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The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES RELATED TO THE SPECIAL SESSION INCLUDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT(S) TO BE ADOPTED AT THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the issuance of the speakers' list of non-governmental organizations and peace and research institutions (A/AC.206/CPR.7).

2. He recalled that delegations had asked for time to consider the recommendations of the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee before taking a decision on them.

3. The report of the Committee on Disarmament’s Ad Hoc Working Group on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament (CD/283) had now been circulated to members of the Preparatory Committee for the information of delegations which were not members of the Committee on Disarmament.

4. Mr. LINDGARD (Sweden) asked whether the speakers' list of non-governmental organizations was circulated purely for information or whether the Preparatory Committee would be asked to approve it.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the Ad Hoc Liaison Group would be entrusted with the task of making an appropriate selection of non-governmental organizations which could be accommodated within the time available at the special session.

6. Mr. DON Ndjura (Kenya) asked whether it might not be useful to establish contact with the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament during the current session of the Preparatory Committee in order to eliminate some of the square brackets in its report. The Preparatory Committee could perhaps discuss the report with that aim in view.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that similar views had been expressed by other delegations and that the Preparatory Committee would consider how best to approach the substantive issues of the special session at a later stage.

8. Mr. BUTLER (Australia) said that, although the current session of the Preparatory Committee was the final one, the special session itself would mark the beginning of a period of work of the utmost importance. The special session should not merely be a re-enactment of the proceedings of the First Committee of the General Assembly, and his delegation would therefore oppose any suggestion that its final document should consist of a restatement of the resolutions which had appeared in the past. The second special session provided an opportunity for fresh consideration of questions of international peace and security, for an analysis of the underlying factors standing in the way of disarmament and for an attempt to identify the areas in which greatest progress could be made. His delegation's experience in the First Committee had led it to conclude that it was essential to
avoid excessive preoccupation with minor details of negotiations, at the expense of larger and more important objectives.

9. His Government had no doubt of the sincerity and legitimacy of the widespread public concern regarding the arms race and the urgent need for measures to stop that race and to remove the threat of the use of nuclear weapons. In Australia, a series of consultations were under way between government officials and representatives of non-governmental organizations and concerned citizens. For that reason, his delegation believed that it was important for representatives of the relevant non-governmental organizations to be given the opportunity to express their views during the special session. At the same time, it should be recognized that the discussions and negotiations which would take place at that session would be held between representatives of Member States.

10. Measures must be developed to put an end to the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the régime of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons must be maintained and strengthened in order to prevent horizontal proliferation. With those aims in view, his delegation supported the negotiation of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

11. His Government also believed that the elaboration of a convention on chemical weapons was a matter of high priority.

12. It was clear that disarmament could only take place in an atmosphere of trust. States must feel sure that they understood the policies of others and that their own territories and interests were not threatened by the intentions or actions of others. Such confidence called for openness in international dealings, and in the specific area of defence and arms control. Satisfactory verification régimes must be negotiated as integral parts of individual disarmament agreements.

13. Although the special session's work on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament would be difficult, every effort should be made to reach agreement on a programme which would be realistic and compatible with the maintenance of national security and could be adhered to by all States.

14. With regard to the work of the Preparatory Committee, he supported the proposal that a working group should be formed and that it should seek to draw up an outline of items and areas of action, and possibly assign priorities within that outline, for the guidance of the special session. His delegation agreed with the Chairman that the working group might draw on the views of delegations as expressed in the Preparatory Committee, and also on the national papers already submitted, in drafting the outline review of the results of the first special session. It was to be hoped that the organization of the group's work would be sufficiently flexible to take into account any new ideas put forward by its members.

15. His delegation was aware that perhaps the most significant product of the Preparatory Committee's work in the coming two weeks would be its report to the special session. In addition to containing an outline of the kind already...
(Mr. Butler, Australia)

mentioned, the report should express the Committee's views on how the special session might best organize its work and on the nature of the final document to emerge from the session. His delegation shared the view of others that the question of the final documentation needed further informal discussion, and it considered that a decision on the matter should be postponed until later in the work of the Preparatory Committee.

16. Mr. MARTIN (New Zealand) said that the statements made at recent meetings of the Preparatory Committee had revealed a large majority in favour of the establishment of a working group. While the Chairman had suggested in his introductory remarks that the task of the working group might be to prepare an outline review for consideration by the special session, some delegations had expressed the hope that the working group, which should be open-ended and should preferably be set up within the next few days, could also concern itself with broader issues. He hoped that that suggestion would be followed.

