



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 15TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. CARIAS (Honduras)  
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

General debate

Statements were made by:

Mr. Neil (Jamaica)  
Mr. Elfaki (Sudan)  
Mr. Menzies (Canada)

UN LIBRARY  
NOV 3 1981  
UN/SA COLLECTION

\* 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 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. NEIL (Jamaica): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I join all those delegations that have spoken before me in congratulating Ambassador Golob of Yugoslavia on his election as Chairman of this Committee. My delegation's congratulations are also extended to you, Sir, and to the other officers of the Committee on your election to your respective posts. Needless to say, the co-operation of the delegation of Jamaica with the Chair may be taken as guaranteed.

It has often been said that in this nuclear age disarmament is a matter of survival. No one has ever doubted the validity of this proposition, yet annually the General Assembly is confronted with a situation where some of its members continue to accumulate ever more weapons of mass destruction. And the pace is quickening. Many speakers who have preceded me in this debate have highlighted and deplored the increased momentum of the arms race and the resurgence of militarism. There can hardly be any doubt that this new phase in the arms race has had adverse effects on international relations and the outlook for the future. The increased tension and rivalry between the military blocs have created an atmosphere of uncertainty and instability in international relations. Peace has been rendered more precarious, and the fabric of international security is increasingly undermined by the relentless escalation in the arms race and the hostile confrontation between the major military Powers.

(Mr. Neil, Jamaica)

In this state of affairs it is important that the General Assembly adopt measures to reverse this trend. There is too much at stake for this Organization to remain a helpless witness to a drift towards a nuclear conflict. Our efforts to halt and reverse the arms race and to promote general and complete disarmament must be redoubled.

Of course, the most effective measure for the prevention of nuclear war is nuclear disarmament. We cannot pretend that this goal can be achieved either quickly or easily. But it is necessary for the process to be started. We have long insisted that the first essential step in the process is the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Unfortunately, the prospects of this step being made appear gloomy. It is evident from the Report of the Committee on Disarmament that there has been no progress in the negotiations; indeed, there is some doubt as to whether there have been any negotiations. Some years ago, negotiations among three nuclear Powers were initiated and we were encouraged to believe that these trilateral negotiations would provide some results -- at least a moratorium on further testing involving the three parties.

Now it is evident that our hopes have been disappointed and, from all appearances, the trilateral talks are in stalemate and are heading nowhere. In this context, my delegation deplores the failure of the Committee on Disarmament to take affirmative action to move the process forward. It is evident from the record that a constructive proposal was made by the Group of 21 to create an ad hoc working group on the test-ban treaty, but the Committee was prevented from taking even this modest procedural step. This naturally raises doubts as to whether the General Assembly can continue to rely on the Committee to deal with these matters when it consistently fails to act on the resolutions of the General Assembly, which have stressed the importance and urgency of concluding a test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Neil, Jamaica)

The failure of the nuclear Powers to agree on the termination of nuclear testing is damaging to the prospects of preventing nuclear proliferation. And as long as the nuclear Powers fail to honour their obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), States not parties to the Treaty will continue to be discouraged from acceding to the Treaty. We have always regarded the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones as an important additional measure to strengthen the régime of non-proliferation, and Jamaica, which is a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, supports the proposed creation of nuclear-free zones in the Middle East, Africa and South Asia. But we are not indifferent to the problem of proliferation in regions where nuclear weapons already exist. Jamaica is most concerned at the nuclear confrontation in Europe and the new weapon systems being deployed in the latest round of the nuclear build-up. It is important in our view that serious efforts be made to reverse this trend. We encourage the parties to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) - the United States and the Soviet Union - to continue that process towards substantial and meaningful results, building on what has already been achieved. In this connexion, we welcome the decision to initiate formal negotiations between the two sides to begin in Geneva at the end of November.

