



General Assembly

UNITED NATIONS
DEPARTMENT FOR DISARMAMENT AFFAIRS
REFERENCE LIBRARY

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.99
5 June 1985

ENGLISH

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINETY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 30 May 1985, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. AHMAD

(Pakistan)

- Concluding statements (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 DC2-750, 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 3.25 p.m.

CONCLUDING STATEMENTS (continued)

Mr. GUTH (United States of America): Let me first congratulate you, Sir, on your effective chairmanship. Your skills were essential to all aspects of our work, from solving thorny procedural problems to grappling with important substantive issues. On behalf of my delegation I should also like to thank the officers of the Commission, the Chairmen of the Working Groups and all members of the staff for their efforts.

Let me comment briefly on the work of our 1985 session. In our opening statement to this body we expressed the hope that this year's session would yield positive results. Indeed, we have tackled important issues, and debate has been serious; and some modest progress has been made. But, if measured by agreements on specific recommendations, results were disappointing.

Let me now comment on the individual agenda items. On agenda item 4 we have, unfortunately, not been able to reach consensus on a complete set of recommendations. The scope of this item is broad, and many important nuclear and conventional issues fall within it. Nevertheless, some progress was made. A more logical arrangement was accepted, and near agreement was reached on such controversial issues as outer space and bilateral arms control. We regret greatly, however, that some delegations refused to permit this progress to be registered unless proposals they had made also received consensus endorsement. These setbacks to progress have led my delegation and others to wonder whether further useful work on this item can continue on a similar basis in the future. We shall be reflecting on this question before the next session of the Commission. We also expect to see additional work done next year on the recommendations dealing with conventional issues.

The failure to conclude agenda item 5, on the reduction of military budgets, despite the air of optimism with which we began the deliberations on this topic, was disappointing.

(Mr. Guth, United States)

Despite general consensus on the essential set of principles, the discussion foundered on the refusal of some delegations to discuss constructively the principles of transparency, comparability and verification. We and our allies consider those principles to be key to meaningful negotiations on reducing military budgets.

But despite this disappointment, we cannot overlook some portents of progress for next year. The recent submissions of military budget data by Romania and Argentina in accordance with the United Nations standardized international reporting instrument are welcome, and we strongly urge that those countries that have not yet complied with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 35/142 B follow their example.

Positive steps taken this year will serve to facilitate the successful conclusion of this topic at the next session of the Disarmament Commission. The United States wholeheartedly endorses the recommendation that the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets" be placed on the agenda again with a view to reaching consensus on the principles that should govern the actions of States in this field.

With regard to agenda item 6, my delegation participated in all the efforts - formal and informal - of the Working Group on the question of the nuclear capability of South Africa in hopes of reaching agreement on a set of principles which could contribute in a substantive way to resolving this problem and to responding to the security concerns of African States.

The United States is one of the principal architects of the international effort to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to strengthen the system of international safeguards in the use of nuclear technology. In our view, southern Africa is in no way exempt from these efforts or from the goal of establishing an Africa free of nuclear weapons. To this end, my country has not supplied nuclear materials or sensitive nuclear technology to South Africa in a decade, and we strongly encourage the Government of South Africa, and those of all other States as well, to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on all nuclear facilities as a means of contributing to international security and of reinforcing peaceful intentions.

We regret that the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission could not have made some progress towards these goals. My delegation and others were willing to

(Mr. Guth, United States)

demonstrate great flexibility and considerable effort to achieve progress. We regret that there was so little response, even on very trivial points. We do appreciate the professional manner in which the consultations were conducted and the readiness to engage in candid exchanges of views which marked these consultations. We hope that in future deliberations this businesslike atmosphere can be continued and can lead to concrete results for the benefit of all people who value the task of controlling and limiting nuclear weapons and of enhancing the peace and security of the African continent.

The United States welcomed the initiative of Cameroon to place on the agenda of the Commission the topic of the role of the United Nations in disarmament. My Government believes that Cameroon's established a useful framework for discussing this subject; it hoped that with this paper as a basis the Commission would be able to focus on a few practical reforms which could enable the United Nations to make a greater contribution to the disarmament process. We were frankly disappointed with the outcome. The procedural wrangle at the beginning of the session over other issues precluded considering this subject early on, essentially leaving only one week in which to discuss this complex question. In the Working Group itself, we were dismayed by the long debate over a work programme which prevented any in-depth discussion of the subject at hand.

My delegation made known its views on the substance of this matter in its submission to the Secretary-General and in its opening statement, and we believe it is widely agreed that the type of reform we suggested - for example, fewer resolutions in the First Committee and greater efforts to reach consensus there - would give increased credibility to the work of that body. We recognize that others may have a different perspective, and we respect their right to disagree. But we urge all members to reflect seriously on whether it serves anyone's interest to hold up progress, modest though it may be, where agreement is possible in order to try to promote progress that is not achievable.

I should also like to make clear that in accepting the list of topics entitled "Topics for Appropriate Recommendations" as the basis for discussion, my Government has acted in accordance with the principle that discussions should be as broad as members desire. We have therefore agreed that the list of institutions to be considered should be inclusive. This approach does not mean that we agree that the role of United Nations specialized agencies in disarmament should be strengthened. On the contrary, the United States will continue to maintain, when this issue is

(Mr. Guth, United States)

considered in detail, that such forays by specialized agencies only distract them from their proper functions and do not contribute to disarmament.

On agenda item 8, "Curbing the naval arms race", the United States supports the recommendation of the final report, which refers this issue to the fortieth session of the General Assembly. The topic is a contentious one, both for political and national security reasons. The resolution which implements this topic is skewed against those countries which rely on the seas for their vital security interests and as a result failed to achieve widespread support. Taking into account the distorted presentations by the proponents of this issue, it is evident that in the present circumstances any attempt at consensus on curbing the naval arms race is doomed to failure.

As far as the third new agenda item is concerned, discussions in plenary session reflected the mixed results of the first half of the Second Disarmament Decade. We hope that the second half of the Decade will bring to fruition some of our expectations in this domain. We would be particularly pleased if my Government's proposal for radical reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union were accepted in the bilateral talks in Geneva. We are also looking forward to early progress in multilateral negotiating forums, such as the Conference on Disarmament, on vital subjects such as the banning of chemical weapons worldwide.

In my concluding remarks, I should like to address next year's agenda and make several recommendations for improving procedures and maximizing results in 1986. First, I should like to raise a question regarding the scope of our agenda. Was the large number of agenda items before us at this session perhaps too ambitious? This is a question we should bear in mind as we consider resolutions at the next session of the General Assembly, particularly in light of General Assembly resolution 37/78 H, which requested the Disarmament Commission

"to direct its attention ... to specific subjects from among those which have been or will be under its consideration". (resolution 37/78 H, para. 3)

Related to this issue is our method of work which, by and large, is dictated by the specific agenda items under consideration. In our view, each agenda item should be treated on its own merits and by a method deemed most suitable to that item. We regret that others held work on some of our agenda items hostage to an agreement on how to proceed on another agenda item. We appreciate your intense efforts, Mr. Chairman, to overcome that impasse.

(Mr. Guth, United States)

My delegation would also like to highlight a central component of our work method - the search for consensus. We believe that this principle plays a crucial role in our deliberations - for if our recommendations are to be truly meaningful, they should reflect a common understanding. Our work here cannot substitute for negotiations, but it can help us to deepen our understanding and to find some common ground on matters where progress might be possible elsewhere.

(Mr. Guth, United States)

In conclusion, I should like to propose that in next year's session we focus on the art of the possible. While our deliberations here have been marked by some success and characterized by a frank and free exchange of views, at times we seemed to have engaged in frustrating and fruitless forays up blind alleys. We regret that some delegations today characterized our position on certain issues as "obstinate". Our views on those issues are well known and reflect serious concern. Their characterization as "obstinate" does not advance enlightened discussion. While there have been disappointments, we are not disheartened. It is our conviction that collectively we can do better and it is our intention to contribute to the Commission's successful work in the future.

Mr. TOMASZEWSKI (Poland): As the Commission's 1985 session draws to an end, I should like to make several observations on its work to which the delegation of Poland tried to contribute as much as possible.

On the agenda of this year's session we have certain important items to which my delegation referred during plenary meetings and during discussions on particular items. It is with regret that I have to state that in my delegation's opinion not much substantive progress was achieved during the past four weeks. We have not moved forward much on the item on reduction of military budgets; we are still at the same place on the question of South Africa's nuclear capability; and the crucial problem of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament is still awaiting a constructive approach by all the nuclear-weapon Powers. But it is certainly encouraging to note that a great number of delegations, especially from the non-aligned countries, voiced their deep concern about the danger of intensifying the arms race and the need to devise ways and means of dealing with that important matter.

At the beginning of this session the Commission's attention was focused on the fortieth anniversary of the victory over fascism and nazism. That reminded us that we must spare no effort to ensure that a world war is never fought again. The Disarmament Commission gives us another chance to achieve that objective, but in order to achieve it we need a sincere commitment from all participants in the Commission. Had there been such commitment in handling the three items I mentioned at the beginning of my statement, the Commission would not have to deal with them any more. Unfortunately, we witness in the Commission a reflection of the very tense international situation, which is itself the result of the efforts of the

(Mr. Tomaszewski, Poland)

United States and some of its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to undermine the existing strategic balance and to obtain unilateral strategic superiority.