17. Turning to the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, he noted that one delegation had commented that the Programme, and especially those aspects of it on which limited progress had been made at the Geneva session, should be the subject of informal consultations in an open-ended working group. Such a procedure would be particularly helpful to smaller delegations, provided that the consultations did not coincide with the meetings of the other working group dealing with the outline review. A further suggestion, with which his delegation agreed, was that the working group should not seek to rewrite the Comprehensive Programme, but, rather, should ascertain the views of delegations not represented in the Committee on Disarmament and possibly suggest new approaches. Finally, it had been proposed that the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Comprehensive Programme should continue to meet informally during the current session of the Preparatory Committee in an effort to make further progress on the Programme. He suspected that such a suggestion would not meet with approval from delegations which, like his own, were not members of the Committee on Disarmament. The latter had completed its report to the forthcoming special session, and there was no reason to believe that anything could usefully be added to it. The Programme would be the subject of informal negotiations in the Preparatory Committee, and it would be preferable if such consultations were open-ended. The Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament could be invited to introduce the draft Comprehensive Programme in the Preparatory Committee and to point out the main issues still to be settled.

18. On the question of organization and procedure, he thought that the Secretariat should be asked to identify any matters relating to the special session on which it might wish to seek the views of the Preparatory Committee or of which it believed the Committee should be informed. That could be done in the form of a single document, to be submitted to the Committee in the next few days.

19. Mr. RAEMYMAECKERS (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community, said that the second special session would give the international community an opportunity to evaluate the progress made on the
implementation of the decisions and recommendations adopted by the General Assembly at the first special session, and to propose appropriate follow-up action.

20. The fact that progress in the field of disarmament had been slow was attributable to a variety of factors, among which a major one was the deterioration of the international situation. However, the increasing number of violations of the principles of the Charter, in the form of invasion, military occupation, interference in the internal affairs of countries and human rights violations should not deter the international community from its endeavours to achieve progress in arms control and disarmament. The Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament would make an important contribution to those endeavours. The Programme must provide a realistic and flexible framework for future disarmament measures, which must themselves be balanced and be subject to effective verification.

21. Where organizational matters were concerned, it would be appropriate, as had been suggested, to establish a working group to consider the implementation of the Final Document of the first special session and to produce a working paper for the deliberations of the second special session.

22. With regard to item 13 of the provisional agenda of the special session recommended by the Preparatory Committee (A/36/49, para. 18), the Governments for which he spoke would be prepared to encourage any initiative calculated to supply the public with impartial and objective information on disarmament issues, provided that no element of propaganda was involved. They hoped that the Centre for Disarmament would make a positive contribution in that respect under an appropriate and carefully considered mandate.

23. In connexion with item 12 of the provisional agenda, concerning machinery in the field of disarmament, the States members of the European Community considered it important to safeguard the progress made at the first special session in affirming the central role of the United Nations in disarmament matters and its increasing role in co-ordinating disarmament activities. The States Members of the United Nations should consider the possibility of adapting its institutional arrangements to the increased burden placed on the Organization, and in particular on the Centre for Disarmament.

24. He stressed the importance attached by the EEC countries to United Nations studies on disarmament, which were a very useful contribution to the efforts to make progress towards the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

25. Lastly, the document or documents to be adopted at the second special session should, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, be in the form of resolutions and decisions. Although there could be some flexibility with regard to the title of the document, it must not impair the authority of the Final Document adopted at the first special session and must not be at variance with the force attributed to General Assembly resolutions by the Charter. The EEC countries were prepared to consider what place the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament might have in the final document or documents of the special session.
26. **Mr. MOUSSA** (Egypt) said that there appeared to be an ever-widening gap between the expectations of the international community as expressed in the Final Document adopted at the first special session in 1978 and the net results achieved in the field of disarmament in the intervening four years.

27. It was the duty of the Preparatory Committee to address itself to all the substantive issues to be considered at the second special session. It could do so by establishing one or more working groups to discuss the two most important questions, namely, the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament and the review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session. There could be no doubt that consideration of the Comprehensive Programme fell within the mandate of the Preparatory Committee.

28. His delegation felt that it might be premature to take a decision on the nature of the final document to be adopted at the session. The Preparatory Committee could, however, discuss the principal elements which would make up that document.

29. He hoped that a consensus would soon be reached on the organization of work, so that the Preparatory Committee could proceed to substantive matters in accordance with its mandate.