The General Assembly has placed the highest priority on nuclear disarmament, but we also cannot ignore the increasing arms race in conventional weapons and the tremendous expansion in the trade in and other transfers of conventional weapons. It is of particular concern that those weapons are going to regions where unsettled disputes provide a potential for conflict. The infusion of arms into those areas contributes to further instability and the intensification of rivalries at the regional level. The saddest feature of this growing traffic in arms is that an increasing proportion of that traffic is going to developing

(Mr. Neil, Jamaica)

countries, consuming resources which are vitally needed to meet the challenge of development. What is needed in all of these cases is encouragement to the parties involved to resolve their disputes through peaceful means, instead of supplying those parties with more and more weapons and providing the temptation to resort to the use of force. We believe, in short, that in our efforts for disarmament, regional measures should be seen as appropriate and helpful to complement the global effort.

I now turn to the Report of the Committee on Disarmament (A/36/27) which is before us and which deserves our careful attention since the Committee is the principal multilateral negotiating body in the field of disarmament. A careful study of the Report reveals that the results of the Committee's two sessions in 1981 are meagre. We have had occasion in the past to be critical of the Committee's performance, and we had hoped that the reforms resulting from the decisions of the tenth special session of the General Assembly would have enhanced the Committee's effectiveness. But we are still not satisfied that the Committee has adopted the kind of business-like approach which is likely to yield results. We are also concerned about its inability to take decisions even on procedural matters.

I have in mind the inability of the Committee to decide on the creation of subsidiary bodies even where such proposals were overwhelmingly supported. Above all, my delegation is concerned at the lack of responsiveness to the wishes of the General Assembly, which year after year has urged the Committee to complete various agreements on disarmament as a matter of urgency. The resolutions of the General Assembly express the will of the overwhelming majority of mankind and they carry corresponding weight and authority. They cannot therefore be treated lightly or as a matter of routine. It is important in our view that the negotiating body on disarmament should be more responsive to the directions of the General Assembly. We believe that this should be one of the more important matters for consideration at the forthcoming special session devoted to disarmament.

(Mr. Neil, Jamaica)

We have a number of studies which have been prepared and are now before us and which I believe will be very helpful in our future work in disarmament. My delegation attaches particular value to the study of the relationship between disarmament and development. We are impressed by the careful and thorough research undertaken in its preparation. The study provides a valuable basis for further work in channelling resources from the wasteful purposes of weapons manufacture to meeting the economic and social needs of mankind.

In conclusion, in mid-1982 we will be holding the second special session devoted to disarmament. The results of the first special session, in terms of concrete achievements, have been disappointing. It is our expectation that an important step forward will be taken at the second special session by the adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament. Jamaica is hopeful that this special session will not only take this historic step but will also generate a new momentum towards achieving the goal of general and complete disarmament.

Mr. ELFAKI (Sudan) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to congratulate the Chairman and the members of the Bureau on their election. We are fully confident that the Chairman's well-known experience and personal dedication will guarantee a successful conclusion of the work on the agenda of this Committee. I wish to reaffirm the co-operation of the Sudanese delegation and its full readiness to co-operate seriously and in a spirit of understanding in order to ensure the success of the great tasks entrusted to this important Committee.

In his statement before the General Assembly at the beginning of this month, the Foreign Minister of Sudan spoke at length about the great deterioration in international relations today and the ensuing anxiety, fear and frustration, and the apprehension that peace and security in the world would break down. The Foreign Minister of Sudan dealt in great detail, and with much warning, with the numerous and dangerous phenomena that require meditation and deep thought. These are the phenomena of the arms race in all of its forms - aggression, expansion, and interference in the internal affairs of other countries by the great Powers and the militarily and economically powerful, directly or indirectly through agents and allies. The reasons for such phenomena and their results are closely linked to the matters under consideration in this Committee within the framework of the problems of disarmament, peace and international security.

Today I do not wish to repeat the Sudanese declaration in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly. However, I would like to contribute, even in a small measure, by drawing attention to the great danger that we have been speaking about for so many years, a danger which is clearly ahead of us and which menaces us at every moment.

