



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.76
17 May 1984

ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS
DEPARTMENT FOR DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS
REFERENCE LIBRARY

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 9 May 1984 at 3 P.m.

Chairman:

Mr. GBEHO

(Ghana)

- General statements and exchange of views (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-0750, 2 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 3.20 p.m.

GENERAL STATEMENTS AND EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (continued)

Mr. CANALES (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to associate myself with the words of pleasure expressed by other delegations at seeing you presiding over our work. Your diplomatic experience, particularly in matters connected with disarmament, is a guarantee of the success of our work.

My delegation, heeding the appeal of the officers, will make a few brief comments on four points: the direction of our work; nuclear disarmament; confidence-building measures; and the relationship between disarmament and development.

The disquieting international climate in which the work of the Commission is beginning makes it essential that its deliberations take place constructively, on the basis of a feasible and objective programme, in order to facilitate the adoption of recommendations which can promote positive, albeit limited, advances in the sphere of disarmament, in particular, in connection with the prevention of nuclear war and nuclear disarmament.

My delegation deems it pertinent to recall the words uttered by the outgoing Chairman of this Commission, Ambassador Souza e Silva, upon adoption of this session's provisional agenda. The Commission, he said,

"cannot afford to become a stale, unproductive body which endlessly repeats itself in search of an illusive consensus on a set of immutable items in a fixed agenda". (A/CN.10/PV.71, p. 4)

In this context the Commission should conduct a useful and constructive debate on the most acute problem facing the world today, one which threatens the survival of mankind: the danger of nuclear war. Disarmament-related issues, specifically their nuclear aspects, are no mere philosophical or political questions, but an inescapable moral commitment to our peoples and to future generations which must be honoured.

The steady upward spiral of the nuclear-arms race, qualitative and quantitative alike, the search for a pragmatic justification of doctrines such as "nuclear deterrence" and "balance of forces", together with the deadlock in negotiations between the major nuclear Powers, contribute to heightening the risk of a lethal all-out nuclear war and gradually undermine international security.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

It is urgent to heed the appeal of the Secretary-General in his report to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, to the effect that it is essential to guarantee implementation of the principles and provisions of the Charter. The alternatives are the threat or use of force with the risks of a nuclear holocaust, or the path of co-operation set forth in the Charter. Towards the latter end, it is essential to strengthen the norms and procedures enshrined in the Charter as an appropriate framework for the search for equitable formulas through the means set forth for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

In connection with conventional disarmament, my delegation reiterates its concern at the deterioration of security in the third world. There exist many seemingly local conflicts - traceable to historical, political or social animosities or to territorial disputes, to mention just a few causes - that nevertheless involve many countries and draw in the major Powers. This demonstrates the fragility of the international system and generates a build-up of conventional weapons in excess of defence and national security needs, to the detriment of the socio-economic development of the neediest peoples.

It seems pointless to refer here to the already familiar causes of the build-up in conventional weapons. To avoid sterile debates the Commission might await the recommendations that will be prepared by the group of experts on this issue on the basis of the guidelines provided by this body in 1982.

My country agrees with the group of governmental experts on confidence-building measures that their basic objective is to enhance respect for and observance of the basic principles of international law. While not a substitute for disarmament, they do represent a promising factor in creating conditions conducive to arms limitation and disarmament. Chile has traditionally affirmed that in order to achieve international peace and security pursuant to Charter provisions, unconditional respect for those principles is a sine qua non condition.

The non-use of force and the peaceful settlement of disputes constitute, inter alia, the essential objective of confidence-building measures. Those principles are most crucial to the implementation of the Charter.

If they are not respected, it is due, we believe, not to ambiguities in the relevant provisions of the Charter but to aggressive attitudes incompatible with the Charter's spirit and letter, generating an atmosphere of greater tension and distrust which in turn promotes an alarming arms build-up. The debate which began

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

last year on definitions and characteristics of those measures demonstrated the need to explore the sources of that distrust in the conviction that their reduction will undoubtedly be reflected in the disarmament process itself.

My delegation wishes to stress the need for the working group that will be dealing with this issue to continue to give priority to the negotiation of recommendations on practical and concrete ways and means to strengthen the universalization of confidence-building measures, with strict respect for regional needs, including the substantive aspects of conventional and nuclear disarmament and their socio-economic manifestations. Our efforts must not be dissipated in a fruitless debate over high-sounding, unattainable projects.

We believe it of interest, in the context of resolution 38/188 F, to consider elements that would enable the extension of confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans. In this connection, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea contains a set of regulations on the obligations of parties to ensure the non-use of force in the marine environment and in the principal sea routes and to preserve that domain for exclusively peaceful purposes. This is a useful model which should be considered by the working group. My delegation is prepared to make some proposals in that forum.

Furthermore, we consider that confidence-building measures should be extended to outer space. The possibility of a new dimension in the arms race, this time in outer space, is one of the issues of concern to our delegation.

As a developing country, Chile understands that the problems of disarmament and development are closely related. It cannot be denied that without resources for development there will be no peace, and those who contribute to the intensification of the arms race are undeniably responsible for jeopardizing the survival of mankind. At the same time, policies of armament, particularly nuclear armament, obstruct the process of co-operation for development for the benefit of universal, lasting peace.

The enormous figures of military expenditures, which increase greatly every year, constitute irrefutable proof of the fruitlessness of our sincere efforts to control, reduce and eliminate nuclear and conventional weapons. My delegation wishes to reiterate its support for the initiatives set out in the document prepared on this issue by the Group of Governmental Experts. We believe that the Working Group should make use of the options contained in that document in order to reach effective consensus agreements and specific recommendations.

(Mr. Canales, Chile)

The need to stem the arms race, thus enhancing international security and releasing resources for use for economic and social development, especially in the developing countries, warrants a full analysis of multilateral assistance in this sphere and of proposals aimed at the establishment of an international disarmament fund for development. The United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and development covers various aspects of those proposals in relation to the principles governing the financing of the fund and the use of its resources. In this connection, it should be recalled that, in keeping with General Assembly resolution 37/84, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research is carrying out a study on this subject.

Lastly, we consider that the Working Group should assess the concrete initiatives in this field, such as that put forward by France, in order to determine the political viability of some of their central elements, such as the operation of the fund and the convening of an international conference to carry out a thorough, ongoing evaluation of the issue.

In conclusion, I wish to stress the sense of urgency with which my delegation hopes for a fruitful outcome of our work. At stake here is the very survival of mankind. We are not here to theorize or to discuss utopian plans, but rather to recommend specific, realistic measures to eliminate the threat of war and of nuclear holocaust.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): My delegation, Sir, is very pleased and encouraged to see you in the Chair, guiding our work. I should like to demonstrate the sincerity of that remark by accepting now your request to all delegations for short statements, and statements directed at the agenda.

With regard to item 4, on various aspects of the arms race, it is no secret that the Australian Government and the Australian people are very deeply concerned about the arms race, conventional and nuclear.

Three weeks ago, on a particular day in Australia dedicated to peace, over a quarter of a million Australian citizens met voluntarily in public meetings to call for an end to the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. Those meetings were voluntary, and the telling way of expressing their magnitude is to say that the number of people who gathered together voluntarily to express their deep concern worked out at no less than one in 32 of Australia's voters.

Accordingly, my Government's dedication to an end to the arms race is not only a matter of policy but a democratic reflection of the wish and the aspirations of the Australian people.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Unlike some others at this meeting of the Commission, Australia is privileged to be able to take part in the work of the Conference on Disarmament. That Conference has a special importance because it is the single multilateral negotiating body. Australia deeply values its membership of the Conference on Disarmament and sets great importance on a multilateral solution to our problems. But this Commission also has a role to play in those multilateral efforts. What we do in the General Assembly and in the Conference on Disarmament can and must be informed by the deliberations of this Commission, the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

In our deliberations under agenda item 4 we must devote attention to the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament. We must encourage the resumption of the negotiations on nuclear weapons. We must advance the process of the elaboration of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. We must strengthen the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and work for universal adherence to it.

In this context I might mention that in the South Pacific Australia is actively promoting with its neighbours the establishment of a nuclear-free zone.

But the wider question of eliminating the danger of war - or, to put this more positively, the need to preserve the peace - also involves deliberations, actions and negotiations designed to halt and reverse the arms race in conventional weapons.

Expenditure on arms today is running at something of the order of \$800 billion a year. Too much of this is given to expenditure on nuclear arms, but the fact is that the larger proportion of that expenditure goes to conventional arms. There should be no illusion that those arms are cheap. They are not. We have heard in the past about a cost-gap between the cost of nuclear weapons and that of conventional weapons. That gap is being closed; conventional weapons today are becoming extremely expensive, and expenditure on them constitutes an enormous drain on the world economy. That expenditure is a scandalous waste of human and material resources and of the ingenuity of humankind.

That expenditure, in fact, has its worst impact in the less developed world, and it has that impact in two senses. It is chiefly in those parts of the world that the terrible effects of the use of such arms are being felt. And it is the development of such countries which is being set back daily by the expenditure on conventional arms.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

A vital part of our deliberations in this body must be aimed at facilitating the establishment of the conditions in which the conventional arms race can be stopped and greatly reduced. This aim relates both to the need to reduce military budgets, an item on our agenda, and to finding ways in which reductions can lead to the diversion of resources from expenditure on arms to the promotion of economic development - and that is another agenda item. Those goals are, in fact, the subjects of items 5 and 8 of our agenda.

It is sometimes argued that it is not possible for us to take such steps unless there is a greater degree of confidence, both in terms of national security as such and in terms of confidence between States on a wider basis, and this introduces item 7 of our agenda: confidence-building measures. There is important work taking place in that field on a regional level; we all know that. It has a particular effect upon the North, or, more particularly, Europe. We propose to encourage such work, but we believe that the need for confidence-building measures is by no means a restricted or geographically limited requirement.

My delegation will take part in the work of the Commission under item 7, but we shall hope to see that work broadened beyond a restricted or limited application of the concept of confidence-building measures; it is a concept that is important to all of us. Such measures have an integral relationship with the fundamental need to stop and reduce the arms race, and they thus have a bearing on the possibility of disarmament leading in turn to development.

In this sense the agenda of this Commission represents an organically related set of issues - confidence-building measures, disarmament and development, and reduction of military spending - and it is this fact that makes the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission particularly interesting. In other disarmament forums one does not often see such an organic relationship; it is not so clear.

In addition, this is a deliberative body, and the result of its deliberations should be a demonstration to the General Assembly and to the Conference on Disarmament of constructive ways in which the vital problems of our time may be approached and negotiated more effectively. Certainly too, a deliberative body should be free - as you yourself have, I think, suggested, Mr. Chairman - of polemical or propagandist statements.

I think our organic approach, however, must lead not to a blurring of special and significant issues, but rather to the elucidation of common interests in reducing the arms race and bringing about disarmament.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Our agenda contains one item on which no such blurring should be tolerated, and that is item 6, the question of South Africa's nuclear capability. This is a question of great significance. My Government's policy towards apartheid is clear: apartheid is abhorrent and we reject it utterly. My Prime Minister has stated publicly that apartheid is itself bad enough without South Africa's ever becoming nuclear-armed.

It is our collective responsibility not simply to make declarations - and I want to emphasize that - but to find effective ways to ensure that this never occurs - that is, that the intolerable system of prejudice and oppression that apartheid represents is never propped up by nuclear weapons. The minimum requirement in this context is that South Africa adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

My delegation recognizes that our time is short, in two senses. First, our session will last for only one month, and we should therefore not waste time; we should seek whatever agreement is available to us on the items on our agenda, and reject, as far as possible, procedural disputes and options which divide us rather than help to forge common solutions.

Secondly, time is short because our subject is disarmament, and there is no more urgent subject today.

Mr. WASIUDDIN (Bangladesh): At the outset, Sir, I should like to extend to you, on behalf of the Bangladesh and on my own behalf, our sincerest congratulations on your well deserved election as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. Your long-standing association with the United Nations and your well-known contributions in the field of disarmament give us every reason to believe that under your proven and dynamic leadership the Commission will be able to achieve concrete and positive results. May I also extend our warm felicitations to the other officers of the Commission on their election. My delegation pledges its full co-operation and support to you, Sir, and the other officers in fulfilling the responsibilities entrusted to you.

My delegation is pleased to participate in the 1984 session of the Disarmament Commission, and it welcomes this opportunity to share with other members of the Commission our views on the items included in our agenda. Our agenda is comprehensive and rightly focuses on the principal disarmament issues. We hope the Working Groups will have ample opportunity to deliberate at length on those items.