30. **Mr. ANT** (Turkey) said that his Government had already made known its views in its communications to the Secretary-General contained in documents A/AC.206/2 and A/AC.206/19. The framework for discussing substantive issues was already established in items 8 to 13 of the provisional agenda of the special session itself. That would enable delegations to make known a broad range of views on all matters. The special session would then have to identify common ground and produce a document expressing the collective will of delegations. It was important that the second special session should give new impetus to efforts for disarmament and, for that purpose, what was needed was co-operation rather than dissension.

31. His delegation was happy to see the trend towards convergence of views and agreed with the proposal to establish a working group to study the decisions taken at the tenth special session in order to prepare the final document for the second special session devoted to disarmament. That document should also include a study of the existing machinery to see whether it was responsive to current needs.

32. His delegation wished to emphasize that the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should involve all members of the international community, and the final document of the second special session should therefore be prepared with the co-operation of all States.

33. **Mr. LOPEZ PAZ** (Cuba) said that the current international situation was fraught with danger for international peace and security, and recent events had again highlighted the urgent need to implement the measures set forth in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session. His delegation therefore firmly supported the convening of the second special session devoted to disarmament and wished to reaffirm the validity of the 1978 Final Document.
34. Cuba agreed with the suggestion that preparation of the document or documents for the second special session should be dealt with later in the current session of the Preparatory Committee and that there should first be an exchange of views on substantive issues under agenda item 4. It also agreed that a working group should be established and should give special attention to the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. While the final form of the Programme would be defined at the second special session, his delegation believed that the Preparatory Committee, through the working group to be established, could help to achieve progress in that connexion. To that end, his delegation would maintain its flexible attitude.

35. Many proposals had been made with respect to curbing the arms race and achieving disarmament and world peace; Cuba firmly supported those proposals which should be taken into consideration at the second special session. It also agreed that there should be a world disarmament conference with the full participation of all States, particularly, the nuclear Powers, with a view to achieving world-wide commitments to the decisions of the two special sessions devoted to disarmament.

36. Mr. SOULIOTIS (Greece) said that his delegation fully subscribed to the statement made by the representative of Belgium on behalf of the 10 members of the European Economic Community. Greece wished to reaffirm its position that the second special session must give further impetus to disarmament efforts; to that end, a study should be made of the reasons for the failure to implement the decisions of the tenth special session. That was particularly relevant today because of repeated violations of the United Nations Charter and of human rights and interference in the internal affairs of other States. It was for that reason that his delegation attached special importance to the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament which was to be the main goal of the second special session. Greece also attached importance to the elaboration of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban agreement, to non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and a freeze on their development and to a reduction of military budgets.

37. His delegation wished to reaffirm its appreciation of the studies carried out in the United Nations on disarmament matters and to emphasize the continuing validity of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, which must be the basis for further work at the second special session. The results of the latter should not be reflected in a second final document but rather in one of the "document of conclusions", in which special emphasis would be placed on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament.

38. Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) said that his Government had already made its views known to the Secretary-General in its communication of 6 April 1981. The main causes of the deterioration in the world political climate and of the emergence and persistence of serious threats to international peace and security were the acceleration of the arms race and the continued accumulation of weapons, especially nuclear weapons. It was for that reason that his delegation had stressed that the primary focus of the second special session devoted to disarmament should be on restoring confidence in the feasibility of disarmament and the possibility of adopting measures to encourage practical moves towards genuine negotiations aimed
(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

at halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament. The Preparatory Committee bore a heavy responsibility for ensuring that the second special session consolidated the results of the tenth special session.

39. His delegation wished to reaffirm its conviction that there was a need to take measures to rule out the threat of nuclear war and that the second special session should therefore give priority to measures in the nuclear field. To that end, there should be a freeze on nuclear-weapon production and a reduction of existing stockpiles, complemented by a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

40. The Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should be drawn up within the framework of the decisions of the tenth special session and should include machinery for continuing negotiations. All agreed that a serious situation existed in Europe, and for that reason Romania supported the proposal for a ban on the deployment of medium-range weapons in Europe and welcomed the discussions in Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union on such weapons. Romania also believed that there was a need for all States that felt threatened to participate in those discussions.

41. With respect to denuclearized zones, his delegation wished to recall Romania's proposals to make the Balkans a nuclear-free zone and a zone of good-neighbourliness. It therefore agreed that the documents of the second special session should make provision for a freeze on nuclear budgets with a view to ensuring the economic and social progress of all States, especially the developing countries.

