



---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 29TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

Draft resolutions were introduced by:

Mr. Marinescu (Romania) - A/C.1/35/L.9  
Mr. Lidgard (Sweden) - A/C.1/35/L.10  
Mr. Mihajlovic (Yugoslavia) - A/C.1/35/L.7

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31 TO 49 AND 121 (continued)

The PRESIDENT: The Committee will begin this morning its consideration and action upon draft resolutions on all disarmament items. The Committee will have 26 meetings, including this morning's meeting, to deal with and to conclude the consideration of the disarmament items by 25 November.

I now call on Mr. Marinescu, the representative of Romania, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.9.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): Today I should like to refer to the question of the freezing and the reduction of military budgets, which is the subject of one of the basic chapters in the report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. We should also like to take this opportunity to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.9.

The discussions which have taken place at the present session, both in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly and in the First Committee, have brought out the fact that the constant increase in military expenditure now is one of the most disturbing aspects of the arms race.

Particularly eloquent in this connexion is the index made available to us by the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, which reveals that no fewer than 81 representatives referred during the general debate to the question of military budgets. This is only natural, because nowadays military expenditure represents a burden weighing very heavily on the shoulders of all peoples. It is a reprehensible waste of material and human resources and a considerable obstacle to economic and social progress and to solving many essential problems for the present and future of mankind. The fact that \$500 billion has

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

this year been swallowed up by the arms race has increased the economic and financial crisis, promotes instability and contributes to perpetuating and aggravating under-development.

In many countries, the rate of increase in military expenditure exceeds the growth in national revenue. For any objective observer of realities, it is obvious that such a course can have no reasonable future and that the only alternative is to intensify efforts by all States to bring about a halt in and a cut-back, before it is too late, of the senseless increase in military expenditures. In our opinion, this is the only option in keeping with the responsibilities of States, primarily the most heavily armed States, with respect to international peace and security. It is consistent with the commitment which they solemnly undertook by virtue of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, namely, to work for general and complete disarmament and collectively to pursue their effort in order to strengthen international peace and security; to implement practical steps to halt and to reverse the arms race, to reduce military expenditures and to use the resources thus released in order to promote the well-being of all peoples and to improve the economic situation of the developing countries.

The constant attention which has been paid by the Romanian Government to the question of freezing and reducing military expenditure is in accordance with the interests of peace and good international understanding and stems from the decision of the Romanian people to devote all its strength and its ability to economic and social development, and to live in peace and co-operation with all other peoples. It is in this spirit that, like other States, Romania has consistently been, and continues to be, in favour of the freezing and reduction of military budgets, either in percentage terms or absolute figures.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

We should like to recall on this occasion also the proposals made by Romania to reduce military budgets by 10 to 15 per cent and to devote the funds thus saved to the social and economic development of every country and, primarily and most importantly, to the developing countries.

Faithful to its position and to its proposals made in this area, Romania has for three consecutive years proceeded to carry out the unilateral reduction of its defence expenditure and has allocated the funds thus released to the implementation of programmes designed to improve the standard of living of the population.

Even if we agree that the real value of unilateral measures is not, as has sometimes been stated, something which goes beyond a mere token gesture, it is quite obvious that the adoption of such measures by the majority of States on the basis of mutual example can make a notable contribution to creating the necessary conditions for negotiations to be undertaken on agreements to reduce military budgets.

We are perfectly aware of the fact that disarmament cannot be accomplished by a single country and even less so by small and medium-sized countries or by developing countries. The solution to the problems of disarmament, including the freezing and reduction of military budgets, requires a political will on the part of States, primarily the nuclear and most heavily armed States, to sit at the negotiating table and to assume specific obligations by virtue of agreements negotiated in good faith. It is, at the same time, our conviction that all States, great or small, important or less important from the military point of view, can and should help to stimulate this political will and to allowing it to make headway.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The first special session devoted to disarmament requested Member States to consider what concrete steps should be taken to facilitate the reduction of military budgets. On this basis, the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly adopted by consensus resolution 34/83 F, which emphasizes that a new impetus should be given to endeavours to achieve agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain, in a balanced manner, military expenditures, including adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties concerned. It also appealed to all States, particularly the most heavily armed States, pending the conclusion of agreements on the reduction of military expenditures, to exercise self-restraint in their military expenditures. The resolution requested the United Nations Disarmament Commission to undertake during 1980 to examine and identify effective ways and means of achieving such agreements.