(Mr. Wasiuddin, Bangladesh)

In your opening statement, Mr. Chairman, you rightly pointed out that since the conclusion of the previous session of the Commission, and contrary to the expectations of the overwhelming majority of peoples of the world, the arms race - particularly the build-up of nuclear weapons, including those for outer space - has continued at a feverish pace. During this period we also witnessed another dangerous phenomenon: the break-off by the super-Powers of bilateral negotiations on nuclear weapons, which shattered yet another hope for peace.

Previous speakers have also correctly pointed out that the failure of more than two decades of negotiations to produce meaningful agreements on disarmament has led to an unbridled arms race between the two super-Powers. The unrestrained arms race and the feverish accumulation of the most sophisticated and lethal weapons in the arsenals of the super-Powers and other militarily significant States threaten not only international peace and security but also the very existence of mankind. What is particularly disturbing is that no meaningful negotiations are currently taking place in the nuclear field; and we do not even know when and how such negotiations might start.

In pursuance of our commitment to general and complete disarmament, Bangladesh acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Although over 100 States have acceded to the NPT, we are disappointed to note that nuclear proliferation, both vertical and horizontal, continues unabated. We are firmly convinced that there can be no durable peace except through the elimination and destruction of nuclear weapons and their stockpiles. We also believe that the limitation of nuclear armaments and other weapons of mass destruction is an important first step in creating an atmosphere of trust and confidence and the relaxation of international tensions.

We have therefore urged that, pending the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, all States should refrain from the testing of nuclear weapons and that there should be a freeze on the production and deployment of, research on and development of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. It is a matter of particular concern to us that some of the militarily significant States, instead of honouring their commitment under the limited test-ban Treaty and the Non-Proliferation Treaty, have continued to develop new types of weapons. The Third Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty is going to take place next year. My delegation attaches particular importance to that Conference, as its outcome is bound to have a crucial impact on current non-proliferation efforts.

(Mr. Wasiuddin, Bangladesh)

Side by side with these developments we now see on the horizon a new technological breakthrough which will undoubtedly upset what the nuclear Powers themselves consider to be the security balance of power. The development of anti-satellite systems is a relatively new area for arms competition. Such attempts to use outer space for military purposes should be halted, as a priority, and outer space should be declared a common heritage of mankind to be used for humanity at large.

Bangladesh has always believed that the complete and effective prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and their destruction should constitute one of the most urgent measures of disarmament. We therefore feel encouraged by the positive efforts which have already been made towards the conclusion of a comprehensive convention on chemical weapons. To our mind, the time and atmosphere have never been so opportune as now for achieving a major breakthrough in this field.

The huge military expenditure stands out in sharp contrast to the current critical international economic situation. The social opportunity cost resulting from the diversion of scarce resources for military use has afflicted the developed and the developing countries alike. Bangladesh firmly believes that there is a close relation between disarmament and development. As a least developed country, it feels keenly that the colossal financial and other resources being consumed by the armaments race should be directed to the elimination of world poverty. The interaction of disarmament and development and the glaring discrepancy in the amount spent on armaments as against development do not bear recounting. We have, therefore, urged that concrete measures be adopted to promote disarmament and to divert resources from armament to development. It was in this context that the Bangladesh Foreign Minister said at the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly:

"One concrete way of doing this would be to institute without delay some measure of international taxation on all expenditure on nuclear arms".

(A/38/PV.18, p. 63)

The Swedish representative, in her statement yesterday, illustrated how scarce resources are wasted on an ever-escalating arms race and gave us some specific instances. She also pointed out how disarmament will benefit the economic prospects of all countries. The United Nations expert study on the subject, completed in 1981, is of particular interest to us. My delegation has always

(Mr. Wasiuddin, Bangladesh)

associated itself closely with all the initiatives taken in the past on this issue, and we welcome the French proposal to convene a United Nations conference on the question of the relationship between disarmament and development. The Bangladesh delegation intends to play an active role in the Working Group which will deal with this issue.

My delegation also attaches particular importance to the question of South Africa's nuclear capability. It is unfortunate that the Commission has been postponing the adoption of recommendations concerning this issue. The illegal apartheid régime of South Africa, in defiance of United Nations resolutions, has continued to occupy Namibia and has mounted acts of repeated aggression against neighbouring States. Its policy of aggression has threatened the peace and security not only of the region but of the whole continent. The subject therefore deserves our serious consideration and we hope that the members of the Commission will make a greater effort during the current session to conclude our deliberations on this item by adopting appropriate recommendations.

The Bangladesh delegation has in the past also taken an active interest in the deliberations on the item "Reduction of military budgets", and we express our sincere appreciation to the Romanian delegation for its initiative in this regard. Similarly, my delegation has actively participated in the deliberations on the item on confidence-building measures, whose importance has already been emphasized by preceding speakers. A comprehensive approach should be taken by considering not only the various military issues but also other related economic and social issues. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, which has consistently taken an important initiative in this regard in the past, has submitted a working paper on the subject. It is also our earnest hope that the Working Groups which will consider these two important items will deliberate on them comprehensively and come up with specific recommendations.

In conclusion, I emphasize once again that we are meeting at a crucial juncture in the history of mankind. Our common awareness of the great dangers posed by the mad race for armaments and our consensus on the need to take urgent practical steps towards disarmament must be translated into reality to usher in an era of global peace and security. It is our sincere hope that the Disarmament Commission will be able during its present session to adopt effective, concrete measures to redress the situation. The Bangladesh delegation assures

(Mr. Wasiuddin, Bangladesh)

representatives that we shall extend our full support to every action to that end. We also hope that all States, particularly the most powerful and militarily significant ones, will display self-restraint and moderation and enter into serious negotiations during the current session.

Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): First, Sir, I congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of the Commission. My delegation has no doubt that your well-known professional and personal qualifications make you the best possible person successfully to guide the very important work ahead of us in the coming days.

This deliberative forum has rightly decided to reduce to the minimum the so-called general debate in order to allot more time to the Working Groups that will be studying the substantive issues on our agenda. My delegation agrees with that decision, therefore I shall refer only briefly to issues that have already been discussed and shall stress the new issue - that of the relationship between disarmament and development.

My delegation does not intend to elaborate on the reasons for the pessimism that permeates debates and negotiations, both multilateral and bilateral, and in general, the forums related to disarmament. There is stagnation and deterioration whose magnitude is matched only by the terrible situation confronting the world economy, and in particular the economy of the developing countries.

While it is true that efforts of all kinds in the disarmament sphere have not yet been exhausted, it is undeniable that deep contradictions and a resulting lack of credibility at present affect the institutional validity of the process.

It should be recalled that the international community became aware at an early date of the extremely diverse and complex nature of the problem of disarmament as well as of its real and constant link with vital sectors of the national activities of States and world development in general.

For this reason, the United Nations has since then devoted enormous resources and efforts to the promotion of multilateral negotiations and to studies and research covering the full range of issues directly or indirectly related to disarmament. Therefore, it is extremely discouraging that the balance sheet on all that work is so far negative, as can be seen from the two reports of the Secretary-General, who gives the highest priority to the issues now before us. It is ironic that the reduction of military budgets, accepted as one of the most urgent needs to put an end to the arms race, is one of the objectives least

(Mr. Arias Stella, Peru)

respected. Neither the many provisions of our Organization nor the declarations and appeals made outside it have resulted, even as an initial step, in the freezing by a significant number of countries of resources devoted to military purposes.

Our Governments are aware of the increasing trend towards larger military budgets. This topic is one of those that have become a source of inescapable impasses, particularly between and with the major Powers. But it is undeniable that the whole international system bears its share of the responsibility, because of the regrettable commercialism involved and the proliferation of regional and local tensions, some self-generating, but the majority the result of growing, harmful bipolarity.

Similarly, since the war the highest priority has been given to curbing and reversing the nuclear arms race, with the proposal of measures ranging from the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons to nuclear disarmament, and including the total prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and the strengthening of existing international legal instruments. There can be no doubt that in nuclear disarmament issues, in the context of the disarmament process, what we are deciding is whether the future of the human race is to be assured. None the less, we see with concern the persistence and heightening of a senseless rivalry for nuclear supremacy between those with the largest nuclear arsenals, a competition that compromises negotiations on strategic weapons and negotiations involving the European continent, talks which, as we all know, have been broken off for the time being.

At the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly I took the opportunity to say:

"The Government of Peru views with apprehension the close relationship between the tense international situation and the deadlock of the disarmament process. The deterioration of the latter has been dangerously aggravated by an escalation in the arms race on a world-wide level which involves primarily those nations that have the largest arsenals of nuclear and conventional weapons.

"In this connection, Peru is particularly concerned over the fact that an appreciation of the universal importance of peace tends to be diluted in theoretical and binding formulations, if not in misunderstandings which lead to failure, and that the institutionalized efforts of the United Nations run the risk of becoming bureaucratized when they are not legitimized by the political will of Governments." (A/36/PV.6, p. 67)

(Mr. Arias Stella, Peru)

The reasons for that markedly negative assessment are to be found in the increase of hotbeds of regional and global tension, the lack of trust and dialogue between States and the distorted, fanatical application of certain security doctrines.

Even though it is difficult to allocate priority among agenda items, we believe that the main issue on which our efforts should be focused in the present circumstances is a careful study of the relationship between disarmament and development. When the President of the French Republic submitted to the General Assembly last September his idea of convening a world conference for the thorough consideration of the relationship between disarmament and development, my delegation saw the merits of such an innovative idea, which is necessary to give new life to the deadlocked talks on disarmament, to channel them pragmatically and imbue them with moral content. My delegation has now submitted its views on this issue to the Secretary-General, and these are to be found in document A/CN.10/57/Add.2.

A great deal has been said about the economic cost and the social and scientific waste caused by the accumulation of weapons and about the exponential increase in the destructive capacity of the weapons that the major Powers hasten to produce. For this reason, all peoples have become particularly aware of the dimensions of the problem, its significance for international peace and security and its negative impact on the social and economic development of all. There can be no doubt that disarmament and development are interrelated by their very nature and objectives. It is clear that the reduction of military expenditure would lead to the release of resources which could be used to promote the growth and stability of the world economy, and in particular the economy of the developing countries.

In that practical and realistic context, we believe that peoples and leaders must understand that collective security resides not in a build-up of weapons but, rather, in meeting the socio-economic aspirations of mankind. World insecurity will increase to the extent that economic development goals are not reached, since hunger, unemployment and a lack of services contribute to generating tension and conflict.

As a country immersed in problems of underdevelopment, Peru considers that we must not continue to relegate to a secondary level the relationship between disarmament and development, on the basis of the false concept that military security is of the highest priority.

(Mr. Arias Stella, Peru)

International agreement is therefore urgently needed to curb and change this dangerous trend, which leads to the arms race and contributes to worsening underdevelopment.

My country believes that the convening of a conference would provide the best means of considering the ways in which resources released by the reduction of military expenditures could be reallocated. A preparatory session of that conference should attempt to define an initial series of objectives for the transfer of resources for the benefit of development. Because of their special responsibilities in this sphere, the main military Powers should participate.

In this context, it is important to specify that the respective regions of the neutral and the non-aligned countries should be represented on the basis of equality. That is to say, they should have a presence at the preparatory conference at least the equal of that of the Western and socialist blocs combined.

Finally, we believe that this Commission is the proper forum for the initial consideration of this matter, in order to adopt recommendations on the choice of machinery, options and alternatives in the field of disarmament and development.

Peru here reaffirms its unshakeable commitment to world peace, and expresses the hope that the major Powers, which are responsible for the development of new and sophisticated forms of mass annihilation, will make the political commitment to help define the true process of disarmament and to give it a creative impetus, so that the spectre of war can be eliminated and so that international peace and security will guarantee the development and fruitful coexistence of all the nations of the world.

Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): I wish first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on behalf of the Bulgarian delegation and on my own behalf, on your assumption of the chairmanship of the current session of the Disarmament Commission. I am fully convinced that under your able guidance the Commission will shoulder the important tasks assigned to it and be able to make an effective contribution to the search for positive solutions.

I also take this occasion to recall that today's meeting is taking place on 9 May, a great day marking the historic victory over fascism by the anti-Hitlerite coalition, in which the Soviet Union played a decisive role. Therefore, this day is a symbol of the aspiration of peoples to eliminate militarism, aggression and war from their lives. That aspiration is the very foundation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of our Organization. This historic date reminds us that

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

we must never forget the millions of victims and that we must step up efforts to ensure that future generations will be spared the horrors of war. My delegation considers that our Commission's mandate is in full conformity with that noble objective.

