

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

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



Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.61
4 June 1982

ENGLISH

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SIXTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 28 May 1982, at 4.10 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. WYZNER

(Poland)

- Adoption of the draft report of the Disarmament Commission to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament
- Closure of the session

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.

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION TO THE GENERAL
ASSEMBLY AT ITS SECOND SPECIAL SESSION DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT

The CHAIRMAN: Members have before them the draft report of the Disarmament Commission as agreed upon by the Committee of the Whole.

I would ask the Rapporteur to inform the Commission about the annexes to the draft report.

Mr. de la FUENTE (Peru), Rapporteur (interpretation from Spanish): In addition to the main document adopted by the Committee of the Whole there are three annexes:

(spoke in English)

Annex I, containing the list of the Commission's documents issued since 1978 and appearing in the document in the series A/CN.10; Annex II, containing the guidelines for the study on conventional disarmament, and Annex III, which deals with a background paper on some of the proposed principles and ideas which should govern the further actions of States in the field of the freezing and reduction of military expenditures.

Mr. de BEAUSSE (France) (interpretation from French): I note with regret that no account has been taken of the comments and request of the French delegation at the last meeting of the Committee. The draft report before us for adoption has indeed been circulated in only one of the working languages of the United Nations. The Working Group completed its work rather late, and the translation section has a heavy agenda, and I am sure that there are other reasons that will be put forward. Nevertheless, by and large this text takes up drafts that have not been circulated in all the working languages, though there has indeed been sufficient time since the day they were compiled for them to have been translated. It should have been possible for the few passages that were added or amended yesterday to

(Mr. de Beausse, France)

have been translated so that the revised text could be made available to delegations in all the working languages. If that was impossible this morning, it should have been done this afternoon.

Whatever the case may be, my delegation cannot give its final views on a text that we have been unable to examine in our own language.

If, in a spirit of conciliation, and to enable the Commission to complete its work today, we do not object to the consensus that might emerge in favour of the draft report, the French delegation will be compelled to reserve its final position on the draft report of the Disarmament Commission until it has been able to see the French version.

The CHAIRMAN: I am grateful to the representative of France for his understanding and spirit of co-operation, which will enable us to conclude our work at this meeting.

Mr. BERDENNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the USSR reserves its position on the draft report until it has seen it in Russian.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the comments of the representatives of France and the Soviet Union to mean that there may be some corrections to be made as far as the different language versions are concerned. I am sure that that can be arranged later on, in co-operation with the Rapporteur and the Secretariat.

If there are no further comments, I shall consider the draft report adopted.

The draft report of the Commission was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to put on record our understanding which was reached at the meeting of the Committee of the Whole to the effect that if necessary the Commission will hold a brief session in the autumn in order to discuss and prepare its report to the regular session of the General Assembly.

If I hear no objection, it will be so decided.

It was so decided.

Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): The constraints of time under which this year's session of the Disarmament Commission was held should not discourage us from attempting a brief but substantive assessment of our work, nor should they have prevented the Commission from giving thought to suggestions on the future role of the deliberative body. The forthcoming special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, far from being used as a pretext for inhibiting the creative potential of the Disarmament Commission, should have provided added incentive to delegations for discussing at this session of the Commission the ideas put forth on how to improve its effectiveness. My delegation regrets that this discussion has not taken place at this session.

On the substantive items of this year's agenda, the Commission again did not achieve progress in its deliberations with the exception of the results accomplished on the guidelines to be transmitted to the expert group that will carry out the study on conventional disarmament. Let us take a closer look at the work of the four substantive questions that were before us this year.

My delegation is glad that resolution 36/92 B, which requested the Commission to continue its work on the guidelines, effectively prevented the downgrading of the Disarmament Commission by enhancing its authority and role. We must be grateful also to Ambassador Hepburn, whose skill and experience were key factors in the achievement of a consensus text that will guide the work of the experts. It is important to note in this context that the misgivings and misunderstandings that plagued the strangely contorted proceedings of last year's session were for the most part overcome this year and that a general atmosphere of flexibility and respect for genuine concerns finally prevailed in our debate on this item. The text adopted is balanced and operative and should provide adequate terms of reference for the experts.