There is no controversy that the main source of concern in the world at large is the wild race which we witness between the great nuclear Powers. It is a race that all of our attempts and resolutions within this Organization and outside of it have failed to curb or halt, in spite of the repeated promises, in spite of some initial steps that have been taken, and in spite of the expressions of good intentions every year.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

As we witness and as we read every day, the major Powers are keen on expanding their military arsenals, and especially their nuclear-weapon capabilities, which reached a sophisticated level of efficiency and precision, and the capacity to destroy the world many times, years ago. We have been following this nuclear arms race with great apprehension and concern because we appreciate, and are fully aware of the consequences and results which might affect international relations if the race continues at such a pace, a race which accords attention only to power and narrow interests, and which is justified only by numerous reasons which we do not find convincing.

The spiralling nuclear arms race and the ensuing apprehension and fear should not lead us to forget all of the interlinked problems which could suddenly transform the race for defence and security into a race towards a true struggle in which we would serve as fodder. Our firm conviction is that the problem of disarmament in all of its aspects is closely linked and profoundly tied to all of the contemporary issues in international relations, and cannot be separated from them or solved without taking into account these varied international issues. This applies to the field of economic, social and cultural relations, as well as to the review of various international instruments, norms and customs, and agreements covering international relations in many fields such as the process taking place with regard to the law of the sea, and steps being taken towards establishing a new international economic order and a new international information order, which would take into consideration the interests of all countries and peoples and their right to live together in peace and security at a dignified human level free from any discrimination on the basis of race, colour, creed or location.

We must all realize and fully comprehend that establishing equitable international relations based on justice, equality, mutual trust and respect would lay the ground work for expanding the opportunities of peace and peaceful coexistence between nations and peoples belonging to different social systems. It would also expand and reaffirm the opportunities for nuclear and non-nuclear disarmament, and would dispel the looming clouds of war and destruction from the consciousness and thoughts of the world.



(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

The responsibility for realizing such a desired system of international relations falls upon us all. However, it may vary in practice according to the importance of the different countries, based on their potential and their influence. This means that the world Powers must assume the greater part of the responsibility in order to achieve progress and success. Therefore, the delegation of Sudan wishes to avail itself of this opportunity to urge all the major Powers, and especially the two super-Powers, to shoulder their fateful and historic responsibilities in order to preserve mankind and its cultural heritage and accomplishments, accumulated over the long path of civilization. It is a great, highly perilous and important responsibility, which requires a high degree of wisdom, understanding, patience, and the necessary will.

What applies to the responsibility of the major Powers can also be applied to the great role that the remaining countries of the world can play, especially the countries of the third world and, above all, the group of non-aligned countries to which we are happy to belong. This group has a major and decisive role to play in the serious endeavours to improve the chances of establishing a new international order on the basis of equality and justice. Those countries must translate into fact the lofty ideals and principles which they have advocated, and they must call on all to strive for peace and security in the world.

We notice in world affairs that there is a polarization and division, which is a source of fear and apprehension. This is a result of the direction taken by international relations, alliances and practices. The non-aligned group, as it celebrates its twentieth anniversary, should continue its positive and effective role, in keeping with the guidelines laid down by the founders of the movement.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

The determination of third-world countries to remain aloof from conflicts between great Powers in any form and to contain international crises and disputes and to solve them through understanding and peaceful dialogue will reduce competition and curb the arms race which we are witnessing the great Powers conduct today, not only in developing lethal nuclear and non-nuclear weapons, but in distributing them to many hotbeds of tension throughout the world. The countries of the third world should close their ranks and should redouble their energies so as to direct international relations and their international capabilities towards establishing an economic and social system and to ensure the future of mankind free from fear of a nuclear or non-nuclear war, either limited or world-wide. The doctrines which relate to limited nuclear war and what we are witnessing in terms of the increased number of bases and military alliances with the great Powers and between the great Powers and many small countries lead to numerous conflicts and increase the danger facing the world, especially the countries and peoples of the third world. These doctrines must be refuted by the third world countries, which must remain aloof from competition and conflict between the great Powers in order to preserve themselves and to protect all the peoples and countries of the world from the dangers of a nuclear holocaust.