The international situation as we begin this current session of the Disarmament Commission is particularly alarming and complicated. Tension has been even further heightened with the beginning of the deployment of new American medium-range nuclear missiles on the territory of certain countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). This has initiated a new, particularly dangerous, stage in the nuclear arms race on the European continent. Under these new conditions and given the attempts to upset the military and strategic balance, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty could not remain indifferent. The People's Republic of Bulgaria fully supports the counter-measures adopted respectively by the Soviet Union and by the other socialist countries.

The escalation of the nuclear arms race, inspired by the aggressive imperialist forces of the United States, greatly increases the risk of nuclear war, with all its catastrophic consequences for mankind and for life on earth itself. Fundamental principles of inter-State relations are endangered, serious damage is being done to European security, and confidence among States continues to be drained. Particularly worrying are concepts dangerous to peace, which call into question existing frontiers between European States and which constitute an assault against the social systems of the States concerned and against other territorial and political realities in Europe.

The ever more dangerous development of the world situation, especially in Europe, is a source of growing concern for vast segments of the population. This concern is legitimately expressed by mass anti-war actions and movements, and by politicians, the clergy, scientists, women and young people, who are demanding an end to the arms race and a start to the process of disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. They are stressing the need for co-operation among States in the interests of peace and stability and for a return to the policy of détente. Statesmen from various countries too have advocated a slowdown in the arms race and decried the policy of confrontation.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

An improvement in the situation and a return to détente require dialogue between States on the vital question of the maintenance and strengthening of peace, a dialogue which must be serious and even-handed, and characterized by a deep sense of responsibility. The People's Republic of Bulgaria and the other socialist countries advocate continuing dialogue and negotiations -- not negotiations for their own sake, but negotiations leading to agreements on the basis of the principles of equality and equal security. We are deeply convinced that where political will exists there are no questions which cannot be resolved through negotiations. That position was set forth clearly, openly and categorically in the communiqué issued following the meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, held at Budapest on 19 and 20 April last.

The socialist countries attach great importance to the conclusion of agreements on key issues of disarmament, such as a general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, a qualitative and quantitative freeze of nuclear weapons, a prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes and of the use of force in outer space and from outer space to earth, and a world-wide prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons.

Halting the arms race is of paramount importance to the peace and security of peoples. My country's position on this question is clear: we are against the race to build up nuclear arsenals. We have been and are champions of the idea of prohibiting and eliminating all types of such weapons. My country fully supports the proposals submitted along those lines in the United Nations and in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

It is that same noble objective which lies at the basis of the initiative of transforming the Balkans into a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Bulgaria will continue to make an active contribution to the promotion and constructive discussion with its neighbours of this timely and far-sighted initiative.

As was stated by the President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, last April:

"There is no doubt that its successful achievement would benefit not only the peoples of the Balkans but also all other peoples and the cause of peace on a world level".

The conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations among States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the States members of NATO -- an important proposal contained in the Prague Political

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

Declaration of 5 January 1983 - would make a considerable contribution to improving the international atmosphere. Such a treaty would make possible the creation of the political, moral and legal basis for specific action to reduce both the nuclear weapons and the armed forces and conventional weapons of the States parties. The appeal made by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty on 7 May for specific multilateral negotiations on an agreement on this question constitutes another considerable step towards meeting the desire of the world public for the elimination of the danger of nuclear catastrophe.

It is also necessary, in order to spare mankind nuclear nightmares, to prevent nuclear war, and this should become the main objective of the foreign policy of the nuclear-weapon States. Those States should also renounce propaganda on nuclear war in all its forms, whether global or limited. It is essential that those States undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and never to use nuclear weapons against countries that do not have such weapons on their territory, to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons of any kind and to endeavour to reduce nuclear weapons step by step, based on the principle of equal security, until the total destruction of all types of such weapons is achieved. The Bulgarian delegation believes that in order to reach a tangible agreement on these matters, it is of major importance, given the present complicated international situation, not to slow down but, on the contrary, to speed up efforts by all States to arrive at tangible measures to prevent nuclear war and halt the arms race.

These are the considerations of principle which will guide my delegation during the discussion of the important questions on the agenda of this session.

As we have already stated, to prevent the risk of nuclear war we must strive to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this context, my delegation attaches great importance to the Commission's activities in connection with the nuclear potential of South Africa. The Bulgarian delegation shares the concern of many delegations, especially those of African countries, about the nuclear ambitions of the racist régime of Pretoria. The acquisition of nuclear weapons by the aggressive South African régime would increase the threat to peace not only in southern Africa but throughout the world. That is why we must make South Africa give up its nuclear ambitions and why the co-operation of certain Western countries with South Africa, which is contributing to the development of its nuclear potential, must be ended. The Commission could make an important contribution in this respect.

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

The Commission will also examine the question of the reduction of military budgets. My country attaches considerable importance to this question. Based on the conviction that the ever-growing military expenditures are directly linked to the acceleration of the arms race, my country and the other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty put forward a new and important initiative last March when they proposed to the States members of NATO the holding of preliminary consultations, with the participation of all the States members of both alliances, to reach an agreement on negotiations on the mutual non-increase of military expenditures and their subsequent reduction.

In the context of ever-increasing tension in the international arena, the adoption of measures on the non-increase and the reduction of military budgets is of particular importance. In proposing negotiations on that matter the aim of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty is to bring about as soon as possible a tangible agreement on the non-increase and the reduction of military budgets and the reallocation of the resources thus released to economic and social development, including that of the developing countries. The reduction of military budgets would have a beneficial effect on the slowing down of the arms race and on the disarmament process.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria takes these same positions of principle on the question of the relationship between disarmament and development.

The Commission will continue its work on the elaboration of guidelines for the promotion of confidence-building measures. My country, together with the other socialist countries, is an advocate of and an active participant in the elaboration of confidence-building measures, including measures in the military sphere.

Bulgaria has put forward several proposals concerning the Balkans, including some within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, for the purpose of making a genuine contribution to strengthening confidence and understanding between States. Our approach to the question of strengthening confidence is based on the belief that specific measures towards disarmament play a particularly important role in that respect. In order to dissipate mutual mistrust and restore the confidence without which it would be impossible to normalize the international situation, we must, first of all, renounce the propaganda of hatred and nuclear war as a means of resolving problems.

My country attaches very special importance to confidence-building measures in Europe, because we are convinced that they would help to prevent the creation of

(Mr. Tsvetkov, Bulgaria)

hotbeds of military conflict in that region in which the military-political groupings of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO directly confront each other. The socialist countries' proposals at the first session of the Stockholm Conference are made in the same spirit. Those proposals are aimed at strengthening security and confidence between States and at permitting the adoption of effective measures towards disarmament and the consolidation of peace in Europe and throughout the world.

These are our ideas on the items on the agenda of the current session of the Disarmament Commission.

It is the view of my delegation that we should seize every opportunity for a broad exchange of views on these items within the framework of the Commission. This will enable us to reach generally agreed, useful recommendations which in turn will be of enormous practical importance for bodies in which direct disarmament negotiations take place. The Bulgarian delegation hopes that the Disarmament Commission will adopt an appropriate approach to the important and responsible problems that it will be considering.

Mr. NATORF (Poland): Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to start by adding my personal congratulations and words of recognition to those already expressed to you by other delegations on the occasion of your election. I also wish every success to all the other officers. Please be assured of my delegation's continued support and of its readiness to co-operate.

Our session is beginning its deliberations in a seriously and steadily deteriorating international situation. The very dynamic of the arms race, imposed upon the world by the American military-industrial complex, leads to a growing danger of nuclear war and the threat of a subsequent "nuclear winter" all over the globe. Destabilizing weapons are constantly being introduced, and the illusory concepts of limited nuclear war or of a "Star War" contribute to general tensions and deepen mistrust.

The deterioration of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States causes great concern. The deployment of new American first-strike nuclear missiles in some Western European countries has created an additional serious threat to peace and security and led directly to the interruption of the Soviet-American negotiating process in Geneva. This move has become a major obstacle to restarting a process of improvement in East-West relations.

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

At the United Nations, a deep concern with the danger of a nuclear conflict and the corresponding demands for prompt steps to reverse this dangerous course have met with obstruction by the same forces that are promoting the arms race and attempting to make it look rational.

In today's highly charged political atmosphere it is of greatest importance that proper conditions be created for the resumption of serious negotiations on matters of disarmament and international security. Détente, an increase in mutual trust, and the manifestation of political will are needed to move ahead. There is no way to solve the differences other than through negotiations.

Poland, together with other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, consistently supports all constructive initiatives to check and reverse the growing threat of nuclear conflict and to halt the nuclear arms race. This policy is based on an understanding of the serious stakes Poland has in security, both in Europe and in the world at large. It is our sincere wish to contribute effectively - both individually and collectively with our allies and friends - to the enhancement of confidence among States, to reducing the level of tensions and to curbing the arms race.

My Government believes that the deterioration of the international situation added particular relevance and urgency to the proposals advanced by the States members of the Warsaw Treaty. Since you have appealed to us, Mr. Chairman, to make our statements as brief as possible, I shall not repeat all of these proposals. Let me only draw attention to the results of the meeting of the Committee of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, recently held in Budapest, and to the 7 May 1984 appeal by those States to the States members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to conclude a treaty on the mutual renunciation of the use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations.

Reopening the dialogue between the two major Powers would have overriding importance for the entire disarmament process. The proposal that the relations between the USSR and the United States of America, as well as between all nuclear-weapon States, be subjected to certain norms is of particular importance.

We wish to see to it that the interests of non-nuclear States are protected, and that the status of existing nuclear-weapon-free-zones is respected. The idea of such zones, once promoted vigorously in Europe by Poland under the name of the Rapacki Plan, has lost none of its vitality.

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

There are possibilities of breaking the deadlock and moving away from the standstill, by pursuing a policy based on the principle of equal security of all the parties concerned, on the preservation of balance in the military sphere, and on a departure from the policy of destabilization and confrontation. °

The Polish delegation is ready to contribute meaningfully to the main topics of our agenda. It is our hope that the work of the Commission may contribute to averting the threat of nuclear war, which is the first objective of my delegation. The numerous proposals submitted by Warsaw Treaty member States in Prague in January 1983 have lost none of their validity and, together with other proposals I have already referred to, could contribute to our consideration of agenda item 4. Their aim is to eliminate the danger of nuclear war as well as to elaborate a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament.

Agenda item 5, on the reduction of military budgets, enjoys our full support. It is worth recalling that Poland has repeatedly voiced its support for initiatives aiming at the gradual reduction of the military budgets of all States, first of all those of nuclear-weapon Powers and other militarily significant States. We feel that the proposals contained in the aforementioned Prague Declaration of 1983, as well as the terms of a freeze on military expenditures and their gradual reduction, as specified in an aide-mémoire of the Government of Romania of 5 March 1984, have direct reference to our work here. Poland and other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty have submitted proposals on this subject in order that the material and human resources thus released might be reallocated to economic and social development, including that of the developing countries.

This brings us to the new item, agenda item 8, on the relationship between disarmament and development. In our view, the possibility of a genuine limitation of armaments-related economic efforts and the reallocation of resources to economic and social development goals is closely linked with the undertaking of concrete steps in regard to the reduction of armaments and to disarmament. This view determines our approach to the idea of an international disarmament fund.

Measures to restrict the nuclear capabilities of South Africa will be supported by my delegation. We earnestly hope that the conclusions and recommendations proposed by the African States in the Disarmament Commission last session, as well as the personal involvement of Ambassador Hepburn of Bahamas and your own guidance, Mr. Chairman, will constitute the basis of further progress on this subject.

(Mr. Natorf, Poland)

Finally, my delegation is interested in the elaboration of guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures. Fully understanding the need for increased confidence, we share the opinion of those who have asked that measures in this field not be viewed in isolation. They should be placed in the wider context of the disarmament process, for they would help to lessen the danger of war, reduce military confrontation and promote détente. The experiences of the Stockholm Conference too may be helpful to our deliberations here aimed at promoting authentic disarmament dialogue on a broader world-wide basis as well.

Mr. CESAR (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): On this day, which is a national holiday in my country, the peoples of the world are celebrating the 39th anniversary of the victory over Hitler's fascism. We should be particularly sensitive and alert to the lessons of the Second World War today, when the overall international situation has reached the most critical stage in the entire post-war period. The danger of a new conflict, a generalized nuclear catastrophe, continues to increase as new American Pershing II missiles and cruise missiles are deployed in Western Europe, targeted against countries of the socialist community, some of them located only several kilometres from the border of my country. The time has come - it is indeed urgent - to adopt measures - political, legal and material - against the threat of nuclear war.