Among the three new items on this year's agenda is that on the limitation and reduction of naval armaments and the extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans. It is in this specific area of the arms race that we note a particularly intense effort to obtain significant strategic superiority by those who still claim to be traditional maritime Powers. This results in destabilizing security regionally and internationally, since the naval armaments with their sophisticated modern equipment, and especially their nuclear capability can no longer be treated as an independent part of modern armaments. Rather, they constitute an inseparable part of the whole strategic parity that is so essential today for stabilizing peace and security.

That is why my delegation supported the initiative of the delegations of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union (A/CN.10/73), in emphasizing the importance of curbing the naval arms race and of preparing conditions for negotiations aimed at reaching agreement on measures that could help to achieve that objective. My delegation also regrets that there was no consensus on a proposal to create a separate working group to deal with that important item. We hope that the results of the work of the group of experts on that subject will help all others to join together in trying to find a satisfactory solution.

Finally, I should like to say a few words on the work of the new Working Group established to deal with one of the new items, Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, to which my delegation also attaches importance. My delegation has no doubt whatsoever about the crucially important role to be played by our Organization in dealing with the number one problem of modern times. But, to be successful, the Organization needs the support of the positive political will of all Member States, particularly of the nuclear-weapon States, in dealing with the problem of disarmament. National security interests cannot be used to justify actions that undermine the strategic parity so essential to world security today. In this context, I shall once again quote from the Declaration in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament:

(Mr. Tomaszewski, Poland)

"Enduring international peace and security cannot be built on the accumulation of weaponry by military alliances nor be sustained by a precarious balance of deterrence or doctrines of strategic superiority. Genuine and lasting peace can only be created through the effective implementation of the security system provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial reduction of arms and armed forces, by international agreement and mutual example..." (Resolution S-10/2, para. 13)

Yes, "mutual example". It is astonishing how easily a bad example is followed and how difficult it is to follow a good example in disarmament.

My delegation has already emphasized the fact that the Members of the United Nations have at their disposal excellent machinery to deal with disarmament, if only the goodwill, the political goodwill, exists to utilize it properly; and even when that goodwill exists it is still not easy. I shall quote a former President of the United States, Mr. Jimmy Carter, who, speaking of the Soviet-American talks, said the following, as reported in The New York Times of 12 May:

"As I know from personal experience, it is difficult enough to conclude agreements even when both sides are determined to succeed." (The New York Times, 12 May 1985, p. E23)

During the many years of the existence of the United Nations we have tried several times to "improve" the existing machinery. But I strongly believe that each time our attempts served only as an excuse for some delegations to divert our attention from their real intention, namely, to impose another round of the costly arms race to obtain military and strategic superiority. Nevertheless, the delegation of Poland joined in the discussion on the item with the best of intentions and is ready to contribute to the Commission's success in this area in the future. Speaking on this point, I cannot overlook the remarkable effort and contribution of the delegation of Cameroon, a non-aligned, friendly country.

In conclusion, I should like to express my delegation's gratitude for the efficient way in which you, Mr. Chairman, have guided the Commission's work. I also extend my congratulations to the Chairmen of the three Working Groups and the officers of the Commission whose conscientious efforts deserve our appreciation. I also express our appreciation of the untiring efforts of the Commission's secretariat.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): I should like to begin, Sir, by thanking you for your work as Chairman. You have indeed exhibited important qualities of patience and fairness, and we are grateful to you.

I should also like to thank the Secretariat for its work, and to thank the Chairmen of the three Working Groups.

On 12 December 1984, the Secretary-General of the United Nations voiced his alarm at the state of disarmament endeavours in the world. He criticized the lack of any substantial progress in disarmament measures. Appealing for action to break the cycle of mistrust and insecurity, the Secretary-General said:

"Discussions have taken on a life of their own. All too often it seems as if the players are only moving their lethal pawns in a global chess game."

(A/39/PV.97, p.123-125)

One wonders if the powerful words used by the Secretary-General made any imprint on our minds. One searches in vain through the report of this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission to find the slightest reflection of the Secretary-General's call to action. One concludes that the immobility of action is matched by a paralysis of motivation.

Did the Disarmament Commission take one significant step towards ending the arms race? No. Did the Disarmament Commission make any meaningful progress on the perennial agenda items of reduction of military budgets and the nuclear capability of South Africa? No.

Did the Disarmament Commission take advantage of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations to reassure the international community that "we, the peoples of the world" will indeed "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war"? No.

It is true that we did have vigorous debate - over procedure, over the agenda, over annexes. We did reaffirm the validity of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade - a status quo decision. We did identify a programme of work for future consideration of the role of the United Nations in disarmament - thanks primarily to the thoughtful Cameroonian working paper. We did conduct our deliberations with a relative absence of acrimony.

So the Disarmament Commission session was not devoid of some value. But any concerned observer would be forced to conclude that the Commission has been sleep-walking through one of the most important moments of history.

For, as the Secretary-General reminded us, the modern world has the power to dissolve in a conflict of hours or minutes the entire work of civilization. And at the same time we have the knowledge and the strategies to reduce the offensive

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

capacities for war. Unfortunately, we cannot put together the problem and the solution so that there is an agreed programme of action to reduce nuclear and conventional arms.

It is true that the negotiations between the two super-Powers are continuing in Geneva. We should be thankful that this bilateral effort is being made, for what would the multilateral forums be able to show the world? Instead of reinforcing the bilateral negotiations with vigorous and meaningful activity in the multilateral forums - both deliberative and negotiating - those bodies have succumbed to lethargy.

What is to be learned from this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission? Have we indeed come to the point where we should admit frankly that all we can do is exchange views without reaching a common position on certain central issues? Perhaps this sterile discourse has its own strange value, for the Disarmament Commission thus reveals the direction of the international community's thinking on disarmament issues. Each State can, on an equal basis, outline its views.

But Canada hoped that the Disarmament Commission would begin to play a more worthwhile role. The Commission could help to improve and strengthen the manner in which the United Nations deals with disarmament issues. The Commission could stimulate more countries to be forthcoming in providing information on military budgets using the United Nations standardized reporting instrument. The Commission could, with its powerful consensus, send an unequivocal message to South Africa that it must commit itself to an internationally binding non-proliferation agreement and the placement of all its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

These subjects, and others, could be advanced through the collective work of the Disarmament Commission. By no means is the Commission devoid of a meaningful work programme, but in the end we come back, as we always do, to the question of political will. That, indeed, was the conclusion of the Secretary-General in his 12 December plea.

Political will: the words are so easily spoken, the spirit so difficult to generate. Yet we can never give up; future generations depend on us. Somehow, some time, there must be a great, new turning point for the world in freeing mankind from the enslavement of arms - but when? That is the real question for us to ponder as we take our leave, once more, of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Mr. PAVLOVSKY (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of Czechoslovakia, too, would like to make a few comments in connection with the conclusion of the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission this year. One of the particular aspects of this session is that it has taken place at a time when the peoples of the world are commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the historic victory over nazism and fascism in the Second World War and when the United Nations itself, which was established as a result of that victory, is preparing to commemorate its own fortieth anniversary.

It is a very positive factor that, against that background, our debates have once again reaffirmed the great significance of the disarmament question for the future development of world events. On the other hand, they have also reaffirmed that the paths leading to progress in resolving these problems remain blocked. As a result, the Disarmament Commission has not been able to achieve the substantive, balanced and universally acceptable recommendations which were expected of it, particularly on the questions of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war. We have consistently heard statements to that effect from representatives of the socialist and many other countries.

(Mr. Pavlovsky, Czechoslovakia)

In the course of the final exchange of opinions it was stated that we could bring about a renaissance of the Commission and achieve results if all delegations would be prepared to make greater efforts to find an agreed formula to produce appropriate decisions. We wish to add that an equally important prerequisite for success is that all States, and first and foremost all the nuclear Powers and other militarily significant States, should in fact demonstrate the political will to achieve agreement on the basis of the principles of equality and equal security and the will to limit the nuclear arms race and, in particular, to conclude a treaty on a general and complete ban on nuclear weapon tests, to avert an arms race in space and to prohibit and eliminate other types of weapons of mass destruction.

If the last session of the Commission made a definite contribution to the formation of such political will, we might assess the results of this session as being at least to some extent positive. Whether that is so will become clear in the near future. It will have already become clear at the forthcoming fortieth session of the General Assembly.

The reasons for the Commission's failure to achieve tangible results at its present session on most of the problems on its agenda are certainly no secret, but this year they were made particularly clear during the discussion of agenda items 4, 5 and 6. The position of the United States of America and of its allies on nuclear issues as a whole, including the question of the nuclear capability of South Africa, was completely different from that of the overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations. That position constituted an obstacle to the achievement of even the most insignificant progress towards the resolving of these questions and was in direct conflict with all the priorities which have been laid down and all the efforts of the international community to implement them.

