particular to the paragraphs on page 6 of document A/CN.10/CRP.11 under the heading "Disarmament and development". I should like to express our appreciation of the adoption of this formulation.

Finally, my delegation believes that the ultimate success of the report we have just adopted is predicated on the application of the political will of the member States of the Commission. One of the cardinal imperatives on which the future progress hinges so critically is the strict adherence of all members - all of us - to the principles of non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States. The present report, although not wholly satisfactory, is but one vital aspect of the totality of our efforts to achieve that goal.
Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French):

Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of our lengthy and very fruitful work, I should like to express the very sincere appreciation of the Romanian delegation to you for the way in which you have guided our debates. Your great knowledge of the subjects before us, your competence, which is well known to us all, your skill in organizing the vast task facing our Commission, your flexibility and the masterly manner in which you have guided us during very difficult and delicate moments in our work are all reasons for our wishing to express to you, as other delegations have, our very deep gratitude. I should like also to thank Mr. Adeniji, under whose guidance the Working Group succeeded in drawing up the elements of the very important declaration of the Second Disarmament Decade. I want to repeat my thanks to Mr. Sucharipsa, who, with the most commendable perseverance, succeeded in helping us to achieve consensus on item 5. I should also like to thank the Secretariat for the valuable and skilful assistance it has provided throughout this long period.

Mr. Chairman, it is undoubtedly a great credit to you that you affirmed at the beginning of our session your optimism and your faith that, in spite of the present international situation, our Commission would be able to work in the conviction that positive results would be achieved. That confidence has been confirmed, and this is one more reason why my delegation, as well as others, has been gratified by our work. While we do not overestimate what we have done, because the risks of the arms race are before us and the dangers of the present situation are familiar to all, the positive results we have achieved encourage us to persevere in the direction of active co-operation with all the members of the Disarmament Commission so as to make genuine progress and adopt effective measures to ensure the cessation of the arms race and, first and foremost, nuclear disarmament.

In view of the special importance that my country attaches to the reduction of military budgets, a question included on our agenda on the initiative of Romania and other countries, I wish to emphasize the value
and importance of the spirit of co-operation shown at this session during our consideration of this extremely important problem, a problem which is important not only in our view but also in the view of other delegations.

I wish to thank all the delegations which have in one way or another expressed support for the proposals contained in the working paper submitted by my country and Sweden and also the countries that have expressed their interest in the ideas contained in that working paper. We are convinced that the consensus results that we have achieved, thanks to the spirit of co-operation of all the delegations and to your own understanding and personal efforts, Mr. Chairman, provide a good basis for continued work during the General Assembly and the next substantive session of our Commission, work that will lead to effective results as regards the reduction of the immense burden represented by the military budgets of States. If any further confirmation were needed, this session has shown once more the role and importance of the Disarmament Commission, within the framework of the new deliberative and negotiating machinery established at the special session of the General Assembly, in the efforts of the international community to achieve our primary objective, that is, the cessation of the arms race and the achievement of disarmament.
We believe that the results achieved during this session will be further developed during the next session of the General Assembly and during the next session of our own Commission. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that so this may be done, Romania will continue to act with the perseverance, firmness and devotion to the cause of disarmament that have always characterized it.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, this evening we shall be leaving one another after four weeks of intensive discussion. The results of that discussion can be described in various terms, but there is I think one point on which there is unanimous agreement, namely the remarkable authority and the outstanding talent and courtesy with which you have conducted our work. We should like to express our warmest and friendliest gratitude for this. We should like to associate ourselves in the thanks expressed to Ambassador Adeniji, who presided over the Working Group with such distinction, as well as to Mr. Suchariya, who made a very valuable contribution to our work by leading the discussions on item 5. We should also like to express our gratitude to the Commission Secretary, Mr. Alem, and to all his colleagues, to all the interpreters and translators and to the Secretariat staff, who have displayed so much dedication and competence.