The debates occasioned by the session of the Commission held last May and June have demonstrated the deep concern of Member States with regard to the economic and social costs of the arms race, particularly in connexion with human and material resources squandered in that race, as well as their conviction that the stockpiling of armaments, far from contributing to strengthening international security, lead, on the contrary, to its continual weakening.

On the basis of the provisions of the Final Document, the Commission reiterated the fact that the final purpose of the efforts to be made in this area should be the conclusion of international agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise limit military expenditures.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The Commission adopted by consensus, on the basis of a joint Romanian-Swedish proposal, a recommendation to the General Assembly that at its next session it continue its examination of the question of the reduction of military budgets and in particular,

"to identify and elaborate the principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military expenditures, keeping in mind the possibility of embodying such principles into a suitable document at an appropriate stage."

(A/35/42, para. 21, 8)

The identification and elaboration of these principles by the United Nations Disarmament Commission, which provided an opportunity for all countries to participate in its work, had the object of establishing a general political framework for efforts by States to conclude Agreements on the freezing and reduction of military budgets. In the opinion of the Romanian delegation, these principles should undoubtedly include the requirement that nuclear States and those most heavily armed be the first to engage in a process of freezing and reducing military budgets. These reductions should be carried out without disturbing the military balance to the detriment of the national security of any particular State. They should also include the principle that multilateral agreements on the reduction of budgets should provide that part of the funds thus released would be reallocated for economic and social development programmes of developing countries.

Like any disarmament measure, agreements affecting the freezing and reduction of military budgets imply the setting up of a verification system as well as the search for solutions to a number of technical problems. Therefore we feel that one of the principles that should govern the activities of States in the freezing and reduction of military budgets is that of ensuring that the implementation of the agreements is verified by appropriate means.

Without underestimating the importance of these aspects, it should not be forgotten, however, that establishing a system of verification and

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

solving the various technical problems should not be regarded as ends in themselves but rather as ways and means of achieving a well-defined final objective, namely, the freezing and reduction of military budgets. The point of departure for the solution of this problem is provided in the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, which states that all verification measures should be adequate and deemed satisfactory by all parties.

Romania participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Panel on Military Budgeting, whose report is before the present session in document A/35/479, and was a sponsor of the draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.10 initiated by Sweden and other States.

While we favour continued careful examination of the technical aspects of the freezing and reduction of military budgets, we believe that these matters must not be considered in isolation; still less should they be regarded as pre-conditions of any practical action in this field. We wish to emphasize once again that the Romanian delegation is in favour of a constructive and flexible approach that will make it possible to identify elements that will make it possible to reconcile the different ways in which States wish to act to reduce military budgets.

The draft resolution which the Romanian delegation has the honour of introducing on behalf of the delegations of Austria, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Sweden, Uruguay and our own country is intended to reaffirm the acceptance by all States of the recommendations contained in General Assembly resolution 34/83 F, which was adopted without vote last year, and also to request the United Nations Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of this matter at its 1981 session and to identify and elaborate the principles which should govern the future actions of States in the field of the freezing and reduction of military expenditures, keeping in mind the possibility of embodying such principles into a suitable document in due course.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The preamble to the draft resolution contains a number of considerations which explain the political reasons for the actions proposed, express the anxiety that has been aroused by the acceleration of the arms race and the increases in military expenditure and emphasize the urgent need for measures to freeze and reduce military budgets. References are also made therein to the Final Document, which has already defined some of the principal parameters of specific measures for the reduction of military budgets, and to previous General Assembly resolutions or proposals made by States in connexion with military budgets. It is also recalled that, in defining the elements of the declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade, the Disarmament Commission also included among the specific measures to be implemented during the coming 10 years measures concerning the reduction of military budgets.

In order to carry out this action in the time provided, it is essential that the elaboration of the principles that should guide the activities of States in the freezing and reduction of military budgets be completed before the end of this decade.

It notes also, in accordance with the Final Document of the special session, the significance of unilateral measures in the field of disarmament and the importance in this connexion of the reduction of military expenditures, in order to create an atmosphere of confidence that will make it possible to move on to the negotiation of agreements.