We see the elaboration of recommendations with regard to such measures as the basic task of the United Nations Disarmament Commission at this session, in accordance with its mandate. I should like to assure the Commission that the Czechoslovak delegation will do everything it possibly can in that regard. For our part, we should like to wish you every success in carrying out your duties, which are considerable.

The problem of preventing the threat of nuclear war has, in our view, a number of interrelated aspects, each requiring the closest consideration and an effective solution on the basis of the principle of the equal security of all States. However, reducing the problem of the prevention of nuclear war to technical questions and measures divorced from the essential aspects, as a number of delegations have done in the past, including here in the Disarmament Commission, is a fundamentally flawed approach to the solving of this problem.

Czechoslovakia advocates a total and comprehensive solution, in the first place through the elaboration and implementation of practical measures on nuclear disarmament. It is with that goal in mind that negotiations must be begun with

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

regard to preventing the production of new types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing arsenals of nuclear weapons up to and including their total elimination.

The proposals put forward by the socialist countries and States belonging to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries concerning a considerable number of other specific measures for paving the way to nuclear disarmament are well known. Such measures, which should be at the centre of attention in the work of the Commission this year, include a quantitative and qualitative nuclear-weapons freeze, an agreement on total and comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests, the strengthening of the non-proliferation system, the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world, and the establishment of firm security guarantees for States that have renounced the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons and which do not have them deployed on their territories.

The position of Czechoslovakia, like that of other States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, is crystal-clear and unambiguous. It was recently reaffirmed by the results of the meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs at Budapest. At that meeting States parties to the Warsaw Treaty also put forward an important initiative on the resumption of negotiations to reach appropriate agreements on ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and theatre weapons, as well as tactical weapons.

Our approach on another item of our agenda, the question of confidence-building measures, is based on the need to put an end to the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race. In that regard we adhere to the conviction that such measures should be seen, not in isolation, but in inseparable union with concrete measures for disarmament, and first and foremost nuclear disarmament. Everyone is familiar with the proposal put forward by the countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee in January 1983, in Prague, addressed to countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), for the conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations. On 7 May of this year the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty once again addressed to the countries of NATO a proposal that they should proceed to multilateral consultations on such a treaty. It is our belief that the conclusion of such a treaty would become an important landmark in a return to a policy of détente and help raise the level of confidence, and we also believe it would create favourable conditions for further progress in disarmament.

(Mr. Cesar, Czechoslovakia)

The most important measure for the achievement of confidence and the strengthening of security globally would be the adoption by all States that possess nuclear weapons of the obligation not to make first use of them. It is our conviction that precisely such measures should become central to the Commission's discussion on confidence building, and we are prepared to participate in that work as constructively as we can.

We attach fundamental importance to questions concerning the reduction of military expenditures and the interrelationship between disarmament and development. The socialist countries have been consistent advocates of the reduction of military expenditures and the reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes for purposes of development, including the provision of assistance to developing countries. A special role in efforts towards the practical solution of that question must be played by countries with great military potential, which are those that account for the greater share of military expenditures. Therefore, in January last, the countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty transmitted to the NATO countries a proposal that negotiations should begin on the freezing and subsequent reduction of military expenditures, a proposal that was further elaborated and finalized in March of this year.

We believe that, if States have the necessary political will, an agreement on the freezing and reduction of military expenditures is feasible, but that political will cannot be replaced by artificial constructs of comparability, military budgets, transparency, accountability and so on. This position will continue to guide us in our approach to the work of the Commission on the reduction of military budgets.

We believe the work of the Commission to be important in relation to the question of the military potential of South Africa, and we support it in view of the far-reaching consequences of the possible emergence of nuclear weapons in the hands of the racist régime.

The agenda for this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission includes the most important issues of our times and requires all States to show the necessary political will to achieve an effective solution, to adopt a constructive attitude, and to respect the principle of security for all. That will continue to be the basis of our approach to the work of the Disarmament Commission at this session also, and we hope that all other delegations will take a similar approach.

Mr. GARCIA ITURBE (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): May I first of all greet you, Sir, and congratulate you on behalf of my delegation on your election to the chairmanship of the Disarmament Commission at this session. The bonds of friendship that exist between your country and mine are well known, just as are the role Ghana has played in the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the diplomatic skill and ability with which you have always conducted the work of your delegation in the United Nations.

I also wish to congratulate the Vice-Chairmen of the Disarmament Commission at this session and at the same time to commend the work done at last year's meetings by Mr. Celso Antonio de Souza e Silva, who presided over the session.

Any efforts to achieve world peace and general and complete disarmament must be taken into consideration and supported by the Members of the United Nations, for it is clear that the danger of war, and, worse still, the danger of nuclear war, stalks us and comes closer day by day. International public opinion has on innumerable occasions affirmed its rejection of war; we can find the most recent examples of this in the hundreds of thousands of persons who have raised their voices in protest, especially on the European continent, at the deployment of the Pershing-2 missiles, the presence of which increases the danger of a global conflagration.

Last year, during the sessions of the Commission and the General Assembly, serious efforts were made to obtain the agreement and support of all Member States for a series of basic principles on the avoidance of world war. However, we all know that those serious efforts did not achieve the results so deeply desired by the majority of countries of our world.

During the work at the last session, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries submitted document A/CN.10/45, which urged the adoption of effective measures for the prevention of nuclear war and contained recommendations which, if accepted by all States, would be the first steps towards the adoption of concrete disarmament measures, particularly in respect of nuclear disarmament. Those recommendations urged all States effectively to contribute to the strengthening of the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament. They affirmed the need to negotiate and to agree promptly on a comprehensive treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapons tests, and the urgent need to negotiate and adopt a convention on the prohibition of the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons. They urged that all nuclear-weapon States formulate, either collectively or

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

individually, declarations in which they pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. They urged the freezing of the development, production, stockpiling and deployment of nuclear weapons and urged that nuclear-weapon States refrain from military manoeuvres using nuclear energy for non-peaceful purposes. They also contained a whole series of measures aimed at improving the international situation, basically through effective action to avoid the possibility of the outbreak of nuclear war, as mentioned this morning by Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico.

I am sure that all members will recall that that was the central issue in our debates at the last session of the Commission, and in fact it should be central to our concerns now, since the dangers then posed to world peace are now even greater, in particular because there are countries that, not content with the existing variety and quantity of nuclear weapons, wish to develop a new line of weapons and to take the danger of war into outer space as well. All of this runs counter to what has been established in international treaties and conventions and in resolutions of the United Nations, such as, for example, General Assembly resolution 37/83, which advocates the signing of a treaty prohibiting the placement of any type of weapon in outer space. That resolution was adopted by 138 votes in favour, with 7 abstentions and only one negative vote - that of the United States.

My delegation considers that at these meetings it is of the highest importance that the nuclear-weapon States should have the political will and the desire to arrive at solutions, and I also believe that the recommendations made by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which coincide with the wishes of the international community and of many countries that do not belong to that Movement, should indicate the aspirations that should in fact be met at this session.

Another of the items to be considered by this Commission is the nuclear capacity of South Africa. We should like to point out that this has been a constant source of concern to the international community and the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and to the Organization of African Unity. Everyone is aware of the work done by South Africa to obtain nuclear capacity, with the basic objective of its serving as one more instrument of domestic oppression and external aggression that can help maintain the policy of apartheid and contribute to an aggressive policy against the countries of Africa.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

In document A/CN.10/43, submitted to this Commission last year, the intentions of South Africa regarding this nuclear-capacity policy are clearly established. The document also clearly indicates which countries have co-operated in that regard, and the minimum measures to be taken in order to guarantee security and peace on the African continent. Of those recommendations we should like to highlight the recommendation that the Members of the United Nations should refrain from any co-operation with South Africa that can strengthen its existing technical capacity to produce nuclear weapons. The recommendations were addressed in particular to the Western industrialized States. In addition, the document indicates that the Disarmament Commission should recommend to the General Assembly that it ask the Security Council to shoulder its full responsibility and take urgent measures in this connection for the observance of the arms embargo against South Africa, including the embargo on nuclear weapons.

Those and other aspects, including South Africa's exploitation of uranium in Namibia and the absolute necessity for this kind of activity to cease, are also urgent, important and necessary matters which must be taken into account in ensuring international peace and security, especially on the African continent.

With regard to confidence-building measures, we are aware of their importance in adopting steps likely to guide us towards a more peaceful modus vivendi for all. Obviously, it is right that we should consider this issue. We have stated from the outset that any effort aimed at securing peace and disarmament must be taken into consideration, and we believe that this is one more such effort. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that if effective measures are to be taken to promote confidence the international climate must be cleansed of neutrons, protons, laser beams and deadly gases, so that we can all breathe a bit of fresh air.

Clearly, respect by all countries for the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter would result in confidence-building. Perhaps we could call upon the countries represented here to make that commitment as an initial step towards confidence-building measures. We believe that it is too much to ask that we all agree that refraining from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State would indeed promote confidence; that it would improve the international climate if all States were to commit themselves to non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

other States; that it would be very healthy and beneficial for world peace for us to commit ourselves to the peaceful settlement of disputes among States; and that it would demonstrate interest in maintaining integrity and sovereignty and, hence, peace in international relations if we were to commit ourselves to the sovereign equality of States and to respect for the self-determination of peoples. Moreover, if the nuclear-weapon States were to declare their willingness not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, I believe that would enhance the climate of confidence and we would have reason to hope that the work of our Commission was really promoting that climate of confidence.

If, in addition to all that, we were able to achieve the cessation of the aggressive military manoeuvres and acts of intimidation which are committed quite frequently, and sometimes constantly, by certain military Powers - for example, the recent "Ocean Venture" exercise - I am certain that a climate of confidence would be created and that many countries - for example, Nicaragua - might feel more secure and be able to devote greater effort and resources to the social and educational development of their peoples. Naturally, all this could be done without even attempting to adopt the more comprehensive and extensive measures that would lead to total and complete disarmament. But, I repeat, if we were to achieve these results in this Commission, I believe that all of us attending these meetings and wishing to improve the international climate would feel a sense of satisfaction at the conclusion of the work that we are now beginning.

Six years ago, at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Programme of Action of the Final Document, which was adopted by consensus, affirmed that

"Gradual reduction of military budgets on a mutually agreed basis, for example, in absolute figures or in terms of percentage points, particularly by nuclear-weapon States... would be a measure that would contribute to the curbing of the arms race and would increase the possibilities of reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries."

(resolution S-10/2, para. 89)

However, excessive increases in military budgets, in particular by a small group of countries, continue. We therefore reiterate the urgent need to take measures to arrest that vertiginous increase.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

The first measure, which would constitute a practical initial step towards the subsequent reduction of military expenditures, should be an immediate freeze on such expenditures by all nuclear-weapon States. The adoption of such a measure would undoubtedly be a tangible demonstration of goodwill and of the desire to promote confidence in the field of the reduction of military budgets and make possible a serious process of negotiation without preconditions of any kind.

In recent years such concepts as the transparency and accessibility of military expenditures have surfaced and been stressed. They have been formulated by a certain group of States whose intention is to divert attention from concrete and objective ways of reducing military expenditures and to postpone the consideration of this important issue.

Everyone is aware that data on weaponry cannot be compared with any precision and that these concepts can only lead to sterile debate on the problem which, far from contributing to a solution, would further complicate it. The freezing of military budgets by the States to which we have just referred would constitute an objective measure and would not require any pointless debates but merely the genuine will and desire to tackle this problem.

Another problem which should be resolved by the effective reduction of military expenditures is the diversion of resources from social assistance programmes by some countries which try to conceal this behind the concepts of transparency and accessibility, just as they try to conceal mounting inflation, the decline in economic growth, the increase in unemployment and other ills afflicting the international system of economic relations. Those countries do not reveal invisible sources of funds in the private sector, which, in addition to the State, grants loans to corporations producing weapons, thus making ever larger sums available for the financing of weapons production.

Lastly, our delegation would like to refer to an item that has been added to our agenda recently but which clearly concerns a long-standing aspiration of the international community, which has for years now seen an excessive growth in the technical, material and economic resources put at the service of death and destruction instead of being applied to improving prosperity and the standard of living of the peoples of the world. I refer to the item on the relationship between disarmament and development.

(Mr. Garcia Iturbe, Cuba)

Our delegation considers, and our Government has repeatedly stated, that any contribution to the cause of disarmament and the cessation of the arms race is important, as is the struggle to establish the new international economic order, to which all peoples aspire, particularly those in the developing countries. We also attach importance to the elimination of the present injustices in the economic relations between the developed and the developing countries and to the establishment of genuine international co-operation on a just and equitable basis.