There is no doubt that the world today is facing a grave and distinct deterioration in the problems of the arms race, disarmament and the possibilities of curbing that race, because the trend today is to increase the production of conventional and nuclear weapons and to improve the sophistication and possibilities of use of such weapons. There are very many indications of this trend and there is no need to repeat them because the Committee fully understands the situation. Nevertheless, we in the Sudan are sincere in believing that this serious situation and this deterioration should not lead us to despair and to frustration and loss of hope. The questions of halting the arms race and achieving disarmament, as has been mentioned by previous speakers in this Committee and as shown in the statements of the majority of countries before the General Assembly are vital and basic issues which cannot be compromised in spite of the difficulties and numerous obstacles in their path.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

The second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, scheduled for next summer, constitutes an excellent opportunity for the international community to work together seriously towards stemming the grave deterioration in international relations, especially in the field of the nuclear arms race. On this occasion I should like to pay a tribute to the efforts of the Preparatory Committee for the Second Special Session on Disarmament and to express once more our full support for the programme of work which was adopted by the Preparatory Committee. We hope that this programme will meet with full support and endorsement on the part of the members of that Committee and from the General Assembly afterwards. I should like especially to commend the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, the representative of Nigeria, for his effective role in securing the success of that Committee in this field also. I would also welcome the declaration by the United States and the Soviet Union of their intention to initiate basic consultations concerning strategic nuclear arms in Europe before the end of this year. We should like to express the hope that those two super-Powers would initiate immediately the resumption of their negotiations on all the issues of the arms race in strategic nuclear weapons and to curb that race and reverse its trend and to work in order to achieve agreements as they did in the case of the SALT I and SALT II agreements and to improve existing agreements in order to curb the nuclear arms race. The two super-Powers and their allies shoulder a basic responsibility in securing solutions to many of the problems which have eluded the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, especially the question of a test-ban-treaty and the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons as well as the aggression against peaceful nuclear reactors. I should like to reaffirm that any progress in this respect would ensure the success of the work of the General Assembly at the second special session on disarmament aimed at stemming the arms race and achieving disarmament arriving at an agreement concerning the methods of negotiations on nuclear and conventional weapons and reducing military budgets as well as reaching agreement on a comprehensive disarmament programme and the proclamation of the 1980s as the second disarmament decade.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

Sudan has on many occasions declared its full support for the non proliferation of nuclear weapons. Our support in this respect was underlined by our acceding to the Non-Proliferation Treaty on 24 December 1968, that is, only six months after our having signed it on 1 July 1968 and one year before the entry into force of that Treaty on 5 March 1970. Sudan is therefore eager to uphold this agreement and calls on all countries to accede to it, to work accordingly and to comply fully with its provisions and avoid any step which would violate its principles and reduce their effectiveness.

Furthermore, Sudan respects the system of verification and calls upon all countries to comply with the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which constitutes the central point of the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We should like to take this opportunity to condemn the Israeli act of aggression against the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which was constructed for peaceful purposes and which complies with the international verification and safeguards systems. This blatant act of aggression, was condemned by the whole international community and by the United Nations, as represented by the Security Council Israeli manoeuvres, which began during the last session of this Assembly and will certainly be repeated this year in this Committee call for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. This may be correct in theory, but their proposal has ulterior motives.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

We all know that Israel is the only country in the Middle East which has nuclear reactors that are not subject to any inspection or to international verification, as confirmed by the report of the Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to prepare a study on Israeli nuclear armaments, which appears in document A/36/431, of 18 September 1981, and that it is the only country in the region to have had such nuclear reactors since the 1950s, in spite of the many appeals and resolutions of the international community, represented by the General Assembly and the Security Council to submit their nuclear reactors to international inspection and verification.