The operative part of the draft resolution reaffirms, in paragraphs 1 and 2, the provisions of resolution 34/83 F, adopted by consensus by the General Assembly. We would particularly emphasize the appeal made to States, pending the conclusion of agreements on this matter, to exercise self-restraint in their military expenditure. In present international conditions, the tendency continually to increase military expenditures, which is both a consequence of and a factor exacerbating the international situation, adds special significance to this appeal.



(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

In operative paragraph 3 the Disarmament Commission is entrusted with the task foreseen in the recommendation adopted by consensus at the last meeting of the Commission to which we have referred previously. In order to stimulate the interest of all States and to involve them in the process of working out the principles which should govern the activities of States in the field of the freezing and reduction of military budgets, in operative paragraph 4 the Secretary-General is requested to invite Member States to express their views and suggestions on those principles and on this basis to prepare a report to be submitted to the Disarmament Commission at its 1981 session. There can be no doubt that, if support is given by all States to the Secretary-General in the carrying out of this task, this will greatly aid the work of the Commission.

One of the important provisions in the draft resolution is to be found in operative paragraph 5, which emphasizes that the identification and elaboration of these principles should be regarded as complementary to any other ongoing activity within the framework of the United Nations related to the question of the reduction of military budgets. It is hoped that the inclusion of these principles in an appropriate document of the United Nations, adopted by consensus, would create favourable political conditions for the various initiatives and proposals, both past and present, concerning the reduction of military budgets to have a better chance of being brought to fruition.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Operative paragraph 6 provides for the inclusion in the provisional agenda of the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly of an item entitled "Reduction of military budgets".

As can easily be seen, the sponsors have attempted to include in the document non-controversial ideas and provisions which the United Nations has in the past adopted on a consensus basis. We hope thereby to contribute to stimulating the interest of all States in the reduction of military budgets, inducing them to break new ground in this sense and creating favourable conditions for the engendering of the necessary political will to negotiate specific agreements. We are convinced that the fact that this new action is entrusted to the United Nations Disarmament Commission will have a very positive effect on the over-all activities of that body.

In conclusion, I should like on behalf of the Romanian delegation to thank all those delegations which participated in preparing the text of this draft resolution and in particular the sponsors. The extensive consultations which we held in order to promote this initiative and the non-controversial nature of the provisions of the draft resolution lead us to hope that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden attaches the greatest importance to efforts to stop the senseless spiralling increase of world military expenditures. There is no justifiable reason for the present immensely high figures of such expenditures, which present a repugnant contradiction to the needs of the world for providing even the most modest standard of living for its rapidly growing population.

My Government is fully aware that the freezing of military budget levels or - which is of course much more desirable - a lowering of these levels cannot be accomplished by a mere recommendation of the United Nations General Assembly. What is required is a major shift from the present state of distrust, in particular between the super-Powers, to one of real détente, where not only the declarations but also the actions of the major Powers give proof that they are intent on solving their disputes and safeguarding their external security not by military but by peaceful means. We may be a long way from such a situation and this

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

may mean that military expenditures will continue to rise in the years to come, - which they actually seem to be programmed to do and without much concern for the tragic economic and social consequences in many parts of the world where the same resources could be used to save millions of people from starvation and other forms of deprivation.

A telling example of this neglect that at the Pledging Conference yesterday in this very building neither of the two super-Powers pledged any contribution to the operational activities of the United Nations for the benefit of the developing countries.

The social and economic situation in some countries within the two military blocs also bears witness that stability and security are threatened from within rather than from the outside to a not insignificant degree, because resources which are needed for economic and social development in those countries are allocated to military purposes. The forecast for the next five years does not indicate much, if any, economic growth either in the West or in the East. Nevertheless, military budgets are rising considerably in both blocs. Thus it is not difficult to foresee further increasing economic and social problems in both, with inevitable and very serious consequences also for the world outside the two military alliances. We are in my country very concerned over these problems. Yet Sweden belongs to the group of most fortunate countries and a cut in our standard of living, as has been predicted, is considered relatively easy to bear. The majority of the world's countries are, however, close to minimum living levels and they will be much harder hit by the continued rise in the military spending of the super-Powers. It is quite obvious that military overspending in the most powerful countries gives added stimulus to the international inflationary trends which threaten to wreck the financial stability of most national economies.