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

The result of the work on the remaining substantive items, however, does not go beyond the report of the 1981 session. In any case, the recommendations of the working groups amounted simply to keeping the respective items on the agenda of the Commission for its next session. My delegation is thankful to the respective Chairmen, to whose dedication we pay a tribute. The lack of substantive progress might be partly ascribed to the short duration of the 1982 session and one should also bear in mind that in its three previous sessions the Commission did not have a chance to examine in depth the priority questions relating to nuclear disarmament which constituted the subject matter of item 4 (a) and (b) of our agenda. My delegation believes that the Commission should give serious consideration to this item at its next session, following the recommendation in the report of the Working Group.

The Brazilian delegation shares the widely held belief that the Disarmament Commission can and should play a more significant and active role in progress towards disarmament. The history of the three previous sessions shows that the Commission has been able to make positive contributions - for example, the elements of a comprehensive programme of disarmament in 1979 and the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade in 1980. This year we can point to the agreed guidelines for the group on conventional disarmament. But this is clearly not enough, for on other pressing questions on our agenda the Commission has so far achieved little or no progress. The representative character of this body, which comprises the entire membership of the United Nations, must be put to full use in order to further the goals for which the Commission was created. Observance by all Member States of the commitments undertaken in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament and in particular by those States that bear special responsibilities is a crucial element that is required to enable the Disarmament Commission to exercise fully the important functions assigned to it in that instrument. The Brazilian delegation hopes that, on the basis of the useful suggestions introduced this year by some delegations, the second special session devoted to disarmament will take a closer look at the Disarmament Commission so as to find ways and means of improving its effectiveness. Let it be said, nevertheless, that in our opinion the present difficulties lie much less in any fault of the machinery

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

than in the attitudes and disposition of some States, especially those belonging to the major military alliances, towards the constructive use of the Commission as a forum for meaningful discussion of problems in the field of disarmament. A clear understanding of the vital interest that all nations, nuclear and non-nuclear alike, attach to disarmament questions, together with the will to discharge the responsibilities recognized in the Final Document, are the key elements to enhance the role and credibility of the Disarmament Commission within the United Nations machinery for disarmament.

These are the comments my delegation wished to make at the closing stage of our deliberations this year. Under your able guidance, Mr. Chairman, the Disarmament Commission has again demonstrated in this short session its potential ability to live up to its responsibilities. The Brazilian delegation is convinced that with the active and constructive support of all its members the Disarmament Commission will be able to give a fully substantive and creative contribution to the achievement of the goals set by the international community in the field of disarmament.

Mr. OCAK (Turkey): Mr. Chairman, as we are now approaching the closing of the Disarmament Commission's 1982 session, I shall start off by congratulating you and through you all the people who contributed to this session. I wish to bring to this Commission's attention some observations of my delegation.

We have followed with great interest the - if I may say so - multi-perspectived views expressed by many delegations during our deliberations these past weeks on all aspects of the Disarmament Commission's work and, in particular, on the future role of the Commission. As all my colleagues and representatives present here very well know, my delegation actually attaches particular importance to all matters that relate to the institutional arrangements to be undertaken during the second special session devoted to disarmament with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of the existing international disarmament machinery. It was indeed our wish that during our deliberations these past few weeks we would have had a substantial exchange of views on the present and future role and functions of the Disarmament Commission. We realize, however, that

(Mr. Ocak, Turkey)

owing to lack of time this has not been possible and the exchanges have remained procedural, and now the matter is kept in abeyance for substantive discussions during the second special session devoted to disarmament itself.

We remain confident that a common desire will actually be demonstrated during the special session in helping to improve the machinery in general under which our collective efforts are undertaken.

(Mr. Ocak, Turkey)

In such a comprehensive context the role of the Disarmament Commission will certainly constitute one of the elements within the broader framework of institutional arrangements.