Israel, as we all know from its blatant practices, does not respect this Organization and other international organizations. It is determined to either ignore or belittle those organizations at every opportunity. The statements of the Israeli representatives on many occasions in the General Assembly and in the Security Council as well as in other bodies of the United Nations confirm my statement without any doubt. The Israeli attack against the Iraqi nuclear reactor, in broad daylight and in blatant violation of international instruments and international law, prohibiting attacks against the sovereignty and independence of other countries, is evidence of its barbaric record of action against the Palestinian and Arab people.

Israel's claim that it is in a state of war with Iraq and that its aggression is part of its national right to self-defence is not a logical argument under the United Nations Charter and international law today. Israel is fully aware of the text of Article 2 (3) of the Charter, which calls on all Members to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered. Israel is also aware of the text of Article 2 (4) of the Charter, which calls on all Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

What, then, have been the Israeli attempts to settle the question of the Iraqi reactor by peaceful means and what right did Israel have to attack the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq and to destroy its property as well as to attack the air space of neighbouring countries? After all that activity, how can Israel claim that it is complying with the will of the international community and that it abides by international law and the provisions of the Charter? How can it go to the extent of calling for a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East? More than that, Israel has demonstrated to the world at large once again, by that blatant attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor, which is subject to IAEA safeguards, its total rejection of the norms and agreements which have been arrived at so far. It has thereby weakened the effectiveness of the international system of verification and inspection of the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes alone.

We note from the report of the Group of Experts - a report which we believe and respect, since it is an objective report - that Israel has developed its nuclear capability and uranium potential and that it has acquired all the necessary assistance in the field of nuclear research, thanks to the great support and co-operation from countries which have given it large quantities of equipment, nuclear technology, expertise and manpower. The report also states that, in spite of the smoke screen put up by Israel, the available information about the Dimona reactor in Israel reaffirms that today Israel possesses nuclear weapons of the capacity of the bomb that was dropped on Nagasaki and that it has the capability of producing more bombs as well as developing delivery systems. The targets of those weapons, of course, would be the neighbouring Arab States.

Despite such clear evidence, Israel is trying to deceive world public opinion by saying that it will not start bringing nuclear weapons into the Middle East and that the system of verification and international inspection cannot be depended upon to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It calls upon us to believe its desire to enter into negotiations on the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East.

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

First of all, Israel should demonstrate its readiness to abide by and respect all the international instruments and resolutions adopted by international organizations; it should respect international law and cease all its policies which are contrary to international practice and law. Israel should also adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and should accept a system of verification and safeguards that would cover all its reactors and nuclear plants. It should follow the example of other States in the region, such as Egypt, which has taken a genuine initiative to establish a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East.

Sudan follows with great concern the increasing military and nuclear co-operation between Israel and its isolated ally, the racist minority régime in South Africa. The international community and the major Western Powers bear the major part of the responsibility to halt such dangerous developments before they reach the point of no return. The African countries have repeated their call for the virgin continent of Africa to be kept free from international intrigues and conflicts. That is a view which the African countries have repeated here and it is not a subject for bargaining or negotiation. We are anxious to implement a decision to that effect and we hope to achieve genuine co-operation with friendly countries, and not co-operation in the field of slogans and empty rhetoric.

The shortages which exist in Africa, the lack of means and of a basic infrastructure, and the numerous calamities, the hunger and the disease which afflict that continent are no secret. This is a well-known fact, which makes it necessary for its leaders and the world community to rise to the challenge in order to save the continent, which has long suffered domination and the exploitation of its human and natural resources. Africa should not be drawn into international and regional conflicts or the acquisition of arms, which would only deplete its resources and lead Africa towards a blood bath and the loss of many lives, of foreign exchange and of resources. Such machinations are totally rejected by us, and we take this opportunity to urge the international community to co-operate with us in order to keep Africa free from all international plots, rivalries and conflicts.

bhs/gt

A/C.1/36/PV.15  
24-25

(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

It is obvious that the security of Africa is indivisible and cannot be separated from the security of the Indian Ocean, because many African countries are coastal countries or constitute the hinterland of that ocean and depend on it for their many contacts and commercial relations with the world. Therefore, the coastal African countries should have special priority as regards the security of the Indian Ocean. It is a sad fact that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean was unable to fulfil its mandate by holding the Colombo Conference this year in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/80 B.