The circumstances under which we met were difficult ones indeed. Disarmament cannot be considered in isolation from the over-all international context, after all. It is therefore quite justifiable for the Commission in that connexion to express its views and concerns and we are very pleased at the way in which that was done. In view of that situation the consensus we achieved is in itself an extremely valuable achievement.

Turning to our agenda items: the Decade was one which particularly claimed our attention. We reached a consensus, if not on all items, at least on a great number of them and that, under present circumstances, is in itself extremely significant and should not be underestimated. We hope that what has been achieved will not be called into question and we hope that the General Assembly, at its next session, will be able to reach agreement on those items that are still pending and will effectively resolve them in a realistic and constructive spirit.
In that context the French delegation would like to recall that, while the
declaration is to serve as an exhortation to initiative and progress, it is
not in itself a programme or any sort of definite timetable for the beginning
of negotiations or the conclusion of agreements.

In the case of item 4, the document which you prepared, Mr. Chairman, and
which was subsequently amended, perfectly well reflects the way in which we
believe we should evaluate the over-all enterprise of disarmament under
present circumstances. We regret, however, that the study of one fundamental
issue, that is conventional disarmament, was not the subject of a consensus.

As far as item 5 is concerned, the freezing and reduction of military
budgets, the French delegation would like to pay a particular tribute to the
delegations of Romania and Sweden for the valuable contribution made by them
during the consideration of this important item. We are also gratified to note
that a consensus has been reached on the continued study of that matter on
the basis of resolution 34/83 F.

This has been a very difficult experiment we have been conducting, but I
think it can prove valuable in the future. The French Government attaches
particular importance to the mission which has been entrusted to the Commission.
Therefore we should like its authority and credibility to be preserved. For
that reason and to that end the following conditions must necessarily be met:
respect for the consensus principle; respect for and recognition by all of the
sovereign rights of States to ensure, individually and collectively, their self
defence by organizing their own security; and respect also for the Final
Document, the balance of the text of which should be preserved. In that
connexion attempts to introduce controversial issues into that document,
issues which some of us cannot accept, is hardly a contribution to progress
towards disarmament.

Finally, it goes without saying that progress in that area will essentially
depend on the international situation, particularly with regard to how the
security of States is being respected.
Sir VENKATESHVARA (India): The documents we have just adopted by consensus relating to the various items on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission have been the result of long hours of patient negotiation amongst the various delegations. By delegation would, at the very outset, like to record our sincere appreciation of the work done by Ambassador Adeniji, as Chairman of the Working Group on item 3, Sir Suchariya, as Chairman of the informal Working Group on item 5, and by you, Sir Chairman, for your dedicated efforts in achieving a consensus on item 4, as well as in guiding the Commission ably throughout its deliberations. I should also like to thank the secretary and the Secretariat staff for their efficient back-up services.

It is of course inevitable that in the process of fashioning a consensus every delegation has to make adjustments in its positions in order to achieve formulations acceptable to all, but we must express our regret that a number of formulations on the draft declaration on the Second Disarmament Decade still remain within brackets. By delegation would like to make clear at this point its basic positions on some of the major issues that have been touched upon in the documents contained in A/CH.10/CRP.9, 10 and 11.

During the general debate my delegation had expressed the earnest hope that the Commission would be able to establish an acceptable time frame for the conduct of negotiations on agreed specific measures to be achieved during the Second Disarmament Decade in order to ensure the credibility and urgency of the disarmament process. We note that in the course of the discussions on the draft declaration on the Second Disarmament Decade, there have been attempts to dilute this important aspect. We have strongly advocated and continue to advocate the need for a clear and unambiguous time frame, particularly in the areas identified in the Final Document as worthy of priority negotiations to be undertaken by the Committee on Disarmament. We reserve our right to revert to this important aspect at a later stage.

On the specific items detailed under the heading "Priorities", on which agreed texts are to submitted to the General Assembly before the second special session on disarmament, it is our belief that a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty would be meaningful only if it is subscribed to by all countries and covers all nuclear weapon tests.