In fact, Turkey was among the countries which were most rapid in providing their views on such arrangements, as expressed in our working paper submitted to the Working Group on Review at the fourth session of the Preparatory Committee for the second special session on disarmament. It only remains to be pointed out that the positive approach most of us choose to adopt towards the enhancement of the role of the Disarmament Commission in our view can and should be substantiated only by the adoption of a similar approach to the role, composition and working methods of other bodies in the sphere of disarmament, in particular the Centre for Disarmament and, of course, the Committee on Disarmament.

I bring this to the attention of the Commission in order to emphasize that it is our earnest wish that all elements of the machinery - namely, the Committee on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission, the Centre for Disarmament, the First Committee of the General Assembly, the Advisory Board and the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research - will have devoted to them the efforts and the enthusiasm which they deserve and which have been demonstrated over the last two weeks as regards the Disarmament Commission.

Mr. LIANG Yufan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Mr. Chairman, the present session of the Disarmament Commission, under your guidance and with the common efforts of all the representatives of the countries, has accomplished a considerable amount of work in a relatively short period of time. The Chairmen of the two Working Groups, in particular, have put in an enormous amount of work. The Chinese delegation would like to express its gratitude and appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the two Vice-Chairmen.

This is the last session of the Disarmament Commission before the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. It is our common wish that the Commission will make its contribution to the second special session by presenting it with the correct analysis of the causes of the lack of substantive progress in disarmament and by submitting reasonable proposals as to how to promote future disarmament efforts.

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

In the course of the present session, representatives of many countries have held a broad exchange of views on certain important issues in the field of disarmament and have held useful and in-depth discussions on them. Many countries have expressed general concern and anxiety over the deteriorating international situation and the escalating arms race, especially the nuclear arms race. They demand that urgent measures be taken to improve the international situation and to promote disarmament. Many countries, presented in a positive manner, views and suggestions on nuclear disarmament, conventional disarmament and the reduction of military budgets. On the basis of these views and suggestions the Commission has produced some documents on the various questions. The document on guidelines for the study of conventional disarmament contains some positive elements which can serve as a guide for the future study of conventional disarmament.

On the other hand, we note with regret that some correct views and reasonable suggestions -- for reasons known to all -- cannot be presented to the second special session as consensus views of the Commission. I should like now to offer some remarks on some of these issues.

First, on nuclear disarmament, conventional disarmament and the reduction of military budgets, the actual situation of armaments and military expenditure in the world today clearly demonstrates that the armaments and military expenditure of the two super-Powers exceed by far those of the other countries in the world. Therefore, they should bear special responsibility in reducing armaments and military expenditure. They should also accept the obligation to be the first to carry out disarmament and the reduction of military expenditure. Of course, other nuclear States and militarily significant States also bear responsibilities in this regard. When the gap between them and the two countries with the largest military arsenals is reduced, they also should proceed with disarmament in accordance with a reasonable ratio. However, in the course of the present session the super-Powers have tried by all means to shirk their special responsibilities in disarmament. This only goes to show that they still lack the good faith for disarmament. This is the main obstacle to progress in disarmament.

(Mr. Liang Yufan, China)

Secondly, on the nuclear capacity of South Africa, many African States have expressed serious concern over the development of the nuclear capacity of the South African racist régime. They demand an end to all co-operation with the South African authorities in the nuclear field. This is entirely reasonable, and we support their legitimate demands. In our opinion, the Disarmament Commission should submit relevant proposals to the second special session, yet to our regret no agreement has been reached on this score.

Finally, on the role of the Disarmament Commission in the field of disarmament, our view is that the Commission -- in which all Member States of the United Nations participate -- constitutes important machinery for the consideration of questions of disarmament. The Commission has played a definite role in the past three sessions. We agree that its role should be further strengthened on the basis of past experience. In this regard, the suggestions of some non-aligned countries deserve our serious consideration.

Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of the meetings of the Disarmament Commission, I wish on behalf of the delegation of Egypt to express appreciation of your personal role in and your very wise guidance of the work of this Commission, which will undoubtedly contribute to the success of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I have a few remarks which I think it appropriate to make at this final meeting. They relate to the fact that, even if we have not achieved much, nevertheless the work of this Commission, especially during this session, has been characterized by seriousness, continuous effort and attempts to achieve agreement on practical solutions to the problems put forward. It is true that the achievement of such results may be quite difficult in existing circumstances. However, the progress which has been made following extensive discussion will contribute, now and in the future, to progress towards our goal of complete disarmament.