(Mr. Elfaki, Sudan)

The various disputes and the manoeuvring that took place in numerous meetings of that Committee are to be regretted, and constitute a serious development which is not in keeping with the basic security interests and requirements of the littoral and hinterland countries, or with their need for peace, security and an opportunity for reconstruction free from the daily threats posed by the bases and fleets of the world Powers. We appeal to all countries concerned to co-operate with the countries of the region so as to transform the Indian Ocean into a lake of peace and security, which would serve the interests of all the peoples and countries of the world and would save them from the international strategic conflict rather than serving narrow interests.

Finally, I should like to deal with an important issue which the Sudan touched on in its statement in the General Assembly, and which has been mentioned by other speakers in this Committee. It is an issue that is closely linked with the work of this Committee. I refer to the serious struggle and competition among small countries to acquire weapons, to employ them to threaten their neighbours for the purposes of expansion at the expense of others, and to act as the agents of major Powers. This is a serious development which can only lead to further anxiety, apprehension and instability in many areas. It threatens to transform countries into bases for the major Powers, which would then use those areas as testing-grounds for their new weapons.

This is a vitally serious and dangerous matter, and we hope that this Committee, and the General Assembly at its coming second special session devoted to disarmament, will grant it the necessary attention and consideration before the situation deteriorates and reaches the point of no return.

Mr. MENZIES (Canada): I should like to use this first occasion of speaking in the First Committee to express the satisfaction of my delegation at the election of Ambassador Golob of Yugoslavia to preside over our deliberations. I am confident that, with his experience as a diplomat and a representative of Yugoslavia at a number of international conferences, he will direct our work so that it will be as productive as can be expected. I ask, Sir, that you extend to him my greetings and my assurance that the Canadian delegation will do everything possible to co-operate with him and the other officers of the Committee in advancing the work of the First Committee.

Many of us here have just completed a fortnight's work on the agenda for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Some of the deliberations of the First Committee at the present session can make an important substantive contribution to the preparations for that special session, which is to be held next June and July.

The Canadian Secretary of State of External Affairs, the Honourable Mr. Mark MacGuigan, in his address to the General Assembly on 21 September, emphasized that:

"international peace and security, as well as development, freedom and life itself, will ultimately depend on whether we can successfully work towards arms control and disarmament". (A/36/PV.6, p. 14)

The second special session therefore must point the way to more concrete progress in this field.

Disarmament is not an end in itself, but a means to an end: that of international security and stability. Present international conditions do not suggest that we can take international stability and security for granted. In their turn, prospects for stability and security at the regional level, in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Central America - or in other areas of this troubled planet - have effects far beyond the regions themselves. Conversely, and at the same time, successful efforts to create stability in one region positively affect other regions outside it. Prime Minister Trudeau recently pointed out that economic problems and international disputes have increased in both number and severity. While the super-Powers have grown stronger, they often seem to have lost control over events. Though political and economic instability may be most visible in the third world, they are also painfully evident across the entire spectrum of international relations. The problems of East-West and North-South relations, energy, nuclear proliferation, the environment, refugees and sporadic outbursts of violence and war all form a complex of cause and effect.

Within this context, in the words of the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, our work leading up to the second special session on disarmament could be of "crucial importance". We should build on the remarkable consensus reached in 1978. We should be governed by the considerations that led to that consensus and should strive to achieve the highest level of agreement on ways to

move ahead on disarmament. Here, I refer to the communiqué of the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting, issued in Melbourne early this month. Those Heads of Government saw as a particularly serious matter mounting tension and lack of confidence among States. They saw that practical measures directed towards nuclear disarmament and the avoidance of all armed conflict, particularly nuclear conflict, must have the highest priority on the international agenda. Such goals can only be sought through restraint and a recognition that change, as an essential part of the dynamic of interdependence, is both inevitable and essential.