Additionally, as we had stated in the Working Group, the preamble to the limited test-ban Treaty of 1963 specifically seeks to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time.
We therefore feel that the comprehensive test-ban treaty should be of unlimited duration. We would like to see the Committee on Disarmament urgently undertake and conclude negotiations on this question, as well as on a treaty for the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction, and on a treaty for the prohibition of the development, production and use of radiological weapons.

Ever more frequently, we are reminded of the danger of an accidental nuclear holocaust being triggered off by the malfunctioning of warning systems. Just as we are concluding our deliberations here, there comes the news of how close once again we were to such a disaster. Fortunately, these errors have so far been detected in time, but we owe it to our children and our children's children to stop now inviting disaster upon ourselves.

I might mention in this connexion that my delegation has consistently called for the conclusion of an agreement on the total prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons as the only really effective measure of nuclear disarmament. It is imperative that our search for adequate guarantees from nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should not deflect us from our primary responsibility of pressing for more complete and urgent means of disarmament. Yet, only the total elimination of such weapons from the stockpiles of nuclear-weapon States can serve as an effective guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending that, all States possessing such weapons should give a binding commitment not to use them under any circumstances.

The General Assembly, in its resolution 33/71 B of 1978, sponsored by 34 countries, including India, specifically addressed itself to this issue and further, at the last session of the General Assembly, it was decided to "transmit to the Committee on Disarmament the views of States concerning the non-use of nuclear weapons, avoidance of nuclear war and related matters" (General Assembly resolution 34/83) for appropriate consideration and for a report to be submitted to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.
In the view of my delegation, therefore, any effective arrangement to ensure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons should be in the context of an agreement totally prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Proposals for so-called negative guarantees provide only an illusory security for those States to which immunity might be assured; and more importantly, they imply that the use of nuclear weapons against other States in certain situations is legitimate. Such a position is totally unacceptable to my delegation. It is in this context that my delegation insists on a specific reference in the draft declaration to the conclusion of an agreement prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons as a priority measure.

We are concerned that on the various specific matters identified in paragraph 44 of the Final Document as needing implementation "over the next few years", there has been distinct unpreparedness on the part of some delegations to accept a clear-cut time frame within the first half of the Decade even for the commencement of negotiations. Such a position is strangely inconsistent with the accepted commitments undertaken by all States in the Final Document, and my delegation deplores this trend.

Coming to the specific items in the draft declaration under the category of other priority measures, we would like in particular to make reference to the mention of the

"strengthening of the existing nuclear-weapon-free zone and the establishment of other nuclear-weapon-free zones in accordance with the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document".

To my delegation, the paragraphs relevant to the consideration of the nuclear-weapon-free zones are paragraphs 33, 60 and 61 of the Final Document, which stress the need for such zones to be established in well-defined and distinct geographical regions of the world on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States concerned and taking into account the specific characteristics of each region. We believe that for a zone to be viable, it
should come into being as a result of initiatives taken by the States concerned because of common security perceptions, common perceptions of threats to their security and the common desire to help each other in meeting such threats. It cannot be imposed from outside the region, nor can it be imposed within the region by one or more States. Free and voluntary participation is the essence of any such proposal. As regards specific proposals for nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world, our voting record in the General Assembly will make our position amply clear.

We are satisfied to note a specific reference in the draft declaration to further steps to develop an international consensus to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 65 to 71 of the Final Document. As paragraph 65 states:

"The goal of nuclear non-proliferation is on the one hand to prevent the emergence of any additional nuclear-weapon States besides the existing five nuclear-weapon States, and on the other progressively to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons altogether. This involves obligations and responsibilities on the part of both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States, the former undertaking to stop the nuclear arms race and to achieve nuclear disarmament by urgent application of the measures outlined in the relevant paragraphs of this Final Document, and all States undertaking to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons." (General Assembly resolution S-10/12, para. 65)