The Egyptian delegation, like other delegations of the non-aligned countries, believes that the role of this Commission should be supported and given priority, and that the implementation of the recommendations formulated by the Commission will undoubtedly contribute to such support.

(Mr. Moussa, Egypt)

This relates to the items on our agenda which we should continue to study and examine: the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, the reduction of military budgets, and the nuclear capability of South Africa, which is of primary importance to African States and to the achievement of international peace and security. At the same time, we should consider with all due care the proposal by a number of States belonging to different geographical and political groupings to enhance the role of the Disarmament Commission. Its mandate would include a review of the comprehensive disarmament programme and the role assigned to it by the General Assembly for the carrying out of studies, in addition to what might be proposed concerning the organic relationship that should exist between the Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament with the Commission discussing disarmament problems and the Committee engaging in negotiations. The enhancement of its role should be one of the positive results of the special session devoted to disarmament to be convened shortly.

In conclusion, I wish to extend our thanks for the efforts undertaken by the Secretariat, particularly the Centre for Disarmament, in regard to these matters.

Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria): Now that we have come to the final meeting of the current session of the Disarmament Commission, the Nigerian delegation deems it necessary to place on record its general appraisal of the efforts undertaken by the Disarmament Commission during the session to discharge the responsibilities entrusted to it by the General Assembly.

The revitalization of the Disarmament Commission during the first special session on disarmament in 1978 as a deliberative body and a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly stemmed from recognition of the vital interest of all States in disarmament. It equally underscored the central role of the United Nations in this field.

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

It is true that the issue of disarmament is becoming more and more intractable because of the political, security and economic sensitivities attaching thereto, but we remain convinced that disarmament is not only possible but feasible, given the political will and the commitment of States to undertake the necessary processes. In this connexion, the relevance of dialogue, debate and negotiations remains fundamental. That is why a deliberative body such as the Disarmament Commission, open to all Member States, must continue, and be enabled to continue, to provide an effective input to disarmament negotiations, leading to the adoption of specific instruments regulating the arms race within the framework of the objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The current session of the Disarmament Commission has undoubtedly striven to come to grips with the issues before it and to achieve some meaningful results. While we would not hesitate to congratulate you personally, Mr. Chairman, on the efficient manner in which you have organized the work of the Commission this year, my delegation would, however, be remiss in its appreciation of the Commission's work if it failed to point to a direction in which the tenor and content of the debate on certain issues before the Commission seem to have led.

While a number of delegations seem to have questioned the competence and relevance of the Disarmament Commission in addressing certain specific issues assigned to it, some others have found it incomprehensible that the Disarmament Commission should even attempt to reorder its own priorities in the light of its own experience and through an assessment of its own performance. My delegation believes that, as an organ, the Disarmament Commission is perfectly within its rights, competence and frame of reference to examine the functioning of its machinery and seek to provide remedies for any established or observed shortfall. That is why my delegation believes that the Disarmament Commission should, in the first instance, be the master of its own destiny. It must seek to justify its *raison d'être* and strive to meet the objective expectations of the General Assembly and the international community at large. In short, it must seek to contribute to the disarmament process.

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

The issues before the Commission have been many and varied. The report of the Commission to the second special session on disarmament with regard to its work over the past four years attests to this variety, as well as to their complexity. The report also underlines the need for the Commission to pursue a constructive debate on disarmament questions. However, among other things, I should like to address myself to the specific question of South Africa's plans and capability in the nuclear field, which formed the subject of substantive consideration during the current session of the Commission.

No one is any longer in doubt that South Africa possesses the capability of producing nuclear weapons. Indeed, South Africa's possession of nuclear weapons is not even in doubt. That is why my delegation must note with regret that the tenor and content of the debate on this particular issue not only demonstrated the failure of the Disarmament Commission to address the basic question of nuclear collaboration which certain countries have freely extended to South Africa, in violation of their commitments under appropriate international instruments and the pertinent resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. We reiterate the view that a destabilized Africa constitutes a threat to international peace and security. Furthermore, South Africa's nuclear-weapon capability poses a serious threat to the stability of African States, frustrates the objectives of a denuclearized Africa and is contrary to the necessary promotion of the non-proliferation régime in the interests of international peace and security.