We saw the same picture in the Working Group concerning the reduction of military budgets. In that Group the delegation of the Soviet Union, supported by the delegations of other socialist countries, this year put forward an important and constructive proposal regarding the inclusion of the principle of confidence-building as a basis for achieving appropriate agreements, and it was proposed that the issues linked to it should be discussed specifically, depending on the existence of such agreements. It easily is understood that such an approach would not threaten the security of any States parties to the negotiations but, rather, would at the least make possible the commencement of negotiations on the freezing and reduction of military budgets. However, the Western countries did not

(Mr. Pavlovsky, Czechoslovakia)

agree to meet us half-way in response to our appeal, and their obstructionist position remained unchanged. This was the reason for the deadlock concerning decision of this important question. No amount of information sent to the United Nations Secretary-General by some Member States regarding their military budgets can resolve this issue. The only solution can be found in bringing about a realistic and businesslike beginning of negotiations on the freezing and reduction of military budgets on the basis of equality and respect for the interests and security of the parties to such negotiations.

Like many other delegations, we welcome the inclusion in the agenda of a new and important question, the curbing of the naval arms race, and we believe that the discussion that took place completely reaffirmed its importance and its relevance and the need for further comprehensive consideration with a view to the commencement, in this context, as soon as possible, of specific negotiations on an agreed international basis. A substantive contribution to the work of the Commission on this question was made by the working paper submitted by the delegations of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union (A/CN.10/73). Nevertheless, we regret that it was not possible to begin work on the establishment of a working group on this subject, to enter into practical discussions and to produce appropriate recommendations.

The argument that in-depth consideration of this problem is not appropriate in view of the fact that the relevant expert studies have not yet been concluded is, in our view, not compelling. We would once again reaffirm that, on the whole, emphasis on the carrying out of a great number of studies on disarmament issues does not serve the cause of practical negotiations. The tendency to replace negotiations by studies in fact leads to a weakening of the role of the United Nations in the disarmament field. In this connection, I should like to recall that when a few years ago in the Commission the substance of its mandate were discussed, under item 4, a number of delegations expressed the view that more intensive study of the subject of conventional weapons was necessary. At that time, however, those delegations did not believe that a condition for this was the conclusion of a study on conventional weapons, and, incidentally, attention was drawn to this by other delegations. At that time, as is well known, we agreed to meet the views of those delegations half-way, taking into account the fact that the priority of nuclear disarmament should not automatically be juxtaposed with that of other important issues. It is perfectly obvious that at the present time, in connection with

(Mr. Pavlovsky, Czechoslovakia)

agenda item 8, those same delegations have chosen another approach with regard to an intensive study of the question of naval arms. In fact they are applying a double standard in the work of the Commission. Such a practice is, without doubt, in keeping neither with the interests of such negotiations nor with an enhancement of the contribution of the United Nations to the settlement of disarmament questions.

(Mr. Pavlovsky, Czechoslovakia)

A great deal of attention was rightly paid by delegations to item 7 of the agenda. The socialist States took a positive view of the Cameroon representative's initiative on strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We are profoundly convinced that in conditions of ever-increasing danger of nuclear catastrophe, all States, large and small, must step up their joint efforts to avert that catastrophe and reverse the pernicious arms race in all spheres, above all the nuclear sphere.

The United Nations, as a body which unites practically all the States in the world and which, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, has been entrusted with the task of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war, must significantly enhance its role in the cause of disarmament. The work of the Disarmament Commission on this issue should be directed towards the creation of the possible conditions for bringing this about. It is with great satisfaction that we note that the question of the specialized agencies of the United Nations system has been included in the list of subjects for discussion. It is our consistent policy that we should involve the specialized agencies ever more widely in the struggle for disarmament in all areas. This is vitally important.

In view of the need for a comprehensive strengthening of the common efforts of States in the struggle to bring about disarmament, we are ready to consider in this context the role of other international bodies also - for example, conferences to review the implementation of treaties and conventions, the Conference on Disarmament and so on. The activation and enhancement of the role of the United Nations and of the entire international community through the various United Nations organs in the field of disarmament is in the interest of the strengthening of international peace and security. Discussion of this issue reaffirmed that all States, regardless of their size and military potential, can make an important contribution to carrying out the urgent tasks of disarmament, including the drafting and adoption of appropriate measures designed to reverse the nuclear-arms race and avert nuclear war. We are sure that this will have an effect on the forthcoming session of the General Assembly, in particular in enhancing the activities of delegations in the First Committee and in terms of new proposals, initiatives and draft resolutions aimed at speeding up progress towards resolving disarmament problems, taking into account the priorities laid down by the United Nations.

In our view this would be fully in keeping with the spirit and the letter of discussion in the Commission on item 9 of the agenda, concerning the review and

(Mr. Pavlovsky, Czechoslovakia)

appraisal of the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, and with the recommendations for achieving progress, which the delegation of Czechoslovakia fully supports.

In conclusion, I should like, on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, to express our gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, for your skilful and experienced leadership of the work of the Commission. We have a very high opinion of your determination and firmness, combined with tact and delicacy, which made it possible for this session to take place in an effective and organized manner. We should like to express our gratitude to all the other officers of the Commission as well, to the Chairmen of the Working Groups and to the Secretary of our Commission, Mr. Alem.

Mr. QIAN Jiadong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): This year marks the fortieth anniversary of the victory over fascism and militarism, as well as the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. The Second Disarmament Decade is at its mid-point and the United States-Soviet bilateral talks have resumed after a suspension of more than a year. It was hoped that all this could have a positive impact on the work of this session, bringing about greater progress. Regrettably, this hope has failed to materialize. There have been some achievements, but on the whole, especially on matters of substance, we have not been able to fulfil the tasks entrusted to us by the General Assembly.

Item 4, on the question of nuclear and conventional disarmament, is a long-standing and difficult one, which in its nature has a great many similarities to the comprehensive programme of disarmament. Since there has been no progress in the Conference on Disarmament on the comprehensive programme of disarmament, we could hardly expect much headway on this item here in the Commission either. Nevertheless, under your guidance, Mr. Chairman, by taking a realistic approach, a significant revision has been made of the compilation of recommendations reflecting the different positions of delegations, removing many of the repetitions and even confusions therein, and the document is now in much more orderly shape and will undoubtedly be of great help in the continued consideration of this item in the future. Item 4 is one of the highest priorities on our agenda. It is in a way a touchstone of the sincerity of the super-Powers concerning disarmament. We shall persist in our efforts and continue our consideration of this item.

On the question of the reduction of military budgets, the representative of Romania has once again made tremendous efforts this year as the Chairman of the working group. Compromise formulas were offered for some of the most controversial

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

issues and some brackets have been deleted. However, no consensus was possible owing to the sharp divergencies between East and West. This question has been under discussion for seven long years already and should not be dragged on any further. We feel that something ought to come out of next year's deliberations.

Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas has shown the utmost enthusiasm and patience in presiding over the Working Group on the question of South Africa's nuclear capability. A solution to this problem was almost within reach last year, and there was no reason to delay a settlement this year, particularly in view of the fact that nuclear non-proliferation is currently a major issue attracting the concern of the entire international community. However, owing to the rigid position taken by certain countries, this question remains unsettled. While imposing severe - even harsh - restrictions on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy by the large number of developing and non-nuclear States, those countries adopt an ambiguous attitude to the nuclear ambitions of the South African authorities, whose apartheid policy is notorious. It is difficult to understand such an approach, which is detrimental to international efforts against nuclear proliferation.

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

It is of special significance that the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament has been discussed on the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of this world Organization. A consensus document entitled "Topics for appropriate recommendations" has been agreed upon following our deliberations. The representative of Cameroon, Mr. Engo, and his delegation have done a commendable job in promoting the work in this regard. The Chinese delegation shares the view that emphasis should be laid on strengthening the United Nations role in the field of disarmament from a political standpoint, including reaffirming and strengthening the commitment of all countries, and in particular the major nuclear Powers, to that role and to the establishment of an appropriate and mutually complementary relationship between the bilateral talks and the multilateral deliberations and negotiations under the aegis of the United Nations. We are also in favour of making explorations from the angle of mechanism, organization and working arrangements to rationalize and improve the functioning of the United Nations and hence to enhance its role in disarmament affairs. This, we realize, is, of course, a matter of only secondary importance. In view of the different preferences of the various parties, the question of how to strengthen the role of the United Nations in disarmament is obviously a complex one. The document agreed upon this year may serve as a basis for future efforts.

The discussion on the naval arms race highlighted yet another aspect of the East-West confrontation. Each side has accused the other of endangering peace and stability by its naval activities. In our view, however, both the major naval Powers bear unshirkable responsibilities for the global naval arms race and naval nuclear arms race in particular. In order to bring about a genuine halt to the naval arms race, both of them should demonstrate true political will and take concrete measures, instead of indulging in mutual acrimony. China supports and participates in the work of the group of governmental experts on a comprehensive study of the naval arms race, sponsored by the United Nations. We hope that the experts will conclude their work on schedule so as to enable this Commission to make progress in its deliberations on this question.