42. Romania attached special importance to the adoption by the special session of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, which should include provisions for both nuclear and conventional disarmament. Accordingly, all States should participate in its elaboration in order to consolidate the new concept of security based not on arms, but on disarmament. The Programme should also reflect the essential role of world public opinion in halting the arms race and achieving disarmament, and Romania accordingly reaffirmed its support for a world disarmament campaign and for the role of the United Nations in that regard. The current world situation was one of tension, and it was essential for the final document of the second special session to reflect the need to ensure mutual trust and promote détente.

43. His delegation agreed that the Preparatory Committee should deal with all substantive matters for the second special session or, in other words, with the implementation of the resolutions and decisions of the tenth special session. It should therefore establish the necessary open-ended working groups and ensure that there was no duplication of effort.

44. Mr. OKAWA (Japan) said that his Government had already made its views known in its communication to the Secretary-General of 5 May 1981 reproduced in document A/AC.206/2/Add.2. Those views were still valid. Japan believed that the
present exchange of views on agenda items 4 and 5 were useful and accordingly supported the Chairman's proposal for a working group to prepare the outline for the final document of the second special session and review the decisions of the tenth special session. His delegation believed that the working group should be limited in size but open to any delegation that desired to participate and that it should begin its deliberations before the end of the current week.

45. With respect to the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, his delegation believed that the Preparatory Committee should avoid taking an immediate decision in the hope that the Chairman would continue his informal consultations with a view to arriving at the most feasible and acceptable programme of work.

46. Mr. Krutzsch (German Democratic Republic) said that the preparations for the second special session devoted to disarmament were being made at a time when concern for the preservation of peace gripped millions of people with mounting intensity. It was especially in view of the worsened international situation that a successful course for the second special session and effective decisions by it were essential for the preservation and strengthening of peace. The task of averting the danger of a nuclear catastrophe called for a constructive approach and responsible action.

47. Proceeding from those considerations, the German Democratic Republic believed that the second special session should focus attention on: (a) a commitment by the nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; (b) cessation of the nuclear-arms race followed by nuclear disarmament, and in particular a halt to the development and manufacture of new types and systems of nuclear weapons, notably the prohibition of the neutron weapon; (c) general and complete prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests; (d) agreements or declarations on the renunciation of the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of other States, withdrawal of such weapons from foreign territory and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace; (e) prohibition of all chemical weapons, especially cessation of the development, production and deployment of new types of weapons such as binary weapons.

48. Those issues, which were central to the preservation of peace, must now be tackled. Success in that area would have a favourable effect on the international situation and on international relations in their entirety. His delegation therefore believed that concrete steps should be taken with a view to resolving those truly vital questions as the main objective of the second special session. Such steps constituted a particularly pressing task for the first phase of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament.

49. The Preparatory Committee would be reviewing the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the tenth special session and his delegation, like others, expected that as a result of that assessment the importance of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session would be underscored.
50. Together with other socialist countries, the German Democratic Republic had made great efforts to implement the efforts called for in the Final Document. The period between the two special sessions had been marked by a series of initiatives launched by the socialist States with a view to implementing the priority provisions of the Final Document. Those endeavours were in line with the interests of all peoples. It was for that reason that the proposals of the socialist countries had met with broad support both at United Nations Headquarters and at the Geneva sessions of the Committee on Disarmament. It was true now, as before, that fruitful negotiations yielding results could be achieved, given the will to do so.

51. The 1979 agreements between the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union on the unilateral reduction of Soviet armed forces on the territory of the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and the proposals of the Soviet Union on a reduction of medium-range weapons all offered further irrefutable proof of a serious effort for progress in the field of disarmament.

52. Where the further work of the Preparatory Committee was concerned, his delegation supported the proposal for the establishment of one or more working groups. With respect to a review of the implementation of decisions and recommendations of the tenth special session, it was clear that a working group could begin the elaboration of the structure of such a document and the main questions it should cover. His delegation would also agree that the working group should attempt to clarify the question of the final document or documents of the second special session. With respect to the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, a method was still to be found to achieve consensus solutions on important problems without attempting to duplicate the work done by the Committee on Disarmament.

53. His delegation hoped that the conviction that nothing was more important than safeguarding peace would determine the actions of all delegations at the second special session. If that was ensured, progress towards ending the arms race and towards disarmament would be forthcoming.

54. Mr. de la GORCE (France) said that his delegation naturally associated itself with the statement made by the representative of Belgium on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community but would like to add a few comments.