In September 1981, in opening the sixty-eighth Inter-Parliamentary Conference, held in Havana, Fidel Castro, President of the Council of State and of the Government of the Republic of Cuba, stated the following:

"We have on innumerable occasions stressed that at the root of the problem of peace, which is the paramount concern of all the peoples of the world, is the economic and social injustice prevailing in the world and that there will be no solution to the tensions, contradictions and political conflicts that threaten and disrupt international relations until the world has a new economic order that promotes the comprehensive development of peoples and reduces inequalities among nations."

My delegation believes that it is just and necessary that the human and material resources now devoted to the arms race be diverted to peaceful purposes, thus contributing to the economic and social development of peoples, in particular those in the developing countries. We also consider it appropriate and feasible to establish an international disarmament fund for development so that the funds now devoted to the arms race may be reallocated to economic and social development. The convening of a conference on disarmament and development which, in addition to mobilizing public opinion in order to bring about a greater awareness of the enormous gap that exists between the arms build-up and development, would help to promote a cessation of the arms race and encourage détente and international confidence, and would be of incalculable value.

Jose Marti, the national hero of the Republic of Cuba, expressed the following thought:

"There are two types of people: those who love and create and those who hate and destroy."

My delegation hopes that the work of this Commission will result in a daily increase in the ranks of those who love and create.

Mr. KOENTARSO (Indonesia): At the outset I should like, Sir, on behalf of the delegation of Indonesia and on my own behalf to congratulate you on your assumption of the chairmanship of the current session of the Disarmament Commission. It is well known that in the past you have made important contributions to many of our disarmament endeavours. Those of us who have admired your activities in the various organs of the United Nations fully appreciate that your election has opened up prospects for the success of this session.

I wish also to take this opportunity to extend our felicitations to the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur on their election.

It will be recalled that General Assembly resolution 38/183 E directed the Commission to continue its work in accordance with its mandate as set forth in the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document and paragraph 3 of resolution 37/78 H and to make specific recommendations on the outstanding issues on the agenda. We welcome the unambiguous thrust of the resolution, which, we hope, will give an impetus to our work. Indeed, my delegation is convinced that there is ample room for enhancing the Commission's contributions to the process of multilateral disarmament efforts.

My delegation is therefore fully aware of the need for the Commission to discharge its deliberative functions in an effective manner through an action-oriented approach taking as its priority the drawing up of recommendations on each issue. We are convinced that, given the political will, the possibilities available to the Commission as a forum for the formulation of constructive proposals can be more effectively utilized.

Indonesia believes that the agenda item on the elimination of the danger of nuclear war must be viewed not only as a priority but also with a heightened urgency, given the continued emphasis placed on nuclear doctrines and other emerging strategic concepts. These attitudes have undoubtedly led to a further and even more dangerous spiral of the arms race, especially in the nuclear field. Indeed, the continued accelerated development and sophistication of weapons systems, and even the likelihood of nuclear war, with its unimaginable consequences for belligerents and non-belligerents alike, have become more apparent than ever before. It is therefore natural that an issue of such transcendental importance to all mankind as the prevention of nuclear war, should be the legitimate concern of all States. The Commission itself has already recognized that among the greatest perils of the day is the threat of destruction as a result of the unleashing of

(Mr. Koentarso, Indonesia)

nuclear war, and that, further, the increase in nuclear weapons, far from strengthening international security, on the contrary weakens it.

We are therefore duty-bound to identify ways and means of confronting the most critical issue facing the international community. While we feel that certain transitional measures are indeed necessary, we find in the position of the non-aligned countries concrete proposals recommending specific courses of action. These include urgent measures to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race, the immediate prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, a freeze on nuclear weapons and a comprehensive test ban. My delegation is fully convinced that only through such a bold and sweeping approach can we go to the heart of the problem of preventing nuclear holocaust.

Our Commission is considering for the second year in succession the issue of South Africa's nuclear capability. In our view, there are several reasons for our continued concern about this dangerous development.

First, there have been persistent reports that South Africa is on the threshold of a nuclear breakthrough. The implications of this achievement are indeed considerable as a threat to both the security of African States and international peace.

Secondly, the Pretoria régime has steadfastly refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place all its nuclear installations under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. Thirdly, the racist régime's military strategy includes the extension of its strategic zone beyond its borders into neighbouring States and even alliances with certain States by stressing its geostrategic importance.

Fourthly, the danger that South Africa poses as a renegade State and an international outlaw which has continuously defied the international community bears ominous implications of the possibility of its using its nuclear capability to promote the attainment of its nefarious objectives of apartheid and colonialism.

Finally, South Africa is the only insurmountable stumbling-block to the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and the application of the principle of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

For all those reasons, we can no longer procrastinate. We hope that the working papers that have already been submitted will form a basis for the preparation of concrete recommendations.

(Mr. Koentarso, Indonesia)

My delegation agrees about the growing importance of the confidence-building process, especially in a world characterized by tension and distrust, increasing recourse to the use or threat of force and escalation of the arms race. The confidence-building process is by its very nature political and psychological and therefore does not in itself constitute a precondition of or alternative to actual disarmament measures. Moreover, the scope and nature of confidence-building measures is wholly dependent upon the political, military and security environment prevailing in a given region. Generally, we believe that the primary role of confidence-building measures should be to ensure that each region is left free from outside interference, so that regional cohesion can be stimulated by joint endeavours, in a spirit of common responsibility and amity, to ensure conditions of stability and confidence. Among other elements of confidence-building that Indonesia regards as indispensable are the prohibition of extraregional military activities in strategically important waters and restraint with regard to adopting military postures of a belligerent nature, whether or not they are intended to threaten the security, sovereignty and independence of States. Such an approach would make a significant contribution to applying confidence-building measures in areas and ways in which their effectiveness would bring tangible results. Finally, Indonesia hopes that these elements will be embodied in the formulation of guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level.

My delegation warmly welcomes the inclusion in our agenda of the item on disarmament and development. Much of the work to date has been concentrated on three main areas: the present-day utilization of resources for military purposes, the economic and social effects of a continuing arms race and the conversion and redeployment of resources. Thus, studies by the United Nations have been policy-oriented and have placed special emphasis on both the desirability and the feasibility of a reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes, following disarmament measures, to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries. These studies have also awakened both leaders and the public at large to the prohibitive costs of armaments to the entire international system.

It is well known that the industrialized States account for nearly three quarters of the estimated \$700 billion global military expenditure, with the

(Mr. Koentarso, Indonesia)

super-Powers accounting for half of the world's defence budget. The allocation of such huge sums not only profoundly affects the economies of the industrialized world and the international economic system but also manifests itself in the decline of official development assistance as a proportion of donor gross national product and in the growing tendency towards protectionism. Therefore, our consideration of this agenda item must at this stage go beyond pointing out the negative impact of military expenditure on development. We must now focus attention on how positive causal linkages between disarmament and development can be established and strengthened at the local, national, regional and international levels. Our discussion should be directed towards the identification of key issues for policy formulation to ensure that the resources released from military budgets will in fact be utilized for sorely needed development.

It is worth mentioning that development assistance continues to be regarded as an act of charity rather than as an obligation and a matter of self-interest in an increasingly interdependent world. A strategy for directing the resources gained from disarmament to development can only be built on the basis of an explicit recognition of economic interdependence. A strongly trade-oriented programme for global development built on the firm foundation of general arms reduction will undeniably result in mutual co-operation for the mutual benefit of all mankind.

Finally, another substantive item that the Commission will be considering concerns the reduction of military budgets. The continuing arms race and growing military expenditures have taken a heavy toll of the economies of all nations and have a negative impact on international peace and security. In this regard the primary responsibility for taking the initiative to reduce military expenditures rests with the nuclear Powers and other militarily significant States, especially those which have the highest military budgets. While the complexity of this question cannot be over-emphasized, the reduction of military expenditures must necessarily be conceived in the context of established principles and priorities and within the context of specific measures of disarmament.

As we assess during this session the current disarmament deadlock our efforts should be directed towards seeking viable approaches and avenues towards achieving the already firmly established goals and priorities. My delegation believes that the agenda is fully consistent with the decisions that the international community has taken as it identifies the key issues that the Commission should confront and

(Mr. Koentarso, Indonesia)

explore during this session. All proposals should be viewed and evaluated on the basis of whether they are likely to lead us out of the existing impasse on each of the items. It is to this framework that my delegation pledges its support, since we believe that it will facilitate our common efforts to strengthen the role of the Commission in the disarmament field.

Mr. SHAH NAWAZ (Pakistan): I begin by extending to you, Sir, our warm felicitations on your assumption of the office of Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. We are confident that under your leadership and skilful guidance, and with the benefit of your great experience, the Commission will be able to make a significant advance in its consideration of the issues which, in their essence, represent fundamental challenges to global endeavours in the field of disarmament. I should also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the other officers of the Commission on their election to their various posts, and I particularly thank the members of the Commission for having elected Pakistan as one of the Vice-Chairmen. I take this opportunity to pledge my delegation's full co-operation with you, Mr. Chairman, and to express our commitment to do our best for the attainment of the objectives which the Commission has set for itself.

The Disarmament Commission is once again meeting against the background of a grave situation marked by intensified East-West confrontation, the continued deterioration of international relations and a virtual breakdown in disarmament talks. Yet the international community cannot afford to give way to despair in its pursuit of the goal of disarmament, which must be carried forward at all levels and in all circumstances. There exists a universal awareness of the cataclysmic consequences of the continuation of the present-day spiralling arms race and the imperative need to halt and reverse it in the interest of the survival of human civilization. All efforts aimed at curbing the arms race, however circumspect in their scope, are therefore precious and deserve to be sustained and strengthened.

We regard the Disarmament Commission as a unique forum, both from the point of view of its procedures and in terms of the issues which have been the focus of its deliberations during the past several years. It is the only international forum in which the entire international community is engaged in developing a consensus view on certain fundamental aspects germane to the international disarmament effort, encompassing nuclear disarmament, the vital aspects of conventional disarmament, confidence-building measures and the question of disarmament and development.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

Such a consensus, when realized, would not only enrich the body of thought on global disarmament but also be of great practical significance for the attainment of the goals which were comprehensively envisaged in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, which was adopted nearly six years ago.

For obvious reasons measures for nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear war remain of the highest priority on the agenda of the international disarmament effort. Naturally, therefore, the absence of progress in this regard, reflected in the suspension of the strategic arms reduction talks and the talks on intermediate nuclear forces has been causing a growing sense of dismay and alarm throughout the world. We appeal to the two super-Powers to resume negotiations without any further delay with a view to concluding agreements as early as possible on halting and reversing the nuclear arms race. In this context my delegation also attaches the utmost importance to the early conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, which, in our view, is essential not only for halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race, but also for ensuring nuclear non-proliferation.

At the same time, the experience of the past several years has made it increasingly clear that questions of nuclear disarmament cannot be wholly separated from the requirement of improvement in the international political climate and progress in the area of conventional disarmament. We have been consistent in advocating efforts which are all-embracing, since an advance in one direction, in our view, could prove to be a catalyst for progress in another direction. It is this basic perception that has motivated our proposals for measures relating to nuclear disarmament of an interim and regional character, such as negative security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. It is by the same token that we discern great virtue in pursuing the goals of conventional disarmament and confidence-building measures, which are the focus of two of the five points on the agenda of the Commission.

Along with progress in nuclear disarmament efforts are called for to secure the gradual reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, particularly weapons of mass destruction. We support negotiations to bring about a balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments based on the principle of the undiminished security of the parties at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces. My delegation also attaches great importance to the early

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

conclusion of a comprehensive international agreement to prohibit the use, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons.

Another grave matter which requires the urgent attention of the international community is the growing possibility of extension of the arms race to outer space, which must be prevented at all costs. It is becoming increasingly necessary to adopt on an immediate basis agreed measures to prevent such a development and to ensure that outer space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind.

The international community is profoundly concerned over the massive diversion to armament of world resources which, if released for the purposes of economic development, would usher in a new era of prosperity for mankind. With the inclusion on the agenda of the twin aspects of disarmament and development on the initiative of France, the agenda of the Disarmament Commission touches upon the broad range of issues which must be regarded as essential to any comprehensive disarmament endeavour. In this context we would like to express our deep appreciation to the sponsors of the several important proposals which are the subject of consideration by the Disarmament Commission and, as before, we would like to continue to make our contribution with a view to enriching these proposals and bringing about a consensus on them.