We do not expect that such reductions can be accomplished in the short term by the adoption of the two draft resolutions on the reduction of military budgets contained in documents A/C.1/35/L.9 and A/C.1/35/L.10. We sincerely hope, however, that the appeal for self-restraint in military expenditures will be heeded by all States immediately and that States will individually make efforts in good faith to reduce their military budgets and reallocate the funds thus saved to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

The purpose of the two draft resolutions, which complement each other, is also to prepare the ground, as regards opinion and through the development of adequate verification measures, for real and substantial reductions of military expenditures, to be agreed upon in a convention.

On behalf of the sponsors, Austria, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Romania and my own country - and I have been advised by the Belgian delegation that Belgium will also become a sponsor - I now wish to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.10.

At its thirty-third session the General Assembly on 14 December 1978 adopted resolution 33/67, entitled "Reduction of military budgets", in which it requested

"the Secretary-General, with the assistance of an ad hoc panel of experienced practitioners in the field of military budgeting:

"(a) To carry out a practical test of the proposed reporting instrument with the voluntary co-operation of States...;

"(b) To assess the results of the practical test;

"(c) To develop recommendations for further refinement and implementation of the reporting instrument."

It also requested the Secretary-General to report to the Assembly at this session on the implementation of the resolution. That has now been done. The test has been carried out and a comprehensive report, contained in document A/35/479, has been prepared by the Ad Hoc Panel and submitted by the Secretary-General.

In my Government's view this report constitutes a very worth-while contribution to the elaboration of a workable instrument for the international reporting of military expenditures, which started already several years ago. As noted in the report, 14 countries from five main geographical regions participated in the test. Although the number of participants could have been larger, several different budgeting and accounting systems are represented by the respondents, which submitted a huge amount of expenditure data as well as other information and several suggestions. That made it possible for the Panel to examine the instrument from many different angles and to evaluate its appropriateness and viability as a means of standardized international reporting.

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

According to the report of the Secretary-General and the ad hoc panel, the test has shown that the instrument constitutes a practical and viable means for such reporting. In its new form, slightly modified by the panel in the light of experience obtained during the test, the instrument should be even better suited to its purposes.

It can be concluded that the carefully elaborated reporting instrument has become available and that a solid and practical basis now exists for decisions with a view to implementing that instrument within an international system of annual and standardized reporting of military expenditures.

Considering the positive results of the test and the recommendation of the ad hoc panel we propose that the General Assembly should implement such a system by recommending all Member States to make use of the reporting instrument and to report annually their military expenditures to the Secretary-General.

It is our opinion that such reporting by an ever-widening set of States would increase international confidence by contributing to greater openness on military matters. We are also convinced that it would be an important first step in the move towards agreed and balanced reductions of military expenditures.

Some countries may find it difficult or too cumbersome to supply all the information requested by the instrument. It should, however, be noted that the structure of the instrument allows for the presentation of data on different levels of aggregation showing different degrees of detail. Consequently it could be expected that all countries should be able to participate in this proposed reporting system by providing at least part of the data requested.

Beyond the confidence-building aspect, which in itself is very important, the implementation of a system for standardized reporting would also serve a further purpose, namely, to help to create the basis needed for negotiations about reductions of military expenditures. Without clear definitions and a forthcoming attitude from all parties concerned there will be little hope for fruitful negotiations. This is, however, not enough. Without generally accepted procedures for comparing the military expenditures of different countries and at different periods of time, it would probably be very difficult to arrive at any long-lasting and substantial agreements to restrain or reduce such expenditures. That is why it is so important to deal with the problems of comparability and to find acceptable and practical solutions to those problems.

This need has already been clearly recognized in General Assembly resolution 3463 (XXX) in 1975 and by the expert group which presented its report in 1976. Although the ad hoc panel was not explicitly requested to work on that subject, it chose not to leave it aside but to deal with it at some length and well enough to underline its importance and to stress the need for further study with a view to finding practical and generally acceptable solutions to that problem.