A document acceptable to all parties has been worked out on the item concerning the Second Disarmament Decade, but we must say that the task entrusted to us by the General Assembly has been fulfilled only in a formal sense. In the last five years not only have the goals of the Second Disarmament Decade remained far from being reached but, on the contrary, the arms race, and the nuclear arms

(Mr. Qian Jiadong, China)

race in particular, has been further intensified and even extended into a new sphere - outer space. These developments, however, have not been reflected in the document. In the spirit of co-operation, the Chinese delegation has not blocked the consensus on this paper, but we feel compelled to point out this deficiency.

Despite the fact that very little has come out of this session, I still wish to end my statement on an optimistic note. The Chinese delegation sincerely hopes that the present impasse will be overcome by the efforts of all parties at the fortieth session of the General Assembly this autumn, so as to further promote the work in the whole disarmament endeavour.

Mr. Chairman, as the session is drawing to its conclusion, I wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation of your efforts and the talent you have displayed in organizing and guiding the work of the Commission. I also wish to express our gratitude to all the other officers of the Commission and the secretariat for their valuable contributions.

Mr. KONSTANTINOV (Bulgaria): In the view of the Bulgarian delegation, the present session of the Disarmament Commission, regrettably, has not made tangible progress in the consideration of some specific issues on its agenda. The deliberations showed once again that the prevailing majority of Member States were deeply concerned at the dangers posed by the unabated arms race and the lack of political will in some circles, which prevented the Commission from achieving more meaningful results. The deliberations proved convincingly that most delegations believe that peace and security can be guaranteed only if new, persistent efforts are made to curb the arms race in all its aspects, and that limitation and reduction of the most dangerous weapons should encompass all types and systems in all areas - in outer space, in the airspace, on Earth and on the seas and oceans.

The prevention of nuclear war and the limitation of nuclear armaments and other weapons of mass destruction are essential prerequisites for the creation of an atmosphere of trust and confidence and for the reduction of international tensions. The cessation of the arms race and nuclear disarmament constitute the most important task facing the international community at the present time. My delegation strongly believes that it is essential to halt and reverse the arms race in all its various aspects, but principally in its nuclear aspect, as well as to prevent the extension of the arms race into outer space and thus prevent the militarization of that sphere.

In this connection, a ban on the testing of such weapons could prevent the creation of new types and new systems of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Konstantinov, Bulgaria)

The conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapons tests has been a pressing question for a long time now, but a settlement of this issue continues to be blocked by certain nuclear-weapon States. We urge, therefore, 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 nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, as well as on research on and the development of new weapons and systems in this field.

The elimination of the danger of nuclear war depends largely on the efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this regard we attach great importance to the work of the Disarmament Commission in its consideration of South Africa's nuclear potential. We share the concern of many delegations, in particular the African delegations, regarding Pretoria's nuclear ambitions.

The Bulgarian delegation continues to attach great importance to the question of the reduction of the military budgets. Over the past years Bulgaria and other socialist countries have suggested various ways of breaking out of the impasse on this question.

The important role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament is recognized by all States. However, if the United Nations has been unable to play a more important role in this regard, this is not the result of any inadequacy of the Organization's structure and machinery to fulfil such a role. This inability is due to the obstructionist position taken by a small group of countries in the work of the bodies dealing with disarmament issues. By adopting that position they have prevented the United Nations from fully meeting its responsibilities regarding the maintenance of international peace and security.

According to the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, the first goal of the Decade is to halt and reverse the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race. The Bulgarian delegation played its part in the efforts that led to agreement being reached with regard to this agenda item.

One of the priority tasks of the current session of the Disarmament Commission was to deliberate on various aspects of the arms race and to make every effort to narrow the areas of disagreement.

(Mr. Konstantinov, Bulgaria)

The Bulgarian delegation, together with other delegations, attaches particular importance to the question of curbing the naval arms race. The international community can no longer remain indifferent to the serious threat to international peace and security posed by its continuing escalation.

Sophistication of naval armaments and naval warfare has a destabilizing effect on the international situation and increases the risk of the outbreak of nuclear war.

Growing military presence and naval activities in the world's oceans adversely affect the security of international sea lanes, increase their vulnerability and impede peaceful maritime activities. In the current strained international situation, it is especially necessary to adopt urgent measures aimed at substantially limiting naval activities, reducing naval armaments and extending confidence-building measures to seas and oceans.

There is no doubt that the question is complex. However, it is time to begin by appealing to States to refrain from enlarging their naval activities in areas of conflict or tension, or far from their own shores, and to recognize the urgent need to start negotiations.

To minimize the significance of the question and the dangers of the naval arms race and of naval activities, as some delegations have done, cannot be considered the best way to handle a vitally important issue. The existence of disagreement and divergent views should not prejudice the consideration of an issue and should not be used as a pretext to prevent United Nations bodies from dealing with this problem and, in doing so, from looking for appropriate ways and means to accommodate the divergent views and to find a mutually acceptable solution.

My delegation is of the view that initiation of consideration of the question of curbing the naval arms race cannot be considered premature, because the naval arms race has for long adversely affected the peace and security of the entire world and of each individual country, and because this question has been neglected thus far.

The relevant General Assembly resolution adopted an objective approach to the problem and inter alia invited

"Member States, particularly the major naval Powers, to consider the possibility of holding direct consultations, bilateral and/or multilateral, with a view to preparing the opening at an early date of such negotiations".

(General Assembly resolution 39/151 I, para. 3)

(Mr. Konstantinov, Bulgaria)

So far only one of the nuclear-weapon States and major naval Powers - namely, the Soviet Union - has responded positively and made concrete proposals in this regard.

The Bulgarian delegation believes that the discussion of all proposals put forward thus far - in particular, those included in working paper A/CN.10/73 - and the consideration of this question at the current session of the Commission, as well as any other views and proposals which may be presented in the future, should be aimed at preparing the ground for a direct transition to negotiations with a view to arriving at mutually acceptable agreements.

Obviously, all appropriate measures should be worked out and implemented in accordance with the principle of not impairing the security of any State, with due regard for all factors determining the balance of forces on the seas, as well as other types of arms limitation which, in one way or another, involve naval forces.

The study relating to naval armaments conducted by the United Nations, in parallel with the discussion in the Commission, should also help to achieve the same concrete results.

In this regard, a useful initial consideration of the agenda item on curbing the naval arms race took place at the current session of the Commission. The Bulgarian delegation would suggest that the Secretariat consider the possibility of bringing to the attention of the experts preparing the respective study the views of delegations as expressed in the discussion on this issue.

Before concluding, Sir, may I extend to you my gratitude and highest appreciation for your excellent performance in discharging with skill the difficult duty of the Commission's Chairman. I wish also to congratulate the officers of the Commission and Mr. Alem, the Secretary of the Commission, and the other members of the Secretariat for their remarkable efforts to help the Commission in its work.

Mr. KONISHI (Japan): We are now approaching the end of our work at this session of the Commission. Under your able guidance and wise leadership, Mr. Chairman, I believe we have done all that was possible within a limited period of time towards the development and formulation of generally acceptable solutions to the complex issues facing us.

What we have accomplished here may not seem particularly significant in the light of the great urgency usually associated with these issues. But my delegation, for one, feels that the efforts made by many delegations in the quest for consensus were encouraging, even though concrete results were not always

(Mr. Konishi, Japan)

achieved. I am convinced that the insight and understanding gained from our deliberations here will benefit our future efforts to narrow down the differences of views still existing among us.

Looking back over our work thus far, we realize that procedural discussions regarding the establishment of a working group on a particular agenda item distracted us for too long from more substantive considerations. This occurred in spite of your indefatigable efforts, Mr. Chairman, to reconcile opposing views, not only during the first part of our session, but also even prior to the opening of this session. As a result, the time available for deliberations on issues whose importance had long been unanimously accepted, such as the role of the United Nations and the mid-term review, was reduced. There is certainly a lesson to be learned here in terms of the conduct of next year's session.

Let me make a few comments on the individual items we have dealt with.

With regard to item 4, all of us started our work with renewed hope that we would be able to move at least one step forward by removing existing brackets in the recommendations. However, to our disappointment, a number of new paragraphs with brackets were introduced, and the number of existing ones was not reduced. In this connection, my delegation notes with great concern that repeated attempts were made to impose reservations on some of the key paragraphs on which there was already a consensus. Such an approach can only work to complicate the already difficult task facing us. My delegation strongly hopes that in our discussions next year on this item we will make real progress by adopting a substantially improved method of work.

Together with like-minded delegations the Japanese delegation co-sponsored the working paper on this item (A/CN.10/1985/CW/WP.2), which was introduced by Belgium. We believe that the paper provides us with a comprehensive and balanced look at the whole issue under review, and hope that it will be fully discussed during the course of deliberations on this item next year.

With regard to the reduction of military budgets, there was some limited progress, and we hope that delegations will make strenuous efforts at the next session to confront the need for fair comparability of military budgets as well as for effective verification, so that our work may at long last be brought to a successful conclusion.