I should like to comment briefly on the specific agenda item relating to the nuclear-weapon capability acquired by the racist régime of South Africa, as established through the findings of the report of the Secretary-General (A/35/402) of 9 September 1980. My delegation has on several occasions expressed deep concern over this grave development, not only because acquisition of nuclear weapons by South Africa would frustrate the achievement of the objective of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the African continent, but also because the possession of these weapons by a racist régime would pose a grave threat to the security and stability of the African States.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the close link between international security and disarmament. No significant progress in disarmament can be expected in the face of serious violations of the universally recognized principles enjoining respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, the non-use of force in inter-State relations and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

(Mr. Shah Nawaz, Pakistan)

The desired progress in the field of disarmament can be achieved only in a propitious international climate created by strict adherence to these principles and to the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

These are our basic perceptions and views on the substantive aspects of the agenda of the Disarmament Commission. My delegation will make specific comments and proposals, where necessary, when the Commission begins its consideration of the substantive agenda items in its various subgroups.

Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria): It is indeed a great pleasure for me to extend to you, Mr. Chairman, the sincere congratulations of the delegation of Nigeria as you direct the proceedings of the United Nations Disarmament Commission during its current session. Your wide and varied experience in the disarmament field is a sure guarantee that under your guidance the Commission will strive to acquit itself creditably in the specific tasks before it and in general achieve the purpose of its creation, and subsequent revitalization, as a deliberative body and a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly charged with the general consideration of disarmament questions. You may rest assured that my delegation will extend to you its full co-operation in the discharge of your responsibilities.

Today mankind is faced with the threat of self-extinction because of the ready disposition of States, in pursuit of their defence postures, to invest in the human suffering and destruction involved in an unproductive arms race which has, in turn, continued to be fed, inter alia, by the powers and pressures of the military industrial complex, by advances in weapons technology, by differences in strategic doctrines and by variations in security perceptions with their implications for meeting the necessity of defence as the first duty of any State.

The pursuit of a weapons option as the sole instrument of conflict resolution has not only undermined a basic provision of the United Nations Charter according to which all States shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State or in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations, but has in fact had the effect of distorting the socio-economic options and possibilities available to States.

What we are witnessing is a crisis of confidence born of mutual mistrust in inter-State relations. The cold-war syndrome is being increasingly manifested and emphasized by the super-Powers. What is more, international efforts to redress

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

this state of affairs through negotiations leading to the adoption of concrete measures are suffering a creeping paralysis and have resulted in a crisis of expectation.

The current malaise afflicting the world in relation to its economic performance is both a function and a direct consequence of the arms race. The sad reality is that, while the two super-Powers and the two major military alliances have pursued the arms race according to an action-reaction scenario and, in consequence, have created a condition of competition and confrontation as well as of world-wide military and economic insecurity, other countries have not been left out of the mad race for armaments.

The deployment of more than 50,000 nuclear warheads with deadly accuracy and high explosive yields, not to mention a highly sophisticated array of conventional weapons, has put the entire world on edge about its security and the survival of its civilization. The quantitative and qualitative development of both nuclear and conventional weapons has extended the arms race into all environments, including outer space. As a consequence these environments are in a state of siege and are no longer able to provide a propitious atmosphere in which productive energies can be harnessed in the pursuit of peace and orderly development.

Another reality is that national perceptions of defence have come to be based primarily on military effort and capabilities, which retain a propensity for increased military expenditures. Available estimates of these expenditures on an annual basis have become so staggering and senseless in the face of socio-economic needs that their sheer quantum has a psychology all its own. The alternative to States' disposition to weapons acquisition should have been reliance on the international system of collective security envisaged in the United Nations Charter, but this, unfortunately, has failed to be implemented because of the very negative attitude of the permanent members of the Security Council, which not only are the major spenders on armaments but also retain the greatest arsenals of these awesome weapons.

In General Assembly resolution 1378 (XIV) of November 1959 the United Nations established general and complete disarmament under effective international control as the basic goal of its efforts. Building upon that international consensus, the Soviet Union and the United States issued a joint statement of agreed principles on disarmament negotiations in what is usually referred to as the Zorin-McCloy

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

agreement of 1961. The first principle in that agreement, which has continuing validity, is the following:

"The goal of negotiations is to achieve agreement on a programme which will ensure:

(a) that disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems." (A/4879)

We call upon these two countries in particular to make good their pledge and pursue negotiations in good faith, not only in relation to their bilateral interests but in the wider interest of humanity. They should defuse the current tension between them, resume all pertinent negotiations at the appropriate level in both the nuclear and the conventional field and, in a spirit devoid of propaganda and vain rhetoric, seek to achieve meaningful disarmament results.

The disarmament problem is proving increasingly intractable because of the sensitiveness of its relationship to the security concerns of States. It is also complex because it has political, economic, social and military implications. But we dare to remove the emphasis from its complexity and maintain that it is not only feasible but possible to achieve disarmament, given the political will of States to enter, through negotiations, upon the relevant processes. In this connection, in 1978 the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament blazed the trail by adopting by consensus a unified strategy for disarmament and a Programme of Action with priorities, as well as enabling disarmament machinery. Only recently the single multilateral negotiating body on disarmament was redesignated the Conference on Disarmament in order to confer upon it a political status expected to elicit from States a commitment to meaningful negotiations leading to the adoption of concrete instruments.

Indications from that Conference in Geneva do not, however, lead us to believe that the change in status has had the desired or anticipated effect. Nevertheless, my delegation is prepared to give the Conference the benefit of the doubt in the earnest hope that it will endeavour to provide, in the short run, agreed texts on conventions on nuclear disarmament, the prevention of the nuclear arms race, a comprehensive test ban, radiological weapons and, chemical weapons and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. In this regard the Disarmament Commission, as a deliberative body, should find itself able to complement the efforts of the Conference on Disarmament by preparing the groundwork for subsequent

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

negotiations at the Conference. That complementary role is particularly important because of the less restricted membership of the Commission.

The chemical industry retains a major potential for contributing to development. For this reason there is a clear necessity to protect the industry. But chemical weapons are weapons of mass destruction and should be banned. It is for this reason that my delegation greets with interest the recent submission by the United States Government of a draft convention banning chemical weapons. We are certain that its provisions may not be accepted by all in each and every aspect, but we stress that it should be given serious consideration on its own merit by the Conference as an earnest of the intention of the American side to undertake constructive negotiations on a class of weapons that have been recognized as possessing a most destabilizing potential. Pending the adoption of such a convention it would be a productive step if those States which now have a chemical-weapon capability were to exercise the maximum restraint in their pursuit of the non-peaceful uses of the chemical industry.

The issues before the current session of the Disarmament Commission are certainly not new. They have all been considered at one time or another, albeit in varying degrees. All that is now required is a renewal of efforts to achieve meaningful progress and concrete results. We shall of course be addressing each of those questions more specifically at the appropriate time. For the moment, however, my delegation wishes to restate that the issue of South Africa's nuclear capability is of particular interest. Over the years African delegations to this body have pointed to the destabilizing threat which South Africa's nuclear capability poses to the security of African States and to international peace and security. We have sought co-operation rather than confrontation with all States on the question. We cannot, however, accept that the security of an entire continent should be held hostage to the so-called interests of a handful of States. We believe that the issue remains an international concern. To that extent, my delegation looks forward to a constructive and productive debate on the question during the current session of the Commission, but, more important, we look forward to the adoption of concrete recommendations on the subject which would have the effect of removing once and for all the threat posed to African security, peace and stability by South Africa's nuclear capability.

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

On the question of confidence-building measures we continue to maintain that their usefulness resides in their capacity to create an appropriate climate for negotiations leading to actual disarmament measures. In other words, they are collateral measures of disarmament and should be pursued only as a means to an end. The vista of such measures should extend beyond the military to cover economic, social and other concerns on a global basis having regard to the disparities between nations or groups of nations.

Finally, the initiative of France at the thirty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly in favour of a more substantive discussion of the relationship between disarmament and development deserves every attention. For my delegation, disarmament should represent a benefit to development. To that extent we believe in the release of real resources from actual disarmament measures to socio-economic development goals, while other human and material resources currently engaged in the military sector - which, by definition, is unproductive - should be converted and redeployed in the productive sector of the economy. We also believe that the concrete suggestion of France to establish an international disarmament fund for development would represent a political commitment on the part of Member States to remove the emphasis from the race for armaments in favour of the pursuit of development in the interest of humanity.

Mr. LIPATOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, Mr. Chairman, I should like to join preceding speakers in congratulating you and the other officers of the Commission on your election to your responsible and difficult posts. I wish you every success in carrying out the functions and duties assigned to you.

This session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission is taking place at a very complex juncture in the international situation, and that fact has already been pointed out by many speakers. As a result, the unbridled arms race being pursued by imperialist States has significantly increased the threat of nuclear war, with all its fatal consequences for mankind and for all life on earth.

World tension has been particularly exacerbated by the transformation of Western Europe into a launching pad for new American missiles targeted on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and its allies. That transformation can be explained by the fact that the United States continues to rely upon a policy of military force, of achieving military superiority and of imposing its ways upon other peoples. By proceeding with the practical deployment of its new nuclear missiles

(Mr. Lipatov, Ukrainian SSR)

in Western Europe the United States has deliberately blocked the process of nuclear arms limitation and reduction. It has created impediments and obstacles to negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons and strategic nuclear weapons. As a result, the negotiations designed to limit and substantially reduce nuclear weapons have been broken off.

The path towards resumption of the Geneva talks is clear. It is necessary to return to the status quo ante, namely, the position that existed when there were no American theatre nuclear weapons in Europe. It is necessary to halt the deployment of American first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe and to adopt measures to bring about the removal and withdrawal of the missiles that have already been deployed. When the United States and the other countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) that act in concert with it adopt measures to restore the situation that existed before the deployment of the new American missiles, the Soviet Union will certainly not be found wanting.

The question is frequently asked whether there is a possibility of improving the political climate in the world. Undoubtedly there is. It is our profound conviction that the possibility of defending and strengthening peace does exist. The socialist countries are prepared to enter into talks on radical measures to limit and reduce armaments on the just basis of the principle of equality and equal security.

The Soviet Union, together with other countries of the socialist community, has put forward a broad range of concrete proposals and initiatives aimed at maintaining and strengthening peace. At the thirty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly many of those initiatives were endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the States of the world. As stated at the meeting of the Committee of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of States parties to the Warsaw Treaty that was held in April of this year in Budapest, the socialist countries advocate speedy and businesslike talks to reach agreement on such important issues as the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, a qualitative and quantitative freeze on nuclear armaments, the prohibition of the militarization of outer space and the use of force in space and from space against the earth, and the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons on a global scale. All the proposals and initiatives on those subjects put forward either jointly or individually by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty remain fully valid.

(Mr. Lipatov, Ukrainian SSR)

Our delegation would like to draw the attention of members of the Commission to the latest appeal made by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty to the States members of NATO for the conclusion of a treaty on the non-use of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations. That appeal was issued on 7 May 1984. This exceptionally important initiative by the socialist countries is intended to help reduce tension and to strengthen peace and security. It is designed to help dissipate distrust between the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty and States members of NATO. That document states:

"The peoples of Europe, the peoples of the world, expect real actions in the interests of peace, security and eliminating the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. It is in this spirit that the Warsaw Treaty member States make the present appeal to the member States of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and hope for a positive answer."

The need for measures to prevent nuclear war is more acute than ever before and decisive steps are called for in this regard. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that negotiations on this question must be begun as a matter of urgency.

The socialist countries submitted concrete proposals for consideration by the Conference on Disarmament at its spring session this year. Of exceptional importance was their appeal to all nuclear Powers to follow the example set by the Soviet Union and undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. As members are aware, the United Nations General Assembly has repeatedly made a similar appeal. If all nuclear-weapon States undertook not to be the first to use such weapons this would have a significant effect on the world situation. It would mean that there would be no first and therefore no subsequent nuclear strike.

An important contribution to preventing war could be made by curbing the arms race on the seas and oceans and by limiting naval exercises. As has already been emphasized in the answer sent by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to the Secretary-General's questionnaire, the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic fully supports the proposal on not expanding the naval exercises of States in areas where there is conflict or tension, withdrawal from certain areas of the world's oceans of ships carrying nuclear weapons and setting limits to the presence in those areas of ships of various categories, limiting the number of warships of certain basic categories and so on.

(Mr. Lipatov, Ukrainian SSR)

The programme for gradual nuclear disarmament remains in effect, and the countries of the socialist community propose that it begin with simple but at the same time effective measures, such as the freezing of nuclear weapons. Our countries continue to try to bring about the outlawing of nuclear war, which is condemned by all as a crime against mankind.