In this regard, we must point to the fact that it is unacceptable for certain States to prefer the pursuit of geopolitical, geostrategic and economic interests to the dignity and worth of the human person and the collective decision of an entire continent to be free from nuclear weapons in order to be left free and able to pursue its socio-economic development aspirations.

We reiterate our call on those States, and in particular those Western and other States which have defiantly continued their military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa, to rethink their options in the interest of their relations with African States.

It is the hope of my delegation that the next substantive session of the Disarmament Commission will address this question substantively and adopt specific measures.

Mr. SUJA (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): Sir, as Chairman of the Group of Eastern European States and also as one of your deputies, it gives me the twofold pleasure to congratulate you, the representative of the People's Republic of Poland, on the conclusion of the work of this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Our congratulations are also addressed to the other officers of the Commission, the Rapporteur and all the Chairmen of the Working Groups, as well as the Secretary of the Commission.

This session has taken place on the very eve of the second session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and has been an event of special importance in the light of the entire four-year period of the history of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, an important subsidiary organ of the General Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, it is all the more pleasant to note that under your able, experienced and effective guidance the Commission has made use of its time in a constructive and fruitful atmosphere and, under its mandate, yielded significant results, which are to be submitted to the second General Assembly special session on disarmament.

We are sure that these results will make a positive contribution to the work of the second special session on disarmament and to the subsequent negotiations on resolving the substantive issues before the Commission.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate my delegation with the many representatives who have paid special tributes to your able leadership of the United Nations Disarmament Commission this year. The fact that we are concluding our work in two weeks instead of the three weeks it took last year, and at a reasonable hour on our final day, is indeed a tribute to your excellent guidance and skill in presiding over this body. We also join the other delegations which have expressed appreciation to the Chairmen of the Working Groups for their dedication and skill in guiding their respective groups. We should be remiss if we did not pay a special tribute to Ambassador Davidson Hepburn for his success in developing the guidelines for the experts who will prepare a study on conventional weapons. His skill and diplomatic finesse has enabled us to make a constructive contribution to that study group and successfully to conclude a long-standing item on our agenda.

(Mr. Fields, United States)

I am pleased at this point to announce formally to this body that my Government has - in the exercise of great wisdom - selected the United States national expert to that group. He is well known to many members of the Commission, having led the United States delegation last year. I am pleased to announce that our expert will be my predecessor in the Disarmament Commission, Ambassador Charles Conway Flowerree. I think that this will bode well for effective work to be done by that group.

Again, I think that we can take pride in the fact that we have completed our work and passed one item of our agenda to a study group where I believe great work can be expected. We have other items remaining on our agenda which, I think, will be addressed seriously in future meetings. I believe that our debate has been helpful and constructive during this session, and I am pleased again to congratulate you, Sir, for the able leadership you have given and also the other Chairmen, who have worked so hard to make our session a success.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Mr. Chairman, I should like first of all to join in the expressions of great admiration for your skill and ability in conducting the entire proceedings of the Disarmament Commission. But I should like to add to that one quality I consider very important - your ethical approach to problems - because that is a very important factor in dealing with matters in the United Nations. I believe that your ability in having completed the work of the Commission early and satisfactorily is to a large extent due to that approach. I wish also to congratulate the Chairmen of the Working Groups - the representatives of the Bahamas and Yugoslavia - and also our Rapporteur for his very constructive work in the Commission.

I should like now to say a few words in regard to what, in our view, is the function of the Disarmament Commission. The Commission was established by the first special session devoted to disarmament because of the difficult situation obtaining when that special session was called. There had been hardly any progress towards disarmament while the arms race had been escalating by leaps and bounds.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

We were faced with a tragic picture of the world, for after more than 20 years of work in the Committee on Disarmament - under various denominations - that escalation had been proceeding unchecked.