(Mr. Konishi, Japan)

In this regard we again emphasize the importance of the standardized reporting instrument developed by the United Nations. It is a welcome sign that one country from among the Warsaw Pact members presented its report recently. We hope this example will soon be followed by other Warsaw Pact countries as well as by all other countries which have so far failed to present their reports.

On the question of the nuclear capability of South Africa, once again we failed to reach agreement. Only by sending a clear message, reflecting the consensus of the international community, can we apply effective pressure against South Africa. We therefore need to work strenuously to reach agreement on this question as soon as possible by adopting a flexible approach to various controversial elements.

(Mr. Konishi, Japan)

I should just like to reiterate that the Government of Japan does not render any co-operation to South Africa in the field of nuclear development, including peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

I believe that the comprehensive review on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament comes at a very opportune time, as we prepare to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations. I am pleased to note that the Working Group on agenda item 7 has drawn up a programme of work, which was subsequently adopted by consensus in the plenary. It is our earnest hope that fruitful discussions with the participation of all Member States will be held on the basis of this programme and that concrete proposals or recommendations will be forwarded to the General Assembly in the coming years. My delegation is eager to contribute towards that end.

On item 8, my delegation pointed out at the beginning of this session that it was both inopportune and inappropriate to enter into substantive discussion on this subject on the basis of General Assembly resolution 39/151 I. It is inopportune because the study on this subject is still under way; it is inappropriate because of the very one-sided nature of that resolution.

A series of general statements in the Committee of the Whole only confirmed our apprehension in this regard. They were mostly one-sided, tendentious and accusatory, and paid little regard to the security needs of the countries involved. It was no wonder that the report on this item contained the statement that no consensus was possible. My delegation believes that this sober experience must be borne in mind when the matter in question is referred to the General Assembly at its forthcoming session.

Finally, my delegation wishes to express particular satisfaction with the consensus text concerning the review and appraisal of the implementation of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. The spirit of mutual accommodation and co-operation displayed by all delegations should be taken as a hopeful and encouraging sign for the implementation of the Declaration in the remaining years of the Decade.

In conclusion, the Japanese delegation wishes to express its deep appreciation of the tireless efforts made by you, Mr. Chairman, and the Chairmen of the three Working Groups, as well as the Secretary and his supporting staff. What progress we have made at this session is due in no small part to your dedicated and perceptive leadership.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I note that as we are concluding our session we are experiencing a veritable spate of speeches. Despite their generally gloomy note, perhaps, as regards our work in this body and the future of that work, they can be said to represent what Dr. Johnson said of a second marriage, that is, "the triumph of hope over experience".

I apologize for the fact that my delegation will have to make its contribution and that I cannot entirely follow the admirable advice of one of our colleagues in another context, that is to k-i-s-s - "Keep it short, stupid".

The representative of Italy earlier today made a statement on behalf of the 10 delegations of the European Community, including my own. What I would like to do is to add some supplementary comments from my delegation's individual perspective.

Despite the regrettable initial procedural paralysis imposed by one group of delegations, in our view this session has turned out to be not without its positive aspects. To that outcome, Sir, your skilful and cheerful chairmanship has contributed to a marked degree. For example, the results that we were able to achieve on item 9, the preliminary review of the Second Disarmament Decade, were the most positive of the session and show what can be done given goodwill and constructiveness.

Item 7, The review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, is a new and important subject on our agenda. We warmly applaud the initiative of the Government of Cameroon in inscribing this item. We also welcome the working paper produced by the Cameroonian delegation in document A/CN.10/71. This is an impressive piece of work by any standard. In many ways it is the most refreshing and thought-provoking piece of work in the field of disarmament that we have been asked to consider for a long time. It will continue to provide an important basis for our future work on this item.

We sympathize with the concerns which have led the Government of Cameroon to take this initiative. We understand these to be a desire on the part of a number of countries for a greater say in the disarmament process, and frustration at the failure of the international security system established by the Charter to work effectively. We take these concerns, which are set out clearly in the initial part of the Cameroonian paper, very seriously indeed. This is clearly an initiative which merits and should receive the most serious consideration and response.

Despite regrettable and unjustified suspicion on the part of some delegations, which thereby demonstrated a very rigid approach, we are glad that it finally proved possible to agree on a programme of work under this item. This will enable

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

us to get down to proper work on this major subject at our next session. In our view the programme of work agreed could and should lead to a fresh look at important aspects of the United Nations treatment of disarmament issues.

In our discussion of this item at the current session two issues were referred to by a number of delegations, including my own, as occasioning urgent concern. One was the need to streamline the work of the First Committee. As my Minister of State, Mr. Luce, pointed out at last year's session of the General Assembly, there are too many resolutions in the First Committee, and they are too often repetitive, propagandistic or contradictory, or all three of these things. The list of items to be included in the provisional agenda of the fortieth session of the General Assembly, published in document A/40/50 'Rev.1 of 17 April of this year, already contains a repetition of too many stale items on disarmament subjects considered at previous sessions.

We had hoped that, as suggested in the paper submitted by the delegation of Cameroon, it would have been possible for this Commission at this session to make recommendations on this subject. Unfortunately, the time available did not permit this. The Commission will return to the subject next year, but this does not preclude the First Committee's doing something to remedy the present unsatisfactory situation, as suggested by last year's Chairman, Ambassador Souza e Silva.

Another matter mentioned in the Cameroonian paper and by several delegations in the Working Group on item 7 as needing early attention is the question of United Nations studies. Recent experience - that is, the failure to reach agreed conclusions on two studies, nuclear-weapon free zones and military research and development - suggest that a review of the way in which subjects for study are selected and the way studies are conducted is long overdue.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

It is pointless and a waste of precious resources to set up study groups to look at issues where there is no general agreement on the problem and/or where balanced information on the issues to be addressed is not available. Repeated failure to agree on conclusions only serves to highlight the increasing problems that the United Nations faces in its handling of disarmament questions. We believe that careful thought should be given to this matter before proposing further studies to the General Assembly.

On item 4, on nuclear and conventional disarmament, we should have preferred the latter subject to receive more attention, especially in view of the valuable recent report on the subject. Although, unlike the case with item 9, it did not prove possible to agree on a generally acceptable text, some useful progress was made in establishing a more coherent working document, and the spirit in the Working Group was generally good and co-operative. We would have been ready to give positive consideration to the Brazilian delegation's proposal to send some agreed language to the General Assembly. This did not prove possible in the face of opposition from the delegations of India and Mexico. We therefore support the proposal on this item in the report that next year the Commission should consider whether it is worth continuing what has become a sterile annual exercise.

Similar considerations apply to item 6, on South Africa's nuclear capability. We are disappointed that the Commission has once again failed to agree on firm recommendations concerning this item, despite the extensive efforts of a number of delegations, including my own, within the Working Group and in informal consultations. This is all the more regrettable since there appears to be no difference of opinion on the fundamental issues - that is, that South Africa should end its abhorrent policy of apartheid and that nothing should be done to aid or encourage the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. The item has now been on the agenda of our Commission for several years without any apparent sign of firm recommendations emerging. We wonder, therefore, whether there is any merit in keeping it on the agenda. If it does remain, the Commission should perhaps approach the subject from a different angle. We note that one delegation has already proposed something on those lines. We believe that this idea is worthy of further consideration.

On item 5, on the reduction of military budgets, we had also hoped that it might be possible to send recommendations to the General Assembly at this session and to take the item off our agenda. Regrettably, the maintenance of positions by

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

delegations from one group of countries again prevented consensus on this important subject. It is especially regrettable, as can be seen from paragraph 9 of the Working Group's report, that these same States appear reluctant to discuss in substance the principles of transparency and comparability. We continue to believe that any reduction of military expenditures must be based on these principles. Anything other than this would be meaningless. In this context, it is encouraging that more States - for example, Romania and Argentina - have used the agreed United Nations reporting instrument to supply data on their military expenditures. It is clear from this that the instrument is gradually gaining the confidence of Member States. We encourage others to follow suit, especially additional Warsaw Pact States. We hope that the General Assembly will agree to the Commission's recommendation that this item should remain on the agenda for another year; in the circumstances, that was the only possible outcome.

The final subject that was on our agenda - item 8, on the so-called naval arms race - was not there at our choosing. We note that, except from the predictable quarter, this initiative received no support. The Commission rightly decided to take no action on it and to send it back to the General Assembly for more mature consideration of the wider subject of naval issues.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia): Let me first express our deep gratitude and appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, for your skilful guidance of our Commission. We are grateful for your patience and competence in discharging your delicate tasks.

The Commission already has seven years of experience. Since its inception it has considered a number of important issues in the field of disarmament. The Commission has affirmed itself as the unique United Nations body for the consideration of disarmament issues, the body in which all countries have an opportunity to participate directly in the consideration and solution of the most important issues of disarmament. Its contribution cannot be judged by simply adding up the number of recommendations it has adopted so far. Nor can it be evaluated by a one-sided assessment of the importance of recommendations submitted to the General Assembly. The role of the Commission is much more complex, and it has a long-term impact.