An important new step in the struggle against the nuclear threat was the proposal on the codification of relations between nuclear Powers put forward in March this year by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Konstantin Chernenko. The foundations of universal peace would undoubtedly be strengthened and a contribution would be made to restoring a climate of international confidence if that initiative were put into effect and binding norms were established for relations between States possessing the most dangerous weapons.

Yet another proposal made on 5 March 1984 by the State's parties to the Warsaw Treaty to the members of NATO, that on the non-increase and reduction of military expenditures, is directly related to an item on the Commission's agenda. It supplements and develops the proposals made on this subject earlier. The proposal is to carry out mutually a small, symbolic, one-time reduction of military budgets and then to freeze those budgets for three years. That approach would facilitate the transition to more radical reductions during the course of subsequent negotiations. As a first step, it might be possible to reduce concurrently the military budgets of members of both military-political groups possessing nuclear weapons by a previously agreed overall amount.

There is also a proposal to reduce the military budgets of the State parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the members of NATO in connection with the implementation of concrete disarmament measures which might be elaborated during negotiations on disarmament, and to agree on maximum ceilings of military expenditures, at lower levels than the existing ones. The resources released as a result of this reduction in military expenditures might be used for economic and social development, particularly of the developing countries.

The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic attaches great importance to the consideration of the item on the nuclear capability of South Africa. We fully share the concern of the world community, especially the African

(Mr. Lipatov, Ukrainian SSR)

countries, over the nuclear ambitions of the Pretoria racists. The Disarmament Commission must do more than condemn the actions of the aggressive régime of South Africa and those States that continue to co-operate with it in the political, economic, military, nuclear and other fields. It must strive vigorously to secure complete compliance by all States with the Security Council arms embargo and the adoption by the Council of mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

These are our views on several of the items on the agenda for the current session of the Commission, whose work gives an opportunity to representatives of States to make specific, concrete proposals and also to elaborate recommendations which would be of practical importance in producing relevant agreements on disarmament matters. That is the approach of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic to the activities of the Commission and its participation in it.

Ms. KUNADI (India): It gives me great pleasure to offer you, Sir, the sincere felicitations of my delegation on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Disarmament Commission. We are confident that with you at the helm we shall be able to achieve important results during the course of our work in the next few weeks.

I also take this opportunity to congratulate all the other officers of the Commission who have been elected to assist you, in your difficult assignment. My delegation pledges its full support and co-operation to you all in the fulfilment of your responsibilities.

During the course of our deliberations we shall deal with important and critical issues. The agenda before us includes the consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and nuclear disarmament, in order to expedite negotiations aimed at the effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war. We shall also consider issues such as the reduction of military budgets, the question of South Africa's nuclear capability, the elaboration of guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and proposals concerning the relationship between disarmament and development.

The Commission meets for its present session at a critical juncture, characterized by heightened East-West tensions and an escalation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race. It is therefore imperative that the session

(Ms. Kunadi, India)

take purposeful and meaningful decisions with a view to adopting concrete and practical measures for the prevention of nuclear war.

The peril we face is immediate. We cannot afford to wait. My delegation is therefore of the view that agenda item 4 (a) and (b), dealing with the burning issues of the nuclear arms race, nuclear disarmament and negotiations aimed at the effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war, must continue to occupy the Commission's priority attention. The consequences of the arms race, particularly in its nuclear aspect, are of the utmost relevance to the community of nations and affect its very survival.

The case for the total prohibition of the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons rests on strong moral and legal grounds. It is morally and ethically abhorrent that a State or group of States should seek to pursue its national security by means which constitute a threat of mass annihilation. It is said that as a result of the nuclear threat mankind is on the brink of self-extinction. Such a statement erroneously conveys a sense of the inevitability of the nuclear threat and the meek submission of all nations to this threat. It is a handful of nations armed with nuclear weapons that threaten the world with mass destruction, and the majority of nations become the involuntary victims of a strategy of mass annihilation. It is therefore imperative that urgent measures be taken to put an end to the irrational and self-destructive desire for nuclear superiority, in order to enable mankind to live in conditions of peace and tranquillity.

The Commission has already recognised that "among the greatest perils facing the world today is the threat of destruction as a result of nuclear war", and that "the increase in weapons, specially nuclear weapons, far from helping to strengthen international security, on the contrary weakens it".

In the Declaration adopted by the Seventh Conference of Heads of States or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in New Delhi last year, it was emphasized that the renewed escalation of the nuclear arms race, in both its quantitative and its qualitative dimension, as well as reliance on the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, has heightened the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war and led to greater insecurity and instability in international relations. I quote from the Declaration:

(Ms. Kunadi, India)

"Nuclear weapons are more than weapons of war. They are instruments of mass annihilation. The Heads of State or Government therefore find it unacceptable that the security of all States and the very survival of mankind should be held hostage to the security interests of a handful of nuclear-weapon States." (A/38/132, p. 14)

The Commission must therefore try urgently to identify ways and means of dealing with this most critical issue facing the international community. The Commission should not only recommend a specific course of action for dealing with the threat of nuclear war, but should also give an impetus to negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

Another substantive item before the Commission relates to the reduction of military budgets. The views of my delegation on this issue are well known. We are not in favour of formulating a document containing principles on which a reduction of military budgets might be undertaken by States. The security situations facing various States in different parts of the globe are not similar and, in addition, may vary over time in response to several important causal factors. It would thus seem to be an uphill task to reduce this wide spectrum of differences to a set of common principles with respect to military budgets which are applicable to all.

The freezing and reduction of military expenditure must be conceived in the context of a global approach to disarmament, taking into account established objectives, principles and priorities. The adoption of measures for the freezing and reduction of military expenditure must be interrelated with other measures of disarmament within the context of progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control. In addition, the international community must work out a practical programme for the reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries.

We welcome the inclusion in our agenda of a new item concerning the relationship between disarmament and development. It is widely acknowledged that the arms race on the one hand and development on the other are in a competitive relationship, particularly in terms of their claims on scarce resources, both financial and of highly skilled manpower. The catalytic effects of arms limitation and disarmament are bound to broaden the base of détente, contribute to the growth

(Ms. Kunadi, India)

and stability of the world economy and lead to the channelling of some of the released resources for the benefit of the developing countries. We hope that the Commission will carefully consider and come up with useful recommendations on this item.

Yet another substantive question to be dealt with by this session concerns the nuclear capability of South Africa. The massive build-up of South Africa's military machine, including its acquisition of a nuclear-weapon capability, for repressive and aggressive purposes has given yet another dimension to an already volatile situation. The racist régime's nuclear programme has enabled it to acquire a nuclear-weapon capability which is being enhanced by the continued support of its collaborators. This has presented a challenge and an increasingly dangerous obstacle to the process of disarmament. It also poses a serious threat to international peace and security.

My delegation recognizes the role that confidence-building measures can play in promoting disarmament. However, confidence-building measures cannot be a substitute for the negotiation of disarmament measures, and lack of confidence among States cannot be allowed to become a pretext for avoiding or delaying negotiations on disarmament. We feel that the reversal of the arms race and the achievement of genuine measures of disarmament would lead to greater trust and confidence among States. This is clearly recognized in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In conclusion, I should like to state that in the course of our work at this session of the Disarmament Commission it will be important for us not to lose sight of the priorities that should govern our approach to the disarmament process. These priorities have been clearly set out in the Final Document adopted at the first special session devoted to disarmament, which represents a collective commitment by all States Members of the United Nations.

Mr. BEESLEY (Canada): I wish to join others in congratulating you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. In accepting that position you have assumed a very heavy responsibility. I compliment you on the skill and wisdom which you have shown in persuading us all to accept an element of discipline in our proceedings, which is clearly essential. Having had the privilege of serving under you in the First Committee, I am not surprised that you

(Mr. Beesley, Canada)

have succeeded so well in this. I can assure you of my delegation's full co-operation.

In your opening statement to the Disarmament Commission on 7 May you made a number of points which my delegation found particularly relevant and which set the right tone for our discussions, as I believe the debate has shown, speaking as late as I am. As you pointed out, there is no dearth of proposals or machinery to deal with the question of arms control and disarmament. What is lacking is political commitment. You were correct also in drawing attention to the unfortunate state of East-West relations as one of the root causes of the lack of progress which we have been witnessing lately. This has been a serious preoccupation of the Canadian Government.

Turning to the arms race itself, in the fall of 1983 the Prime Minister of Canada drew attention to three potentially dangerous trends, namely, the resort to force to settle disputes, the risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the worsening state of East-West relations. At the same time he announced the intention of the Government of Canada to devote its full political resources to reducing the threat of war. He resolved to try to inject high-level political energy into East-West relations in order to reverse the flow of events. Over a three-month period Canada's Prime Minister visited 16 countries and the United Nations in furtherance of this peace mission. The Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting expressed support for his initiative.

It is clear from his efforts that there are areas of common interest, and in the Canadian House of Commons on 9 February last, the Prime Minister enunciated 10 principles of a common bond between East and West. These are:

1. Both sides agree that a nuclear war cannot be won.
2. Both sides agree that a nuclear war must never be fought.
3. Both sides wish to be free of the risk of accidental war or of surprise attack.
4. Both sides recognize the dangers inherent in destabilizing weapons.
5. Both sides understand the need for improved techniques of crisis management.
6. Both sides are conscious of the awesome consequences of being the first to use force against the other.

(Mr. Beesley, Canada)

7. Both sides have an interest in increasing security while reducing the cost.

8. Both sides have an interest in avoiding the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries - so-called horizontal proliferation.

9. Both sides have come to a guarded recognition of each other's legitimate security interests.

10. Both sides realize that their security strategies cannot be based on the assumed political or economic collapse of the other side.

I should like to emphasize also, however, the importance in this context of the Brussels Declaration of 9 December 1983. In that Declaration, my Government joined its allies in urging the countries of the Warsaw Pact to

"seize the opportunities we offer for a balanced and constructive relationship and for genuine détente."

There is a good reason for this. As Prime Minister Trudeau pointed out in a speech on 2 May:

"In matters nuclear, we are learning that the West's security is the East's security; that we depend on each other for our survival. We are learning that old attitudes do not go with new technology, that notions of fighting and prevailing in a nuclear war are very dangerous delusions. But we have not yet found a sure means of bridging the gap between new understanding and age-old instinct. And so we risk the ultimate Darwinian test."

An increase in mutual security is the only sound basis for effective arms control and disarmament, as the Canadian Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, Allan MacEachen, stated in what is now the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. He pointed out that attempts by one side to make gains at the expense of the security of the other ultimately will not work; action by one side which is perceived by the other to be threatening creates or widens a gulf of suspicion and produces reaction which can poison the political relationship. As Mr. MacEachen noted, arms control negotiations offer an escape from this danger only if the parties accept as their fundamental objective increased mutual security rather than unilateral advantage. The organic link between items on our agenda pointed out by the Australian representative earlier today reflects those very points made by Mr. MacEachen.

(Mr. Beesley, Canada)

The Secretary of State for External Affairs went on to emphasize that an attempt by any Power to develop a policy which assumes that nuclear war can be winnable contributes to mutual insecurity.

My delegation has noted the interest expressed yesterday by the Warsaw Pact in consultations on a treaty on the renunciation of force. At the Bonn summit in 1982, Canada and its allies pledged that their weapons would never be used except in response to attack. Last December that pledge was renewed in the Brussels Declaration. We shall, of course, give the most careful study to the Warsaw Pact proposal. Our guideline in assessing it will be whether it could lead to a reduction in the current level of East-West tension and to the successful negotiation of meaningful and verifiable arms control agreements.

It is against this background that my delegation approaches the items on our agenda. Some of these, as others have pointed out, have been with us for a considerable time. One is a new item which my delegation believes deserves very serious attention, namely, the relationship between disarmament and development.

As regards items 4 (a) (b) on the various aspects of the arms race, we of course recognize the need to focus on the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, which constitute the overriding issue of the day. The risks to human survival in a nuclear war are frightening. We should remind ourselves, however, that conventional arms and disarmament are also included in this item. In mentioning this I do not in any way imply the downplaying of the seriousness or importance of the problem of nuclear armaments. My reference to this point does, however, reflect the fact brought out by other delegations that approximately 80 per cent of the world's spending on arms is directed to conventional arms and that this expenditure involves not only the super-Powers but other countries, both developed and developing.

Why Governments spend funds to the extent they do on arms of this magnitude is a fundamental question which has to be addressed. It is at the heart of all arms control and disarmament negotiations. The answer usually given is their search for security. In many, possibly most, cases that may be true; but the question needs more attention, more study, since there is ample evidence of arms expenditure well in excess of normal requirements for security, and scant evidence that arms races contribute to the security of anyone.