According to the proposed and recommended reporting instrument, countries are supposed to report their expenditure data in national currencies. In order to allow comparisons, such data have to be converted to a common currency through some set of exchange rates or parities. Practices in this field can be quite different. The main problem of using exchange rates for comparisons between the domestic expenditures of different countries is that such rates are based on price relations between internationally traded goods and services only. It is obvious that in most cases such products do not represent more than a small part of all the services and commodities that are being produced within each country. It is therefore evident that exchange rates established by international trade can only be regarded as approximations of the rates that would prevail if all types of goods and services were taken into account and probably more so if only military goods and services are considered.

This problem of using exchange rates for international comparisons applies not only to the case of military expenditures, but to other domestically accounted expenditure categories as well, as for instance the gross domestic product. As a consequence, that problem has also concerned the United Nations Committee on Contributions, and this has led the Statistical Office of the United Nations to initiate a study aimed at elaborating a world-wide set of so-called purchasing power parities to be used instead of exchange rates for comparisons of data on real gross domestic product per capita. Such parities may also prove to be more suitable than exchange rates for use in comparing military expenditures. That is one of the questions that needs further consideration.

The problem of comparing military expenditures at different periods of time is a matter of defining real military expenditures and changes in such expenditures with regard to price changes. It must be supposed that agreements on reductions of military expenditures will be expressed in real terms, either in absolute figures or as percentage points.

The ideal solution to the problem of deflating price increases for military goods and services would be for each country to have a price index which was agreed to be relevant to the military sector. Very few countries have, however, developed such an index.

In the United Nations expert report of 1976 that question is discussed at some length. Possible ways of constructing a military price index are described, together with the problems of finding accurate statistical data. It is clearly realized that the issue is not purely technical, but that it is also of a political nature, as the kind of index chosen or composed will have an important impact on the rate at which reductions of military expenditures will have to be carried out by countries acceding to such possible future international agreements.

Decisions on those matters can therefore not be taken separately but have to form an integral part of negotiated agreements. Nevertheless, much work can be done to prepare the ground for such decisions, inter alia, by investigating different methods of price deflation based on a survey of available statistical data. Another problem that has to be dealt with in the course of negotiating agreements on reductions of military expenditures is the problem of verifying that all parties to the agreements comply with their stipulations. It is hard to believe that any such agreements can be reached if that question is not solved in a manner satisfactory to all parties concerned. Strong efforts should therefore be made to facilitate future negotiations by investigating such alternative methods of verification that may prove to be practically applicable and generally acceptable.

It is not possible for me in this statement to touch upon all the different aspects of the remaining problems of comparability and verification. I have, however, tried to explain the reasons why we think that those problems should be studied further and why we suggest that the Secretary-General should be requested, with the assistance of a group of qualified experts, to:

"...examine and suggest solutions to the question of comparing military expenditures among different States and in different years as well as to the problems of verification that will arise in connexion with agreements on reduction of military expenditures;" (A/C.1/35/L.10)

At the same time that expert group would be entrusted with the task of further refining the reporting instrument on the basis of further comments and suggestions which we hope will be received from States during its general and regular implementation.

We also suggest that the Secretary-General should be requested to report on those matter to the General Assembly's second special session devoted to disarmament and that he should provide the proposed expert group with the financial and secretariat services it will need for carrying out its important and demanding work.

I apologize for having been somewhat technical in my presentation of the question, but we consider that the technical aspects of this question are of a very important character and that they should certainly not be underestimated.



The CHAIRMAN: I call next on the representative of Yugoslavia, Mr. Mihajlovic, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.7, to the list of sponsors of which the names of Ecuador, Madagascar and Qatar should now be added.

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): On behalf of the following countries co-sponsoring draft resolution A /C.1/35/L.7, which are inscribed in the draft resolution I am introducing, namely, Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Cuba, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Morocco, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Zambia, Ecuador, Madagascar, Qatar, and my own country, I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution relating to agenda item 44 concerning the preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In preparing the draft resolution, the co-sponsors have adhered to the same principles that guided them at the time of the establishment of the preparatory committee for the first special session devoted to disarmament. The purpose of this draft resolution, of a procedural nature, is to set up a preparatory committee and determine its mandate, as provided in operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution. The text of the draft resolution is practically the same as that of resolution 31/189 B of 21 December 1976, which was adopted by the General Assembly without a vote, with some minor additions rendered necessary by the current draft, and mindful of some constructive comments made by certain delegations.