The Commission is the confirmation of the view that all countries have the right to participate in the consideration of crucial issues of today. The universal membership of the Commission represents the negation of exclusive

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

consideration of disarmament issues by a few, most powerful, countries. The Commission is also an expression of the necessity of considering and solving acute contemporary problems in multilateral forums - above all, within the United Nations. The goal and the role of the Commission have become even more important today, since this year we are observing the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and, particularly, owing to the fact that the state of affairs in negotiations on disarmament offers no basis for optimism.

In the course of the seven years of its work, the Commission has been confronted with numerous problems stemming from the complex nature of the issues it is dealing with. All the hopes vested in the Commission have not been fulfilled so far but, objectively speaking, it has achieved important results which should not be overlooked. The Commission has successfully elaborated elements for the comprehensive programme of disarmament, as well as for the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade.

Furthermore, the Commission has contributed to the clarification of certain questions in the field of nuclear disarmament, common security and confidence-building measures. It has succeeded in contributing to a better understanding of the issue of South Africa's nuclear capability and has shed light on numerous aspects of that problem, which poses a grave threat to peace in the region and beyond. Consideration of the reduction of military budgets of States has proved that this idea, for the implementation of which there exists agreement in principle, should not be left aside, without further deliberation.

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The Commission has established itself as a body that is making a great contribution to keeping the public better and more substantially informed about the seriousness and importance of disarmament issues. This function of the Commission is of exceptional importance, and we believe that its work should be given greater publicity.

The work of the Commission over the past several years leads us to consider what should be done with regard to its method of work and to enhancing its effectiveness. We proceed from the view that the Commission was established in order to contribute to and promote the ongoing negotiations on disarmament, but also to launch new ones.

We must reiterate our view that the Commission should not be burdened with a large number of issues. We are mindful of the limited time at the Commission's disposal as well as some other existing difficulties. It is evident that if we focused on a smaller number of issues there would be a greater possibility of solving some of them. We should concentrate on a number of crucial questions related to the halting of the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race. At the next session of the General Assembly an effort should be made in this direction and the Commission should be given a clear mandate to consider those crucial issues, as well as being entrusted with adopting concrete recommendations within a time-frame to be agreed upon in advance.

The Commission would also be more effective if numerous procedural questions regarding the organization and method of its work were agreed upon before its regular session. This would enable us to proceed with consideration of substantive problems from the very beginning of the session.

This year again we have failed to achieve any substantial progress in the issues that we have considered. This conclusion cannot be avoided.

The Commission considered this year a new item, on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. We would like to express our gratitude to those members of the Commission, and in particular Cameroon, as a result of whose initiative the General Assembly decided at its last session that comprehensive consideration of that exceptionally important issue should be undertaken. We would like to stress that the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament really should be comprehensive. This implies a review not only of the negotiating machinery and negotiations on disarmament but also of the political aspect of the problem. Mere consideration of the existing machinery is not sufficient. We must not lose sight of the principles and objectives laid down at

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which led directly to the establishment of that machinery. We consider that the machinery should primarily serve the purpose of the implementation of the tasks entrusted to it at the first special session devoted to disarmament. In that sense, it would be useful if, whenever the need arises, all proposals that could contribute to a more effective functioning of the machinery were to be considered.

None the less, simple reorganization of the machinery without taking into account the political aspect of the problem would not help us to achieve our real goals. In our view, the absence of results in the field of disarmament cannot be explained by the machinery's lack of effectiveness. Obviously, the causes are different. Our commitment to the principles and goals unanimously adopted at the first special session devoted to disarmament should be renewed and enhanced. It is also necessary to reaffirm the central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, as well as the right of all countries to be equal participants in consideration of and negotiations on the crucial issues of the day.

The review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament is a more lengthy process that does not end with this session of the Commission. Next year we should proceed to a more detailed consideration of that question in order to enable us to adopt concrete decisions regarding the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament at the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Mr. ADJOYI (Togo) (interpretation from French): "The shell fired from the cannon's mouth does not discriminate between soldier and civilian, innocent and less innocent, women, old people, children, the able-bodied; the shell fired from the cannon's mouth is indiscriminate in the havoc it wreaks among the population. A nuclear bomb does not differentiate between developed countries and underdeveloped countries; chemical and bacteriological weapons, when they are launched, will not select their victims. All strike indiscriminately. The unbridled nuclear-arms race is a threat to all mankind, poor and rich, developed and less developed, alike."

Those are the words in which His Excellency the President and founder of the Rally of the Togolese People and President of the Republic of Togo expressed the deep concern of the Government and people of Togo at the arms race, especially the nuclear-arms race, which threatens the international peace and security that are indispensable if we are to carry out successfully the various development programmes that are necessary for our peoples to flourish.

(Mr. Adjoyi, Togo)

How can we speak of development without peace, and how can men, women and children be provided with the bare necessities for existence without development? How can we continue to sink billions upon billions of dollars in armaments while the men, women and children we seek to protect do not even have enough to eat or drink and are doomed to a death even more cruel than death by weapons?

Those are questions with regard to which our consideration of some of the items on our agenda - in particular, consideration of various aspects of the arms race, the reduction of military budgets, the curbing of the naval arms race and the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament - has, unfortunately, not had the hoped-for result, namely, the adoption of concrete measures for the effective solution of disarmament problems in order to bring about the peace and security to which we all aspire.

(Mr. Adjoyi, Togo)

In fact, as we have considered, either in plenary or in working groups, these different agenda items one by one at this session, which is now drawing to a close, we have once again made statements - each more brilliant than the other - to recall the lofty principles embodied in the Charter of our Organization, only to retreat behind the screen of certain unspoken selfish interests when it comes to taking concrete measures to tackle these various disarmament problems. This has shown a clear lack of political will, which could be explained inter alia by the general absence of a clear global vision of our humanity, which we should all protect together. We have often lost sight of the interdependence of our States and of the way in which they complement each other. We too often forget that nuclear war will spare no one.

The difficulties that we have encountered during our consideration of the questions put before us stem basically from that lack of political will which is related to factors such as distrust, fear and the defence of national interests, of which that lack of a global vision of the need to protect mankind forms a part. And yet we all agree that peace is necessary on our earth. It is therefore time for our respective countries to display greater political will so we may make greater progress towards general and complete disarmament.

It is in this context that the Government of Togo is sparing no effort to make its contribution to the solution of disarmament problems with a view to peace in the world. Togo is a country of peace, and the constant search for peace, in Togo, in Africa and in the world at large, is the basis of its foreign policy.

Togo has all the necessary political will to help to resolve the problem of disarmament and it is applying that will very actively: by way of example, I might mention the National Seminar on Peace and Disarmament organized at Lomé from 6 to 10 August 1984 with the co-operation of the United Nations. Another example is General Assembly resolution 39/63 J, which Togo ensured was adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session in the context of the World Disarmament Campaign.

By associating the United Nations with its various activities, the Government of Togo wishes to underscore the fact that it believes in the fundamental role that the United Nations can and does play in the field of disarmament. The Commission will therefore understand the particular importance that the delegation of Togo attaches to agenda item 7 of the Commission's agenda, on the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, and to the important document

(Mr. Adjoyi, Togo)

submitted by Cameroon, for which my delegation would once again like to express thanks and congratulations. It is regrettable that that document was not used for the formulation of concrete proposals at this session.

My delegation would like to recall once again that the role of the United Nations derives from the will of the States Members of the Organization. The United Nations is and will be what States want it to be, and the Organization cannot resolve problems of peace and security without the political will of States: hence the need for consciousness-raising activities that will lead to a broader awakening of that political will.

In this framework, the World Disarmament Campaign must be encouraged and strengthened, particularly through the establishment of regional mechanisms which should not limit their role to merely providing information but should also deal with peace and security problems as a whole.

For the Government of Togo, as is clearly stated in document A/CN.10/69, the establishment of regional bureaux will among other things provide the appropriate supporting mechanism for achieving the goals of the World Disarmament Campaign, in particular that of informing, educating and stimulating the public at large in their understanding and support for the goals of the United Nations on the issue of arms limitation in all regions of the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to congratulate you for the skill, wisdom and patience which you have demonstrated in guiding our work. We should also like to congratulate the other officers of the Commission and to congratulate the chairmen of the working groups for their efforts and their helpful attitude. We would like to share with them both their disappointments and their satisfactions, with the hope that their task will be made easier at our next session.

I could not conclude my statement without paying tribute once again to Mr. Jan Martenson for his commitment and his determination to carry out successfully the programme of activities assigned to his department.

Mr. GBEHO (Ghana): My delegation came to this substantive session of the Disarmament Commission with some hope and expectation that we would this time make a breakthrough or at least achieve substantial progress from where we left our work last year.

Our hope was founded, first, on the modest but perceptible improvement in the international atmosphere which, by general consensus, seemed to have been brought about by the resumption of the bilateral disarmament talks in Geneva between the two super-Powers on outer space, strategic and medium-range missiles. We had expected, therefore, to see reflected in the deliberations of the Disarmament Commission this year some of the positive impact which the return to the Geneva bilateral talks was supposed to have had on the disarmament field as a whole.