(Mr. Beesley, Canada)

Turning to disarmament and development, the needs of the developing countries are all too urgent and pressing to require emphasis here. The efforts of Member States of the United Nations have long been directed - however inadequately - at trying to meet some of those needs. Under item 8, on the relationship between disarmament and development, which will be discussed in Working Group IV, we shall have an opportunity to examine how disarmament might offer a way to make a substantial contribution to this universally desired goal.

As pointed out by the representative of Sweden yesterday and many other speakers today, if even a fraction of the arms expenditures of the super-Powers or the militarily important Powers were to be diverted to meeting the needs of the developing countries, great prospects for development could be opened up. If the expenditures on arms by the developing countries themselves could be reduced - as has been pointed out by some representatives of developing countries - a substantial amount would also be released for development purposes.

However, the major military Powers - and, indeed, others - are not likely to agree to disarm simply to divert funds to development, particularly international development. This is a hard truth but one that should be faced. Equally pressing reasons for disarmament have not persuaded them to do so up to now in the face of their perception of overriding security concerns.

In discussing the disarmament-development relationship, attention must focus on the problems involved in diverting for development purposes resources now being devoted to arms by both developing and developed countries. It is not enough simply to try to find additional funds for development. If it were - and proposals have been made to that effect - the disarmament aspect of the discussion would become irrelevant and the objective would simply be a matter of raising funds - an important enough objective in itself, but the discussion could be held elsewhere in a purely developmental context. Our twofold objective was clearly outlined for us in General Assembly resolution 38/71 B, which based its call for action not only on development needs, which provide compelling enough reasons, but also on the arms buildup and the resulting risks for world peace and security. My delegation urges members not to lose sight of this when we begin our in-depth discussion in Working Group IV.

(Mr. Beesley, Canada)

I come now to the reduction of military budgets. In our view, priority should be given to establishing the actual expenditures on arms. We have already drawn attention to the various budgetary systems employed by States functioning under different social systems and the consequent need to develop a common data base on which equitable reductions could be made and verified. The discussions in Working Group I on item 5, on the reduction of military budgets, will clearly be relevant in this respect. Unfortunately, United Nations experience with the universal reporting instrument, which would allow military budgets to be measured, compared and eventually reduced with some assurance of compliance, shows that very few countries - some Western and some non-aligned - are ready to provide this essential information. As a consequence, there is a question in the minds of some as to whether this item should be maintained on our agenda. For our part, we have not made such a judgement as yet, but we will bear this factor in mind in participating actively and constructively in Working Group I.

Turning to the question of confidence-building measures, in the days ahead we shall, under item 7, be concentrating on ways of developing trust between States that might facilitate arms control agreements. The elaboration of confidence-building measures which are militarily significant, politically binding and verifiable and thus go beyond a merely declaratory approach would be a major contribution to the negotiating process. As many delegations have pointed out, confidence-building measures cannot be a substitute for arms control and disarmament, but they can certainly pave the way. We hope that this year some agreed guidelines may emerge from our discussion of this item in Working Group III.

Turning to the problem of South Africa and its nuclear capability, I wish to refer to certain aspects of that item. My Government has, as members know, worked hard for many years to strengthen the non-proliferation régime based on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Indeed, this forms an important element of our Prime Minister's recent initiative. We continue to monitor South Africa's nuclear status very carefully in view of its potential capability to develop nuclear weapons. We have strongly urged South Africa to adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Earlier today the representative of Australia eloquently warned of the alarming prospect of a combination of a policy of apartheid and a nuclear-weapon capability.

(Mr. Beesley, Canada)

There is a lesson for all of us here, perhaps: the consequences, not merely for neighbouring countries, whose abhorrence of apartheid we strongly share, but for all States, of this rejection of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Canadians are amongst the severest critics of the inadequacies of the implementation of the Treaty. We are also amongst the strongest supporters of the Treaty, however, because of our awareness of the consequences for all of us should the régime be destroyed by its critics, however sincere, whether from within or from without.

The representative of Japan warned earlier today about the potentially serious implications for the NPT régime of non-fulfilment by the nuclear-weapon States of their obligations under article VI. The representative of New Zealand emphasized the crucial importance of concluding a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

Taking all these factors into account, it is our considered, continuing view that the world would be less secure - that each of us would be less secure - if the NPT régime were undermined. Let us join in urging on South Africa, and accepting for ourselves, the norms embodied in the NPT, which strengthen the security of all States. If there is cause for concern, as we all seem to agree, about South African nuclear-weapon capability, then let us use our efforts to the utmost in seeking some measure of common ground in our approach to this important and serious issue.

In making these comments, Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to respond to the invitation you extended to us in your opening statement to express our candid opinions without polemics. In doing so, I have focused on only certain aspects of our agenda, but my delegation will have more specific comments and suggestions in the Working Groups.

Mr. BARIDO (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): At the outset, Sir, I congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of the Disarmament Commission for 1984. We are certain that your ability, expertise and diplomatic skill, which are well known to all, will enable you to guide this Commission and help it to find the necessary solutions to the difficult problems facing mankind, as reflected in our agenda.

Once again this year the Disarmament Commission is meeting at a time when the international situation is characterized by tension and anxiety and the continued threat to mankind posed by the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, which has exacerbated international tension and impeded all efforts to establish international relations based on peaceful coexistence and confidence and

(Mr. Barido, Sudan)

co-operation between States. Moreover, this situation prevents the achievement of the purposes of the United Nations Charter and, in particular, observance of the principles of respect for sovereignty, the non-use or threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States, and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The nuclear weapons for whose acquisition and deployment the major Powers are competing have drastically altered the concept, nature and potential dangers of war. Because of these weapons, it is imperative for the survival of human civilization and of mankind itself to stop the nuclear arms race and establish an international community free of nuclear weapons. The stepped-up arms race and its consequent dangers manifested in the deterioration of political relations and the increased possibility of nuclear or conventional war strengthen our belief that international peace and security can be guaranteed only through general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, under effective international control.

Sudan attaches great importance to the work of this Commission, for it is the representative deliberative body in the field of disarmament and is an effective adjunct to the negotiating body, the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

The agenda of this session contains five items which are of the utmost importance for the establishment of international relations based on peaceful coexistence, confidence, co-operation and mutual security. My delegation is pleased that the attention of the international community is focused on these important items, and that the 1984 agenda of this Commission is concerned with the discussion and resolution of those issues.

As regards agenda item 4 (a) and (b), relating to the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, nuclear disarmament has a direct bearing on the vital security interests of all States. Therefore, all States should play an active role and to make an effective contribution to the search for the international measures necessary to achieve that purpose. Nuclear disarmament is the most important security guarantee for all States, bearing in mind that nuclear-weapon technology has weakened the old concept of national borders as strong shields against the dangers of conventional war. This technology has diminished the security of all States on the planet, in the absence of general and complete nuclear disarmament.

The Disarmament Commission is called upon this year, in implementation of the recommendations and resolutions in the Final Document of the first special session

(Mr. Barido, Sudan)

of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to recommend to all States - in particular, the nuclear States and those with the largest nuclear arsenals - to begin multilateral negotiations without delay in order to carry out the priority tasks set out in the Programme of Action, which derive originally from the letter and spirit of the Charter. While responsibility for commitment to the Charter and respect for its principles is borne by all Members of this Organization, the primary responsibility rests with the nuclear States, and in particular the super-Powers, for saving mankind from the scourge of war and destruction, the most dangerous means of which are nuclear weapons.

Sudan attaches the utmost importance to item 5, entitled "Reduction of military budgets", which it believes should be considered in the framework of a comprehensive approach to disarmament, taking into consideration the purposes and principles of the Charter.

My country, which had the honour to be in the first group of States to report their military budgets to the Secretary-General, hopes that the Commission will be able to find an appropriate formulation leading to the conclusion of an international convention governing the reduction of military budgets, which we hope will lead to genuine reductions in forces and in military budgets and the consequent strengthening of international peace and security.

In connection with negotiations on the freezing and reduction of military budgets, it is necessary that data on military budgets be provided and that the standardized international reporting instrument be used, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 35/142 B.

Item 6, concerning South Africa's nuclear capability, has been on the Commission's agenda since 1979. It is truly regrettable that the Commission has not been able in five successive sessions to adopt a consensus draft resolution on this grave matter. It has become clear to the Commission that the racist régime in Pretoria has, because of its despair at being shunned internationally, resorted to the military option, and the nuclear option in particular, as a tool for internal repression and external aggression. In order to achieve its goals, that racist régime has focused on the development and acquisition of nuclear weapons, which has been made possible by the co-operation in the nuclear field of some States Members of this Organization, primarily Israel.

South Africa's nuclear capability, which is dedicated to the service of its policy of apartheid, is of profound legitimate concern to the African States, which

(Mr. Barido, Sudan)

at the summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in Cairo in July 1964 adopted the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. In keeping with its commitment to that OAU Declaration, Sudan calls upon the Commission to make the necessary recommendation during its present session on preventing the acquisition by the racist régime in South Africa of more nuclear technology or weapons. This could be achieved through the commitment of all States to the relevant Security Council resolution and through the fulfilment by the Security Council of its responsibility to eliminate the danger posed by South Africa's nuclear capability to international peace and security in general and to the security of the African States in particular.

We also attach great importance to item 7, relating to confidence-building measures, and in particular to their role in creating and improving a climate conducive to the implementation of disarmament measures. We believe that, since the disarmament process has come to an end and the conventional and nuclear arms race has continued at an accelerated pace, particular priority must be given to measures that would assist in creating a climate favourable to halting the nuclear and conventional arms race and accelerating progress towards disarmament.

We believe that confidence-building measures are not the preserve of the major Powers, but will often help in strengthening confidence between developing States. In order to establish a positive concept of confidence-building measures, a comprehensive approach must be adopted to the consideration of such measures to ensure their adoption and implementation in the social, economic and political fields.

We believe that the guidelines necessary for the adoption of appropriate confidence-building measures must involve full adherence to the international security system enshrined in the United Nations Charter and complete commitment to the general principles of international law and the declarations on the peaceful conduct of relations between large and small States. I refer in particular to the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted on 24 October 1970; the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted on 16 December 1970; the Declaration and Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, adopted on 1 May 1974; the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, adopted on 12 December 1974; the Declaration on the Deepening and Consolidation of International Détente, adopted on

(Mr. Barido, Sudan)

19 December 1977; the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, adopted on 30 June 1978; and the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, adopted on 9 December 1981.

We hope that, while taking all those documents into consideration the Disarmament Commission will be able during this session to establish the guidelines for the definition of the appropriate confidence-building measures and their implementation at the global and the regional level.

My delegation attaches particular importance to item 8, relating to consideration of proposals concerning the relationship between disarmament and development, which is based on the effects of world military expenditures on the economic situation and world development. This is a matter of particular concern to my country. We believe that serious attention must be paid to the question of the reallocation of the resources released by disarmament to economic and social development, especially that of developing countries, and to determining appropriate mechanisms for that process of reallocation.

The necessary reduction of expenditures on armaments and therefore the achievement of greater international security and the release of resources to be used for economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries, justifies serious consideration of the proposals concerning the establishment of an international disarmament fund for development. The lack of progress in achieving the internationally agreed objective of 0.7 per cent of gross domestic product for official development assistance emphasizes the need to adopt a new approach to achieving social and economic development.

For these reasons, we approve the French proposal to convene a United Nations conference on the relationship between disarmament and development, to carry out an in-depth assessment of the effect of military expenditure on the international economic situation as well as on development and to make recommendations for future action at the international and national levels. We hope that the Commission will be able at its current session to make the necessary recommendations to enable preparations for this important conference to be made.

This, briefly, is what we wanted to say about the items on the agenda for the current session. We shall deal with them in detail in the Working Groups entrusted with the discussion of those items.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of China, who wishes to speak in exercise of his right of reply. I remind him of General Assembly decision 34/401, which limits such statements to 10 minutes.

Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I do not want to take up too much of the Commission's time at such a late hour, but I am compelled to speak - for only one minute - because this morning the representative of one country attacked China by implication. The Chinese delegation categorically rejects that representative's slander and vilification of China.

As everyone knows, the Chinese Government has consistently followed a foreign policy of independence and self-reliance, in opposition to hegemony and in defence of world peace. This is a fact that nobody can deny. The truth is that it is precisely the country to which I have referred that is following a policy of regional hegemonism in South-East Asia and carrying out aggression, intervention and harassment in neighbouring countries, seriously threatening the peace and security of the region.

The CHAIRMAN: That brings to a close the general statements and exchange of views on the items on the agenda of the Commission.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.