A precondition for moving ahead at the second special session is the resumption of arms-limitation talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. Their recent decision, as announced in the General Assembly, to begin talks next month on theatre nuclear forces in Europe should give a positive impulse to our work. We look forward to those talks leading to a treaty which would restore the balance at the lowest possible level.

Canada therefore warmly welcomes the statement made here last week by the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Mr. Eugene Rostow, that the United States will be ready to resume negotiations on strategic arms early in 1982. We are particularly encouraged by the emphasis being placed on reductions and on the need for co-operation in ensuring mutual confidence. We look for an equally positive attitude on the part of the Soviet Union. In a number of statements, my Prime Minister has attached the highest priority to the resumption of the SALT process. It is to us of paramount importance that these critical negotiations, once resumed, move forward with the objective not just of limiting, but of reducing, these forces.

(Mr. Menzies, Canada)

It is our view, moreover, that one of the most important factors governing the prospects for success at this year's deliberations, and at the second special session itself, will be the degree to which the atmosphere generated by these talks, even in their anticipation, will contribute to creating an atmosphere of international confidence.

We believe that the international concern expressed about the nuclear arms race would be incomplete if the dangers of further horizontal proliferation were not given sufficient weight. The implications of the nuclear dimension for regional tensions recently took concrete shape in the Middle East. With this as an example, and with the prospect of further regional proliferation still a matter that cannot be easily dismissed, we are convinced that greater efforts must be directed towards strengthening the international non-proliferation régime and the international instruments that support it. In this regard, we warmly welcome the ratification by Egypt of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, announced earlier this year.

Canada believes that there is no substitute for the painstaking negotiation of verifiable agreements on arms limitation and disarmament. I would underline the word "verifiable". Verification is not a tactic to delay or prevent success in negotiations. More than ever before it is a prerequisite for their success. Canada has for many years sought the development of international verification procedures wherever these are required to supplement national mechanisms in order to enhance confidence that the parties are complying with the terms of agreements. Yet even in this body and elsewhere, ingrained habits of confrontation continue to persist - the hortatory over the practical, the seeking of the propaganda advantage and in some instances the launching of proposals patently devoid of any hope of realization. We regard verification as one of the most important tests of the seriousness of a proposal. Verification deals with facts, not with arguments, and for this reason is impartial. And impartiality is essential to building a climate of confidence.

(Mr. Menzies, Canada)

The international community has used the United Nations to serve as witness to compliance with the provisions of a variety of agreements. In this connexion, I should like to recall that next week will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the momentous resolution of the General Assembly calling upon the Secretary General to establish the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East to witness the cease-fire and withdrawal of forces. It seems to me there is an appropriate analogy to be drawn between United Nations peace-keeping and what we hope will be an increasing role of the United Nations in serving as witness to compliance by parties to arms-limitation and disarmament agreements.

It has long been accepted that there is an international role in the verification of a nuclear test-ban treaty: co-operative seismic monitoring measures which have been under consideration by the Ad Hoc Group of seismic experts in Geneva. As we have said in the Committee on Disarmament, we believe that that Committee and the Ad Hoc Group of seismic experts can supplement in a very practical manner the efforts of the negotiating States and the national verification provisions.

The realization of a verifiable nuclear test-ban treaty is one of the four elements of the strategy of suffocation proposed by Prime Minister Trudeau at the first United Nations special session on disarmament. I should like to recall that, in addition to a comprehensive test ban, he envisaged verifiable agreements: first, banning the flight-testing of all new strategic delivery vehicles; secondly, banning the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes and, thirdly, limiting and progressively reducing military spending on new strategic nuclear weapon systems. Conclusion of agreements on these four elements in combination would go a long way towards preventing both vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. We recognize, of course, that much progress must be made in negotiations on nuclear forces between the Soviet Union and the United States before agreements can be realized on all four elements.