Proceeding from positive experience gained in the course of preparations for the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the co-sponsors have again laid stress on the need to establish a preparatory committee with a definite membership appointed by the President of the General Assembly on the basis of equitable geographic distribution. The advantage of such membership resides in the fact that it ensures a broad representation of all regional groups which will be responsible to the General Assembly for preparations for the second special session.

(Mr. Mihaejlovic, Yugoslavia)

Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution does not provide, at this stage, for the number of members of the preparatory committee owing to the fact that consultations are underway within the framework of regional groups, and in this respect the role played by the Chairman of our Committee is indispensable and greatly appreciated by the sponsors of this draft resolution. Preliminary consultations conducted by the sponsors of this draft have shown that the Member States are increasingly interested in taking full part in the preparations for the second special session and that the number of 54 countries on the preparatory committee for the first special session has proved to be inadequate and should be adjusted to meet new needs, always bearing in mind the principle of equitable geographic distribution. The sponsors are also of the view that once the number of States members of the preparatory committee is determined, other interested countries should not be prevented from participating in the work of the preparatory committee. In view of the fact that preparations for the second special session should start as soon as possible, the sponsors are hoping for an early completion of ongoing consultations with respect to the membership of the preparatory committee, since the draft resolution also has some financial implications that require a timely decision by the General Assembly.

The mandate of the preparatory committee is clearly defined in operative paragraph 2. The preparatory committee is requested to prepare a draft agenda for the second special session devoted to disarmament, to examine all relevant questions relating to that session and to submit to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly recommendations thereon, including those with respect to the implementation of the decisions and recommendations adopted by the first special session devoted to disarmament.

Such a broadly-construed mandate enables the preparatory committee to make - after having considered all relevant questions relating to the second special session - necessary recommendations, including those with regard to

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

the document or documents to be adopted by the second special session devoted to disarmament. In this respect, the preparatory committee should be assisted by the Governments of Member States, which are, under operative paragraph 3, urged to communicate to the Secretary-General, not later than 1 April 1981, their views on the agenda and other relevant questions relating to the second special session.

As was the case with the first special session, it is entirely up to the preparatory committee to decide what recommendations it is going to make. That also applies to the number of substantive meetings to be held by the preparatory committee, depending on the scope of preparations for the second special session. However, I should like to emphasize, and I believe that I am also expressing the views of all sponsors of the draft resolution, that the task of the preparatory committee is not to amend or redraft the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, which was the result of the concerted efforts of all Member States and which was adopted by consensus and belongs to those documents of the General Assembly that are of lasting value. The preparatory committee should, in our view, draw upon that valuable document, elaborate it further and submit recommendations ensuring the implementation of its decisions.

Operative paragraphs 4, 6, and 7 are self-explanatory and I need not comment on them. I wish, however, to draw attention to operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution which, in the present phase, does not provide for dates for the first, short organizational session of the preparatory committee, which in turn has to set, inter alia, the dates for its substantive sessions. There are practical reasons for this, a number of delegations having expressed the wish that this meeting be held during the current session of the General Assembly. This would enable the General Assembly to economize considerably on its financial resources and the delegations would also save time and money, as they would not have to come especially for the organizational session at the beginning of 1981. But the setting of a date for the session depends on a timely

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

determination of the membership of the preparatory committee, which would enable the President of the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly to announce it in the course of the current session.

The countries sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.7 hope that it will be submitted for adoption to the Committee and to the plenary assembly as soon as possible, so as to enable the preparatory committee to meet by the end of the current session. They also express the hope that the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote. On behalf of the sponsors, I also wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your personal involvement in the consultations you have conducted with representatives of regional groups regarding the determination of the membership of the preparatory committee.

(Mr. Mihajlovic, Yugoslavia)

In conclusion, I should like, as I am already speaking, to express, on behalf of the Yugoslav delegation, some preliminary views concerning the convening of the second special session.

In his statement made in this Committee on 22 October this year, the head of the Yugoslav delegation, Ambassador Miljan Komatina, said, with respect to the preparations for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that:

"we have to consider what new content we should impart to that session."