Therefore, it was felt that, parallel to the negotiating work of the Committee on Disarmament, there should be established a deliberative body to consider why there had been no progress on disarmament - because there had to be a cause. It is now the task of the Disarmament Commission to look into the cause that prevents progress on disarmament.

It is of particular importance that for the first time in history we had parallel courses - disarmament and, at the same time, an escalating arms race. There had been a pattern in the past that, in preparations for a war that was expected to begin in a very short time, there was a rapid escalation of armaments; but soon after that war ended what was wanted was the very opposite - to disarm, or not to continue arming. But for the first time now, we have these two elements, which are quite contradictory, continuing at the same time in opposite directions.

Therefore, the task of this Commission is to make a distinction in its work from that of the Committee on Disarmament. The Committee on Disarmament is engaged in negotiations, and it has a very hard task with those negotiations, which do not seem to be leading to any, or hardly any, productive results. The Committee on Disarmament is working very hard and with dedication, but it does not have the time, nor is it its purpose, to deal with the root of the matter. Hence, it would hardly be constructive to the work of this Commission should it emulate the work of the Committee on Disarmament. This Commission should not point out what the Committee on Disarmament should do on this or that negotiation. It is for that Committee to deal with these concerns and the Disarmament Commission should deal with the basic problems of the arms race and the need for disarmament.

(Mr. Rossides Cyprus)

Therefore, from a careful reading of the Final Document, which set up the Disarmament Commission, I believe one would soon realize that the purpose of this Commission is to deal with these problems in depth. This is borne out by the fact that at the same time as this Commission was set up it was decided that the First Committee of the General Assembly should deal exclusively with disarmament problems and the related issue of international security.

Now, that is very indicative, first, of the feeling at the special session that international security is closely linked with disarmament measures and, secondly, of the decision taken at the special session to study the relationship between disarmament and international security. After so many years of disarmament efforts, never before had a study of the relationship between international security and disarmament been considered. So that is a second indication of the particular importance attached to international security by the special session on disarmament.

The study on the relationship between disarmament and international security and vice versa has been completed. It points directly to the need for parallel efforts at disarmament and international security and stresses that international security can come only from the system of international security provided for in the Charter. The study itself refers, in its various chapters and in its conclusions and recommendations, to the need for compliance with Article 43 of the Charter to enable the Security Council to give effect to its decisions, because a Security Council that does not have the possibility and means of giving effect to its decisions loses its validity and effect. Therefore, the system of international security under the Charter becomes inoperative.

Consequently, if we want disarmament, we must have a system of international security. And to have a system of international security, we must have a Security Council operating as was intended by the Charter - that is, with its resolutions implemented. Or, if its resolutions are not implemented, the Security Council must have the means of enforcing those resolutions. If that were done we would have an effective Security Council, a meaningful United Nations and, therefore, world order and security, in so far as that is possible.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

The fact that there are nuclear weapons does not alter the situation at all, because nuclear weapons cannot be used and, therefore, there cannot be nuclear wars, because a single nuclear war could spell the end of the world. That is why, in a continuing world, we want to have order and security. And that can be achieved only through an international security system as provided for in the Charter.

In reading the Disarmament Commission's report of last year, as distinct from the one of the previous year, 1980, we noticed that there was no mention anywhere of international security, and we felt it necessary that we try hard to place this important aspect of disarmament before this session of the Disarmament Commission. I am very glad about the co-operation we received in getting this important and vital issue of international security included in a paragraph of the report.

I wish the Commission to be able to function effectively so that it will be given the consideration it deserves, because the Disarmament Commission, as distinct from the Committee on Disarmament, represents the whole world and has a task that is very important in preparing the way, the means and the conditions that would make negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament positive and productive. That is a great task for this Commission and, therefore, it should be given that consideration and respect it deserves if it does its work properly by imbuing the United Nations with a sense of responsibility. After all, it is the United Nations, which, in the opinion of the General Assembly expressed at its special session, has a central role in, and primary responsibility for, disarmament - a role and responsibility with which it is endowed by the Charter.