Secondly, my delegation's expectation had been raised this year because the Commission had decided to focus its attention on a narrow range of subjects which had been exhaustively discussed over the past several years and which therefore, in common with many delegations, we considered were ripe for agreement and could be disposed of at this session given the necessary goodwill and political will on all sides. I had in fact derived some personal satisfaction from seeing that our work had been reorganized and streamlined in this way this time, because it was one of the principal recommendations that I made to the Commission when I had the honour of serving as its Chairman last year. I therefore had every hope and reason to expect that the change in our method of work would help bring about positive results in our deliberations at this session.

On both counts my delegation has been sadly disappointed. We have seen little or nothing at all of the change of heart or tactics that we had expected. After nearly four weeks of deliberations, and in spite of our disappointment, my delegation believes it is appropriate that we assess our work and see which way we can move in the future. In so doing, bearing in mind the time available to us, I shall direct my comments mainly to the report of Working Group II, with which my delegation has been most closely concerned at this session.

As its report confirms, once again Working Group II could not arrive at a consensus on the question of the nuclear capability of South Africa. In spite of intensive consultations, no progress could be made on the text of the working paper as we left it last year. In the face of this seemingly insurmountable impasse, we need to ask ourselves whether the supposed obstacles to achieving a consensus are real or not.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

First, there is the objection to describing South Africa's nuclear capability as posing a threat to international peace and security, on the grounds that the Security Council alone is qualified to make such a pronouncement. My delegation has been at pains to point out that, in operative paragraph 1 of its resolution 418 (1977), of 4 November 1977, the Security Council indeed made that pronouncement against South Africa in precisely those terms. Are we therefore seriously seeking to bring an end to the apartheid system in South Africa by insisting on not using that phrase or are we content merely to indulge in its pious condemnation? Are we justified in this forum in trying to alter the principle already established and adhered to by the Security Council?

The second observation that I wish to make relates to the distinction that some delegations have persistently sought to make between military and peaceful uses of nuclear power. We do not deny that such a distinction can be drawn, but simply wish to state that a régime with such a record of duplicity and unreliability as the racist régime of South Africa cannot be trusted with nuclear power even for peaceful purposes, especially when it persistently refuses to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and will not put its activities under our common safeguards system. Indeed, we have, if anything, been strengthened in our conviction that South Africa should never be allowed to possess nuclear capability of any sort if all it takes to convert peaceful nuclear power to military use is a tiny trigger device, as recent reports in the press would seem to confirm. Those who have argued in favour of allowing South Africa access to peaceful uses of nuclear power should know that the dividing line is very thin and easily crossed and should now realize what a grave responsibility they must bear in contributing to South Africa's nuclear capability. They have done nothing but help to undermine the peace and security of the rest of Africa.

This should also put to rest doubts that have been raised as to whether South Africa has or has not nuclear capability. If it does not have that capability, it surely should not take long for some of the nuclear trigger devices reported in The New York Times yesterday to have been illegally exported from the United States to Israel to find their way to South Africa. In this regard, we should like to state that it is for those who have argued against singling out Israel for condemnation for its nuclear collaboration with South Africa to prove that no such collaboration in fact exists. So far, no such proof has been forthcoming and, besides, it is not clear to us why they cannot leave Israel to speak in its own defence, if indeed it is that innocent.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

Let me make a third point on this issue by inviting those Western countries which do not wish to be mentioned along with Israel as collaborating with South Africa simply to heed the protests and demonstrations of constituencies and persons in their own countries against apartheid and withdraw investments from South Africa. It is their transnational corporations that are engaged in reaping huge profits from the sweat and labour of the suffering black population of South Africa and Namibia, and they should act to withdraw those corporations and investments if they genuinely wish to see apartheid dismantled.

A fourth point that needs to be addressed briefly is the question of the permanent sovereignty of the people of Namibia over their natural resources. If the Namibian people are to be denied that right in perpetuity, may we ask whether this situation is not as unreasonable as asking when the people of the United Kingdom, for instance, intend to relinquish their sovereignty over North Sea oil, since presumably they do not propose to exercise it permanently?

May I, finally, remind those who have sought to confer respectability on the racist régime in South Africa by describing it as the Government of South Africa that Security Council resolution 560 (1985), of 12 March 1985, has more aptly described the so-called Government as the Pretoria régime. Here, again, it is my delegation's belief that we would do well, in the interest of legality and a likely consensus, to follow the example of the Security Council.

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

I should now like to turn briefly to the report of Working Group III on item 7, Review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. As has been observed by others, it is regrettable that the Disarmament Commission failed, at this session, to give this subject the priority attention requested by the General Assembly in its resolution 39/151 G of 17 December 1984. That was, of course, due to the delay in setting up Working Group III, which consequently had only about six meetings in which to do its work.

In spite of the time constraint, it is the view of my delegation that we succeeded in laying a sound foundation for future work on this subject. The list of topics we have identified for appropriate recommendations at a later date is a reflection of the flexibility and spirit of co-operation that characterized the deliberations of Working Group III once the initial procedural uncertainty had been overcome.

There could be no finer moment, no more appropriate occasion, than the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations to initiate, as we have done, a review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. It is a monumental enterprise since we intend it to be a comprehensive review and we have taken an important step forward. We should like in this regard to express, in particular, our appreciation to Ambassador Engo of Cameroon and his delegation for the broad scope and breadth of vision displayed in their Government's important and excellent contribution to the review (A/CN.10/71). It is undeniably a document that will continue to inspire us in our future consideration of this subject.

I now wish to make a brief comment on agenda item 8, Curbing the naval arms race. In our discussion of this item we heard suggestions that because the subject was being studied by an expert group it should not be discussed in this Commission. My delegation does not share that point of view. Indeed, we consider that any views and comments that may be expressed in the Commission, a deliberative body, may prove useful to the expert group. But even more important than that, we are concerned at what we regard as a creeping attempt to curtail debate in this forum, an attempt to compartmentalize and to create exclusive reserves. My delegation has already had occasion to point out, in relation to the item on nuclear capability of South Africa, that the jurisdiction of the Security Council should not preclude us from commenting freely on matters that may be before the Council or within its competence, especially those that are unceasingly threatening international peace and security. We urge all delegations, therefore, to bear in

(Mr. Gbeho, Ghana)

mind that the Disarmament Commission is a deliberative body and that it should not be fettered in the discharge of its function in the field of disarmament, whatever other United Nations bodies, including the Security Council, may be doing.

Let me also spare a brief thought for the future. In view of the continuing deadlock over several items on our agenda, particularly the item relating to the nuclear capability of South Africa, we must pose the hard question whether it is worth trying to operate on the basis of seeking consensus on every question before us. I raised that question at the end of the session of the Commission that I was privileged to preside over, and now it has again been raised by the representative of Cyprus, and we ought to give it serious thought before the next session of the Commission. As the representative of Cyprus rightly pointed out, consensus was never intended to paralyse our work; it was thought desirable or preferable if there was a possibility of achieving it. In those instances where, year after year, it has become abundantly clear that no such possibility exists, we should be prepared to face reality and act accordingly.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to express the thanks and profound appreciation of my delegation for the diligence and skill with which you have conducted our deliberations at this session. You have more than lived up to the confidence we placed in you when we elected you as our Chairman. We extend to the other officers of the Commission the same sentiment of thanks and appreciation.

Mr. TINCA (Romania): As we conclude this year's session of the Disarmament Commission, all delegations seem to agree that the results of our work are limited. An honest assessment of the recommendations to the General Assembly contained in the report already adopted against the background of the present serious international situation shows that the fruits of our work are undoubtedly modest.

Unfortunately, there is also a failure to achieve concrete results in other disarmament forums, both multilateral and bilateral. It is regrettable that the first round of the Soviet-United States talks in Geneva were concluded without notable results. As a matter of fact, there were no results at all. The Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has been unable for many years to reach substantive agreement on any item on its agenda. The same is true for the negotiations in Vienna on Mutual Reduction of Forces and Armaments in Central Europe or in Stockholm on confidence-building measures and disarmament.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The fact that the lack of results in all those forums was matched, and we think not coincidentally, by continuing acceleration of the arms race, particularly in the nuclear field, and the constant increase of military expenditures, is a sound reason for grave concern.

Enormous quantities of nuclear weapons, far beyond those required for security reasons, have been accumulated in the world. They have brought no more security; on the contrary, by its intensity and growing scope, the arms race has increased the threat of another world war that would inevitably lead to a nuclear catastrophe. A highly dangerous situation has developed in Europe where new nuclear missiles continue to be deployed. There is a greater danger that the arms race is extending to outer space, stepping up further the military competition and considerably increasing the threat of a destructive war.

It has become self-evident that the cessation of the arms race, and first and foremost the nuclear arms race, the transition to disarmament, the elimination of the danger of a world war and the maintenance of peace and security, constitute the fundamental task at present.