It is our expectation that the consensus to be developed will cover both the horizontal as well as the vertical aspects of this important problem. In the course of the proceedings of the Working Group, we have also opposed attempts to use extraneous arguments relating to dangers of proliferation of nuclear weapons in order to circumscribe the inalienable rights of States to apply and develop programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for economic and social development.
There has been general agreement in the Working Group and in the Commission on the paragraphs relating to disarmament and development, and it is our earnest hope that the coming decade will see more constructive results in the reduction of military expenditure, especially on the part of nuclear-weapon States and States with the largest military arsenals, leading to the allocation of these resources to economic and social development, in particular for the benefit of developing countries. On the relationship between disarmament and international security, my delegation fully subscribes to the view that an essential condition for progress in the field of disarmament is the preservation and strengthening of international peace and security. The General Assembly has declared that the use of nuclear weapons is a crime against humanity and a violation of the United Nations Charter. Their existence poses the greatest danger to mankind. As such, it is of paramount concern to halt the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of a war involving nuclear weapons. The complete elimination of nuclear weapons should therefore be our most urgent goal.

My delegation has participated actively in the consideration of agenda items 4 and 5. At both the formal and informal meetings of the Commission to consider working papers in this regard, my delegation has clearly indicated its position and its reservations on various points contained in the working papers in documents A/CN.10/18, 19 and 20.

As regards nuclear and conventional disarmament, my delegation has consistently held the position that the highest priority in the process of disarmament must be given to nuclear disarmament. We believe it is therefore of the utmost importance to keep the major emphasis on this priority question in any recommendation to be made to the General Assembly. To our mind, this has not been adequately reflected in the various consensus working papers presented to the Commission. We feel that any acceptance of the concept of a linkage between nuclear and conventional disarmament runs the risk of eroding the emphasis on nuclear disarmament for which the responsibility lies squarely on all the nuclear-weapon States.
Whatever the rationale or acceptability of such a concept of linkage, which may have been proposed for a specific region of the world, that is, Europe, there is no question in the mind of my delegation of accepting this linkage even by implication in regard to the various disarmament questions before the international community. The concept of balance between nuclear and conventional disarmament projected in some quarters is not in keeping with the priorities already accorded by the international community. Nor is it practical or realistic to contend that a particular measure of nuclear disarmament should be balanced by a corresponding measure of conventional disarmament. As to the specific question of the proposed study on conventional disarmament, in the past also such proposals have been made in the context of embargoes or restraints on arms supplies, particularly to so-called areas of instability, tension or conflict. Such proposals, we apprehend, could adversely affect non-aligned developing countries, in particular those which are struggling to preserve their newly-won independence from external as well as internal threats to their security, while at the same time whatever took place within military alliances would remain uncovered on grounds of the secrecy of the information of the alliances and the right of collective self-defence under the umbrella of the Charter. We cannot agree to any discriminatory study and any proposal for a study to be undertaken by the United Nations in the field of conventional disarmament must therefore address itself to these basic problems before it can be agreed upon by us even in principle. In any case the Final Document already contains the guidelines in regard to these matters which have already been accepted by all delegations, and those guidelines, we feel, should be followed in regard to deliberations and negotiations on disarmament.

Finally, we should like to indicate some of our basic preoccupations concerning item 5, on the question of the freezing and reduction of military budgets. If it is our intention to bring about progress in arms limitation and disarmament through an approach involving the reduction of military budgets, in addition to such other recognized and functional approaches as negotiating
and concluding specific measures in the field of disarmament, then the basic
fact that confronts us today is that just six States of the world account for
80 per cent of the total global military expenditure. It is therefore appropriate
that those six States first start reducing their military budgets by parallel
action and through mutual example. This basic issue has, in the course of
discursive debate, been associated with other ideas, including proposals for a
declaration, convention or other document on the reduction of military budgets.
The issue has also been mixed up with theoretical exercises on the measurement
and comparison of military budgets. For my delegation it is essential to
distinguish the basic fact stated above from the plethora of proposals and
technical matrices which seem to attract many delegations. While, therefore, we
do not object to proposals being examined by member delegations in the United
Nations Disarmament Commission or elsewhere, we remain firmly against any decision
even in principle at this stage on a declaration on the freezing and reduction of
military expenditure, which, as my delegation mentioned earlier, would be
putting the cart before the horse. Such an approach, we feel, would also obstruct
rather than expedite our endeavours in this field.