Such a role can only be understood to mean that the United Nations is to produce the international security required for disarmament. I will not elaborate further on this point, but I do hope that in the process of its future work the Disarmament Commission will acquire the importance that is really its due.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased to extend to you the gratitude of my delegation for the most effective manner in which you have presided over our proceedings. This comes as no surprise to me, as I have had an opportunity to see you in action in a similar way in many other forums devoted to disarmament. Hence this is merely a natural confirmation of it. I should like to extend our sincerest congratulations to you and to the members of the four working groups of the Commission, as well as to the Rapporteur and to the members of the Secretariat who have contributed to the work of the Commission, be they at the higher ranks or in more modest positions, and whether they are "visible or invisible", to use the phrase commonly employed in cases such as this.

Finally, I would venture to make a few brief comments of an administrative nature.

Today my delegation received a list of delegations. I counted the number of delegations listed in information document No. 8, and the total is 53 or less than one third of the Organization's 157 Members.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

I would venture to express the hope that perhaps there is a more or less large number of gaps in the list that could be filled. To that end, I should like to suggest that the Secretariat entrust a secretary with the task of calling, perhaps tomorrow, every mission absent from the list of delegations. It should be told that before the first revised list is issued the Secretariat will wait 48 or 72 hours, whatever may be desired, in order that the number of delegations included on this list might be increased, perhaps considerably so. It would be truly discouraging if that did not happen.

The reason why I dare hope that something of this kind might occur is that, as members may have noticed, Mexico does not appear on this list, but the Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations addressed to the Secretariat of the United Nations on 23 April a note verbale, number 587, on this matter, and I would like to hand a photostat of it to the Secretary of the Commission at the end of this meeting.

Perhaps that note arrived too early, since our Commission's work began on 17 May. But it seems to me that since it was sent on 23 April, instead of our being omitted, special care should have been taken to see that we were included.

Let me therefore repeat my suggestion that these telephone calls be made tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that the Secretariat will take due account of the suggestions made by him in connexion with the list of participants in this session.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: One of the few privileges of the Chairman is that he can be first to address the session and also the last.

We have come to the end of the present session of the Disarmament Commission according to our schedule. It is a session which has been relatively short, very busy and quite successful. Members have all worked with full dedication and a genuine desire to achieve concrete results. If those results were perhaps less than completely satisfactory in some areas, this, I am sure, is due mostly to the little time we had at our disposal. I hope that in its future work the Commission, guided again by the spirit of sincere co-operation and mutual accommodation, will take further steps towards the fulfilment of the goals it was created to achieve.

I think we should recall in this context the interesting suggestions put forward during our current session concerning the future role and functions of the Commission. I am confident that both the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the public at large will welcome the progress we have made on the items of the agenda dealing with the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, the study on conventional disarmament, and the reduction of military budgets.

The relative lack of progress on the item concerning the nuclear plans and capability of South Africa should not discourage us from undertaking further efforts on this important issue.

All in all, I believe we have had a very useful session, from which we should certainly not emerge with a sense of disappointment. Its deliberations and results show clearly the need for, and the urgency of, further determined efforts to achieve our common objectives. At the same time, I hope that what we have already accomplished here can be considered a modest contribution towards the achievement by the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament of tangible progress on questions of the utmost importance and priority, such as the prevention of nuclear war and nuclear disarmament.

(The Chairman)

I wish to offer my warm thanks to all members and, in particular, to the officers of the Commission and to our most able Rapporteur and the Chairmen of the four subgroups for their hard work and co-operation, as well as the support and friendship they have given me. I am sure all the members of the Commission would also wish to join me in expressing sincere thanks to the two Assistant Secretaries-General, Mr. Jan Martenson, head of the Centre for Disarmament, and also to Mr. Rikhi Jaipal, and to our tireless Secretary, Mr. Fehmi Alem and to all their able collaborators in the Centre for Disarmament for their valuable and selfless assistance.

Likewise, our thanks go also to the Conference Services personnel, our excellent and hard-working interpreters and conference and press officers. Once again, I thank you very warmly for all your co-operation and understanding and we shall meet again at our next session.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.