In these circumstances, the absence of practical results, which is a common feature of this Commission as well as of the entire disarmament machinery, far from inspiring any sentiment of resignation, emphasizes more than ever the urgent need for resolute action on behalf of peace and disarmament.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

This is all the more valid since the fruitless ongoing negotiations and even certain calls for realism seem to suggest that an attempt is being made to appease public opinion so as to accustom people to the idea that the arms race can be accepted as a simple fact of life.

As was stated recently by the President of Romania, widespread action to embrace and unite the endeavours of all Governments, parliaments, progressive political parties, trade unions and cultural, scientific and religious organizations and institutions all over the world appears timely and necessary in order to give a new impetus and dynamism to the efforts being made to reverse the present trend towards nuclear war, to halt the arms race and to proceed to real disarmament negotiations in a spirit of high responsibility for the peace and security of every State and for the future of our planet.

That is also the central idea of the appeal for disarmament and peace that the National Council of the Socialist Unity and Democracy Front, the largest and most representative organization of the Romanian people, addressed a few days ago to political parties, democratic organizations and Governments and all the peoples of European countries, the United States and Canada.

Romania considers that everything should be done to ensure that the negotiation between the Soviet Union and the United States in Geneva lead to the conclusion of real agreements on nuclear weapons and space arms. In order to create an atmosphere of confidence conducive to the successful conclusion of these negotiations, we advocate the halting during the Geneva negotiations of the testing and production of nuclear weapons, the deployment of additional nuclear missiles in Europe and all activities connected with the militarization of outer space. All European countries, especially those on whose territory nuclear missiles are deployed, should make a greater contribution to halting the further deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe and achieving appropriate agreements on this issue.

We also advocate resolute efforts to step up the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, the Stockholm Conference and the Vienna talks with a view to reaching concrete agreements on nuclear disarmament and the reduction of armaments, enhancing confidence and peace.

The exchange of views held during this session revealed again the serious concern among States with regard to the growing military expenditures. The facts show that the enormous amounts of money spent on armaments do not bring more security, and we are confident that sooner or later all of us will come to the conclusion that the present policy of increasing military budgets is a tragic error

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

of our times. The Romanian delegation, as everyone knows, has always attached particular importance to the question of the reduction of military budgets, and it will continue to do so. The concrete proposals by my country to freeze and reduce military expenditures and to reallocate the resources thus saved for economic and social development were once again reiterated recently by President Ceaucescu. As the President of Romania stated a few days ago, a freeze on military budgets at this year's level and their reduction by 5 per cent to 10 per cent in the following years would have a positive impact on the international political climate and would facilitate the implementation of economic and social projects.

The serious situation currently prevailing requires measures to step up activities in the bodies and international conferences devoted to disarmament. It is now more than ever necessary to ensure that the central role and primary responsibility of the United Nations in the field of disarmament are fully demonstrated and that these functions are performed more effectively. As an organization of universal scope, the United Nations must direct its main efforts towards the identification of the political will and determination of all States, and primarily the nuclear-weapon States and other heavily armed States, to initiate action geared to the prevention of war, the cessation of the arms race and the achievement of nuclear disarmament.

In that regard, my delegation welcomed the inclusion in the agenda of this session of the Commission of the item relating to the review of the United Nations role in the field of disarmament, and we took an active part in its examination. As we have already stated, the Romanian delegation considers that the review of the ways and means of strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament is of great political and practical importance, linked as it is to the primary task of the United Nations, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security. We hope that next year the Commission will be in a position to elaborate and adopt recommendations which would lead to a genuine strengthening of the role and efficiency of the existing multilateral machinery for deliberation and negotiation in the field of disarmament.

In further considering this item it will be essential to address the root causes of the present situation and the reason why for so many years disarmament efforts have been blocked in spite of the will expressed by the overwhelming majority of States and by the world public. The lack of specific results in this Commission, as well as in other disarmament forums, can in no way call in question the democratic feature of the existing machinery, which represents, inter alia, one

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

of the most notable achievements of the first special session devoted to disarmament. Our feeling of frustration is due to the absence of the political will on the part of certain States to recognize the vital interest of all States in disarmament and to use more effectively the multilateral forums for deliberation and negotiation in the field of disarmament. In this context we express our regret and astonishment that ideas and even written proposals have been submitted with regard to the possible dissolution of the Disarmament Commission, a forum in which all Member States of the United Nations are represented and which has a specific position and role in the multilateral machinery for disarmament.

My delegation considers it essential that any efforts or proposals to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament should lead to further enhancement and development of the democratic character of the existing machinery for debate and negotiation on disarmament questions. We want to make it very clear that any measures intended to adjust, rationalize or improve the functioning of the existing machinery are totally unacceptable to us if they are meant to limit the right of all States, regardless of their size and economic or military potential, to participate effectively in deliberations and negotiations on disarmament and to raise in the forums dealing with disarmament the problems they consider most important in relation to international peace and security. It is the conviction of the Romanian delegation that today, when dialogue and co-operation are based on awareness of the immense danger to the very existence of all peoples, posed by the continuation and acceleration of the arms race, it is of paramount importance that all States have the right and the duty to participate in and contribute to the disarmament process.

Before concluding, permit me, Mr. Chairman, to associate my delegation with those which have congratulated you on the exemplary manner in which you have guided the work of this session. In presiding over our deliberations you have demonstrated diplomatic talent and ability, patience and calmness, flexibility and determination in command, and for this you have our admiration. As Chairman of Working Group I, I was privileged to serve under your guidance, and I wish to thank you personally for the support you extended to me. I wish also to express our congratulations to the other officers of the Commission and especially to our Rapporteur, Mr. Laclaustra, to the Chairmen of Working Groups II and III and to the secretariat of the Commission, who contributed greatly to the orderly conduct of the Commission's work.

Mr. HANDOGHITY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic would like to take this opportunity to make a few comments on the results of the work of our Commission.

Of course, those delegations that took note of the virtual lack of tangible results in our work as regards practical disarmament measures were correct. Like many other delegations, we are not satisfied with such a situation, when for a number of years now the Commission has been unable to agree on concrete recommendations on problems that have long been ripe for solution. This is attested to, in particular, by the deadlock on items 4, 5 and 6 of our agenda. In this connection I should like to emphasize that the lack of progress in producing recommendations on South Africa's nuclear capability, for example, is a consequence of overt attempts on the part of a small number of States which have ties with the racist régime of Pretoria to impose on the international community their approach to the problem - an approach which is based on their economic, political and strategic interests and which ignores the security interests of African States and others as well.

A similar picture can be seen with regard to nuclear issues and the reduction of military budgets. We have no illusions on the reports of the relevant Working Groups; in effect, they have taken note of the growing divergence of opinions among States. In our view, all this serves once again to reaffirm the well-known thesis that the Disarmament Commission is not working in a vacuum and that its successes are directly proportional to the solution of specific tasks in the field of disarmament. We are deeply convinced that there is clearly a lack of desire on the part of certain countries to heed the voice of reason by renouncing their futile attempts to achieve military supremacy through an accelerated arms race and removing their rejection of practical measures to limit and reduce armaments.

While we are fully aware of the Commission's scant results in promoting the cause of disarmament - for the reasons we have stated here many times in the past - we cannot share the view that this important body is working to no purpose and, hence, has no place in the existing United Nations disarmament machinery. Such ideas, it seems to us, play into the hands of those who would limit opportunities for States to express their profound concern regarding the continuing arms race and to draw the attention of the international community to problems requiring constructive deliberation and immediate decisions.

(Mr. Handoghiy, Ukrainian SSR)

The general discussion of agenda items in the Working Groups has unquestionably showed that the overwhelming majority of States are aware of the growing threat of nuclear catastrophe and that concrete and specific steps must be taken to avoid it. A role can and should be played by our Commission, as well as by the United Nations as a whole, in seeking solutions to these problems. We welcome the agreement on guide-lines for carrying out a comprehensive review and appraisal of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. Of great significance is the fact that, with regard to the problem of enhancing this role of the United Nations, a high priority has been given to the political aspect of our activities: the necessity for strengthening the collective action of States to achieve disarmament objectives. Also, we can consider as positive the result of our work in plenary meetings held on the question of curbing the naval arms race and limiting and reducing naval armaments. Although some delegations tried to hamper our consideration of this item, the discussion has clearly demonstrated that the initiatives of the People's Republic of Bulgaria are extremely timely, relevant and important. Many speakers stressed the danger posed by the arms race on the seas and oceans - a threat to international peace and security which affects two thirds of the world's surface. We are sure that the discussion of this issue this year will play a positive role in helping to find solutions.

The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic believes it necessary once again to stress that measures to enhance the effectiveness of our Commission can be found, not in various proposals regarding the machinery or the restructuring of this body, but rather in the presence or absence of the political will of States to resolve those problems now facing mankind on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security. As has been demonstrated at this session of the Commission, the socialist States have that will.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me thank you sincerely for your skilful and effective guidance of the work of the Commission. I wish also to express our appreciation to the other officers of the Commission, to the Chairmen of the Working Groups and to the members of the Secretariat who have assisted you in carrying out your responsible duties.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.