A camel has been defined as a horse which was designed by a Committee. My
delegation is happy that the documents we have produced as a result of our
labours have not suffered in this manner and in fact come quite close to the
objectives we had set for ourselves, although understandably they still suffer
from a number of serious shortcomings. It is our hope that in the decade of
the 1980s our further efforts will be more purposeful and our achievements more
concrete, and that our aspirations to bring about a world free of the shadow of
nuclear catastrophe will come closer to realization.

Mr. NORBERG (Sweden): My concluding remarks will be restricted to
item 5, concerning military expenditures.

In General Assembly resolution 34/83 F of 1979 it was emphasized that
a new impetus should be given to efforts to achieve agreement to freeze
and reduce military expenditures. It was in the spirit of that resolution
that my delegation, together with the delegation of Romania, submitted
the working paper contained in document A/CN.10/PV.14, the purpose of which was to stimulate our discussion in the matter and to prepare the ground for further action by the General Assembly. We have very much appreciated the positive interest that delegations have shown in our working paper and the wide support our proposals have received.

We note with satisfaction the general support for the final objective of achieving international agreement to freeze and reduce military expenditures and that a consensus formulation to that effect has been included in our report to the General Assembly. There were, however, divergent views on how to reach that common goal. My delegation has made its position in this matter clear on previous occasions in the Commission and there is no need to repeat it at this moment. Suffice it to say that in our view there is a need for increased efforts to pave the way for and facilitate negotiations on international agreements to reduce military expenditures. In order to pursue this issue it is important to intensify the work on a wide range of problems connected with such negotiations. In this context my Government attaches great importance to the work carried out to design and test an efficient and generally acceptable instrument for defining and reporting military expenditures. Many other problems remain to be settled.

Parallel with those efforts, the Disarmament Commission should continue its consideration of this matter with a view to elaborating and later adopting a joint political commitment in the form of a declaration expressing the firm intention of Member States to freeze and subsequently to reduce their military expenditures.

The working paper I have just mentioned contains a proposed recommendation to the effect that the Secretary-General should further study the fundamental legal and technical problems connected with the conclusion of international agreements on military expenditures. We regret that it was not possible to achieve a consensus on that recommendation. My delegation believes, however, that the problems relating to reporting and comparing military expenditures, as well as other technical and legal problems involved, will have to be examined further with a view to facilitating future negotiations. My Government is therefore considering the possibility of pursuing this matter in the course of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.
Finally, I wish to express our deep appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, for the excellent way in which you have conducted the work of the Commission. We also extend our thanks to Ambassador Adeniji and Mr. Sucharipa, who presided with great efficiency over our discussions on the Disarmament Decade and military expenditures.

Mr. RAHMAI (Morocco) (interpretation from Arabic): Once again, the Disarmament Commission has demonstrated that it is able to fulfil the role assigned to it by the General Assembly during the special session devoted to disarmament. During this session the Commission has discussed three issues of great importance: the preparation of the elements relating to the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, in order to prepare a general plan for nuclear and conventional disarmament negotiations, and a study of questions relating to the reduction of military budgets.
We believe that the Disarmament Commission has achieved very encouraging results on all of these issues.

My delegation, which was among those that submitted the draft resolution concerning the second Disarmament Decade (A/RES/34/75) and participated in the very difficult work done by the drafting group, in drafting the declaration, wishes to express its heartfelt appreciation for the very intelligent way in which Mr. Adeniji, the representative of a brother country, Nigeria, guided the work of the drafting group.

We are pleased to see that the draft declaration was adopted. It contains principles which my country considers to be the very basis for the existence of an international community free from the spectre of the accumulation of weapons, where cooperation among States can prevail. It is encouraging to observe that the draft declaration highlights the need for respect for the principles and objectives of the United Nations Charter, particularly the principle of the non-use of force or the threat of force against the sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity of States.