(Mr. Menzies, Canada)

Nuclear weapons are not the only threat to international peace and security. The Final Document of the first special session listed conventional forces among the priorities. We cannot ignore the vast array of conventional weapons to which 80 per cent of arms expenditures is directed. Canada is ready to participate in any serious effort to control conventional arms. In this regard, we hope that the study on conventional disarmament will be approved during the present session of the General Assembly by consensus, without resort to formal voting.

There has been progress recently on working towards the prohibition of chemical weapons, another high priority of Canada, which has continued to contribute the expertise it has gained from its research on defensive measures, means of destruction and verification. We are now working in co-operation with others to develop a draft resolution which will express the Assembly's desire to see progress quickened in the Committee on Disarmament towards such an agreement.

A closely related issue is that of the reports of the use of chemical weapons and, more recently, of toxin weapons. It appears to us that in the investigation launched by the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly the Group of Experts has not yet fulfilled its mandate, both because the Group has only recently been given permission to go to countries in the area in question to collect evidence and because recent reports of the possible use of toxins must be given serious study. We would therefore urge other delegations that wish to see the effectiveness of existing agreements maintained to join in extending the mandate of the Group of Experts.

Of the several studies which will be presented to this session of the General Assembly, we have nominated experts to take part in those on confidence-building measures and on the relationship between disarmament and development. I have referred earlier to the necessity to build and maintain confidence as an essential ingredient of the process of negotiation. The study on confidence-building measures will be a valuable reminder that the

(Mr. Menzies, Canada)

measures and factors which it analyses can and should be used to assist in the negotiation and implementation of agreements.

With regard to the disarmament and development study, I share the hope expressed by Sweden's Under-Secretary of State for Disarmament, Mrs. Inga Thorsson, that this project will represent the beginning of a process. A Canadian expert participated in that study, with which we are proud to have been associated. It underlines the interrelatedness of the problems which confront the world community and the need, more than ever before, for breadth of vision for their resolution.

(Mr. Menzies, Canada)

A year ago I drew attention to the incipient arms competition in outer space and called for intensified efforts to conclude further measures to prevent an arms race in outer space. Canada has been involved for over 20 years in the peaceful use of outer space. Eight Canadian-built satellites are at present serving in the communications field. We hope to use the experience we have gained in these peaceful activities to assist in reaching an agreement to maintain outer space as a weapon-free environment. Negotiations towards such an agreement should be carried out in the Committee on Disarmament.

I began by referring to the preparations for the second special session. In concluding, I should like to mention that in Canada parliamentarians, community groups, non-governmental organizations, universities, secondary schools and individuals are involved in the study of issues likely to arise at the special session. In the years since the first special session the Canadian Government has greatly increased its efforts to assist the process of public involvement. Financial support has been provided for international conferences held in Canada as well as for seminars, study groups and speakers at a variety of meetings during this Disarmament Week. We have attached particular importance to research being undertaken from a Canadian perspective. We have also been issuing a news-letter on national and international activities in the field of disarmament.

In his statement in Plenary Assembly the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs said:

"we cannot ignore the growing impatience of the world's peoples with the lack of progress towards verifiable arms limitation and disarmament agreements. Our efforts on their behalf should take into account the situation as it is in covering realistic proposals which have some substantive chance to effect change". (A/36/PV.6, p.16)

In present-day circumstances, it is imperative that we not be diverted from this task.

Canada is ready to work toward progress where progress is possible. We should emphasize the practical over the theoretical and resist polemics.



(Mr. Menzies, Canada)

We should not become so fascinated with tactics, either now or at the special session next year, that opportunities for progress will be missed. No procedural victory, no recourse to divisive vote, will substitute for realism and restraint and the search for the possible.

There is one final consideration: the ability of the United Nations to deal with the critical matters of arms control and international security. Ultimately, the success this institution achieves in real arms control is a test of the credibility of this Organization in these demanding times.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.