(A/C.1/35/PV.10, p. 46)

He went on to say that:

"A mere reaffirmation of the programme of action adopted at the tenth special session cannot be the only aim towards which we should be tending" because "it would mean that we have reconciled ourselves to the state of stagnation prevailing in the field of disarmament and that we have accepted failure". (ibid.)

My delegation believes that the second special session requires careful preparation. It must look ahead, having as a basis the Final Document of the first special session, in order to give impetus to the implementation of its decisions and recommendations and to identify the new tasks in the field of disarmament and arms limitation. A review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session is, therefore, the most important task before the second special session, since it is only on this basis that it can contribute constructively towards the implementation of the Programme of Action of the earlier session. In other words, the second special session by its over-all results should mark a transition from declarations and recommendations to genuine disarmament measures.

We view the special sessions devoted to disarmament not as an end in themselves but rather as a process. For that reason it would be inappropriate - before we have even started with preparations for the second special session - to reconcile ourselves to the thought that there is nothing much we can do but resign ourselves merely to reaffirming the Final Document once again.

(Mr. Mihajlović, Yugoslavia)

The Preparatory Committee will be faced with the serious task of agreeing on a list and on the contents of measures that it will recommend to the second special session for adoption. Its task will be rendered all the easier if agreement is reached, in the period preceding the second special session, on certain measures of disarmament and arms limitation which are now the object of negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament and in other forums. The basic purpose of those agreements is the adoption of measures for halting the arms race, which is one of the prerequisites for opening a process of disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament.

In the course of the debate, some delegations have laid emphasis on the need to complete certain measures prior to the second special session. My delegation also shares that view. What is involved is the conclusion of negotiations on a comprehensive programme of disarmament to serve as a basis for the consideration of the programme of measures of disarmament to be adopted by the second special session. We believe that it is of the utmost importance to conclude the negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban, to ratify SALT II and to start forthwith negotiations for the reduction of nuclear armaments. The conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction is also one of the required measures to which the General Assembly should accord a high order of priority and which have been on the agenda of the Committee on Disarmament for a number of years. Besides these and some other measures, the second special session should also provide an incentive for the concretization of agreements on the establishment of zones of peace and co-operation in various parts of the world and on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, particularly in regions where they increasingly threaten to provoke armed conflicts and confrontations. We also attach importance to the adoption of measures of disarmament that would make it possible to take a decisive step towards the social and economic development of countries, particularly developing ones, by reducing expenditures on armaments.

(Mr. Mihaejlovic, Yugoslavia)

The second special session should, in our opinion, also contribute to a further strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament. The first special session revitalized that role by reviewing the mechanism of the United Nations through the United Nations Commission on Disarmament, by assigning a new role to the First Committee, by democratizing and expanding the Committee on Disarmament as a multilateral negotiating organ, by strengthening the role of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament and by initiating the elaboration of a number of studies in the field of disarmament.

We feel that the second special session should find, through an analysis of the work of the aforementioned organs, the ways and means most appropriate for enhancing their effectiveness and the contents of their work.

The success of preparations and of the work of the second special session will, however, depend on joint efforts exerted by all the Members and on their firm resolve to initiate a process of genuine disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I would inform the Committee that the United Republic of Cameroon has become an additional sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.7, and Belgium of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.10.

There are no further speakers for this morning's meeting, and before we adjourn I should like to remind members that, in accordance with the understanding reached earlier in the session, no meeting will be convened unless at least four delegations are inscribed to speak. That will certainly enable us to make the most adequate use of the time and resources available to the First Committee, and I would appeal to all members to inform the Secretariat in advance should they find that they are unable to speak as planned so that the understanding may be applied effectively.

There are indeed no speakers for our forthcoming meetings, and if members do not inscribe their names it will be necessary to cancel them.. Once again I urge delegations to inscribe their names as soon as possible so that we may avoid unnecessary cancellations.

The open-ended Ad Hoc Working Group on non-interference in the internal affairs of States will be unable to meet this afternoon as planned, because of lack of speakers, and it will resume its discussion of the item at 10.30 a.m. on Monday, 10 November.

The First Committee also will be unable to meet in the morning of Monday, for the same reason, and it will meet next at 3 p.m. on that day - always provided that at least four delegations inscribe their names to speak then. In the circumstances I would suggest that representatives consult Monday's Journal.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.