We have also stressed the close link that exists between disarmament and development, above all recalling the fact that the second Disarmament Decade coincides with the third Development Decade. We are pleased to see that the draft declaration mentions the need to make every effort to implement measures so that disarmament can contribute to the objectives of the New International Economic Order. We are equally pleased to see that the draft declaration underscores the need to make every effort to strengthen international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for the benefit of economic and social development, particularly of the developing countries.
But in spite of these positive results my delegation cannot fail to express its regret that the Disarmament Commission has not managed to eliminate certain square brackets in the text — areas on which it was impossible for us to reach agreement. My delegation cannot understand why the ideas put forward by the non-aligned group were not retained, for instance the idea of a timetable for the implementation of certain disarmament measures. This was not reflected in the declaration in spite of the fact that we were prepared to accept realistic formulas concerning the results that we would like to achieve at each stage.

We hoped that all delegations might have agreed to have delegations invited before the next session to submit draft agreements or conventions prohibiting nuclear tests and the use of nuclear weapons and an international instrument guaranteeing the security of non-nuclear States. We also would have hoped that before the end of the first half of the second Decade negotiations to achieve disarmament might begin.

We regret that the draft declaration does not contain any specific provision with a view to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa and in the Middle East, above all recalling the fact that our continent of Africa issued a declaration in 1964 requesting that Africa become a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

It should also be recalled that a great danger faces Africa and the Middle East — two regions in which my country is to be found — should South Africa and Israel obtain the nuclear weapon.

Another point that we regret in the declaration is that it does not provide for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. We hope that it will be possible for us to eliminate these differences and square brackets which I have mentioned during the next session of the Assembly.

Before concluding my statement I should like to say that the results achieved by the Disarmament Commission on the item on military budgets are very practical and positive. We should like to express our
thanks to the representative of Austria for the results arrived at by the working group over which he presided. I need not recall my own country's position on conventional weapons. It was reflected in the reply that we addressed to the Secretary-General concerning the second Disarmament Decade. I can sum up our view by stating that my country supports the reduction of conventional weapons to levels that are essential to national security and the maintenance of order.

So if during this session the Disarmament Commission has achieved positive results as I have mentioned, I should like to say that I am convinced, Sir, that your diplomacy and patience and the efficiency with which you guided the work of this session contributed a great deal to that success. Please accept, therefore, our heartfelt thanks. I must also take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the Secretary of the Commission for the enormous efforts that he made to facilitate our work. We also convey our thanks to all the Secretariat staff and all of those who contributed to the success of this session. I want to mention in particular the interpreters, who agreed to stay with us to this very late hour.

The CHAIRMAN: Before concluding the session I should like to say a very few words.

I should like first of all to express my deep gratitude to all those who in the course of their statements today have made some very generous and somewhat exaggerated references to my limited contribution to the work of this session of the Disarmament Commission. If we have been able to achieve a consensus report once again, even with the reservations that have been expressed in the statements made today, I feel that it is entirely due to the co-operation and understanding that I have received from each and every one of you.
At this last substantive session of the Commission under my chairmanship, I should like therefore once again to thank all of you for the confidence which you have always given me and for your understanding and patience.

I think I would be failing in my duty if I did not also take this opportunity to thank Mr. Adeniji and Mr. Sucharipa, both of whom had tremendous responsibilities thrust upon them but discharged these responsibilities to our entire satisfaction, and I wish to place on record our deep gratitude to both of them.
I wish also to thank the members of the Bureau, without whose understanding and assistance throughout the session I would have found things very difficult. I should like to place on record my deep gratitude to Mr. Otegui who, as members probably know, is leaving early tomorrow morning on a home posting.

I wish, of course, to thank all the staff of the Centre for Disarmament and the Secretariat, in particular Mr. Alem, the Commission's Secretary. I wish to apologize to them for the tremendous work load that we have given them, particularly during the last five or six days. Finally, I wish to express special thanks to our interpreters, conference officers and other Secretariat staff and to offer them my apologies as well.

I declare the substantive session of the Disarmament Commission closed.

The meeting rose at 10 p.m.