55. Questions relating to the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session devoted to disarmament should be considered objectively and against the background of the growing sense of insecurity engendered during the past four years by serious violations of the principles of the United Nations Charter. Fair and balanced decisions were required to restore international confidence. That meant that progress must be made in the area of nuclear disarmament, and special responsibility in that respect rested with the two great Powers, which possessed 96 or 97 per cent of all nuclear weapons. Equally important to ensuring the confidence that must exist between States parties to disarmament agreements was the acceptance of international verification.
56. As for the role of the international community and the United Nations, the institutional system established in 1978 was generally satisfactory and should be fully used, particularly with a view to promoting international co-operation and research relating to verification and to the relationship between disarmament and development. Equally important was the need to ensure the greatest possible objectivity in informing public opinion about disarmament, and in that area Governments had to bear the major responsibility.

57. Where methods and procedures were concerned, the Chairman should make suggestions regarding agenda item 4. The establishment of a working group would be appropriate. A particular question was what efforts should be made, prior to the convening of the special session, to achieve wider agreement on the draft Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, which was most important and should constitute one of the major results of the special session.

58. Mr. HUSHAN (China) said that, since the current session of the Preparatory Committee was the last one before the second special session on disarmament, it was extremely important for it to start its substantive work as soon as possible. With regard to agenda item 4, his delegation agreed that a working group should be established at an early stage to review the implementation of the Final Document adopted at the first special session and to begin the very difficult task of drafting. As for the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, the drafting work already done in Geneva had brought to light a number of disagreements on many points. The Committee on Disarmament had the responsibility of reporting to the special session and submitting a draft, but the Preparatory Committee also had a responsibility to give impetus to the drafting work. His delegation therefore supported the establishment of a formal or informal working group or a contact group to study questions relating to the Comprehensive Programme as soon as possible, because time was running out. Serious consideration should also be given to any proposals for other action by the Preparatory Committee.

59. As to agenda item 5, the form and number of documents to be adopted should be determined by their content and by the requirements of the special session. The Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament was an extremely important document but could not cover all questions, and others would be required. The Preparatory Committee should defer consideration of that problem until later, but delegations should express their views in the meantime.

60. Mr. O'CONNOR (Observer for Ireland) said that his delegation subscribed fully to the statement made by the representative of Belgium on behalf of the 10 States members of the European Community.

61. Notwithstanding the current deterioration in international relations, every effort should be made to conduct the second special session in a constructive way, because that very deterioration made negotiations more urgent than ever. The special session should consider why the Committee on Disarmament had failed to negotiate measures in areas where the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations had long demanded progress.
62. The elaboration of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should be among the session's first priorities. The Comprehensive Programme should represent an advance on the Programme of Action in the Final Document of the first special session. It should set realistic goals for the international community and for the States principally concerned and should be so framed as to impart an impetus to disarmament negotiations. It should contain an outline of measures which would institute an orderly and integrated progression towards the major disarmament and arms control goals, in accordance with a sequence of phases and in such a manner as to ensure undiminished security for all States at each stage of the process.

63. The special session should stress the growing need for progress in nuclear disarmament. Conventional arms had caused untold death and injury in the past quarter of a century, but nuclear arms represented a threat to mankind itself. The strategies and tactics of nuclear war, in which the possibility of a limited nuclear war was for the first time being envisaged as a rational instrument of State policy, underlined the need for renewed resolve to completely eliminate those weapons for all time.

64. A comprehensive test-ban treaty was a logical first step in nuclear disarmament, and the special session should reaffirm the importance which the international community attached to concluding one. It should also urge the Committee on Disarmament to expedite negotiations and conclude a multilateral agreement at the earliest possible date.

65. The adoption of a realistic Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should promote a phased, progressive and balanced reduction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery. The General Assembly should urge the nuclear Powers to discharge their responsibilities by engaging in the bilateral negotiations envisaged in such a Programme.

66. The special session should examine the possibilities for the early conclusion of effective international arrangements to protect non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The discussion of that question in the Committee on Disarmament had demonstrated the need for the nuclear-weapon States to take concrete steps immediately.

67. His delegation had always attached great importance to the question of nuclear non-proliferation, and it believed that the adoption of the above measures would be a major step in strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and in promoting universal adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, strict observance of which was essential to achieving nuclear disarmament.

68. On the important question of chemical weapons, his delegation had taken note of the broadened mandate given by the Committee on Disarmament to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Chemical Weapons, which it hoped would report to the special session substantial progress towards a convention. It also believed that the recent upsurge in acquiring conventional arms, both in developed and in developing countries, had given new urgency to the need for limiting and reducing those weapons.
69. Ireland hoped that the Secretary-General's study on the relationship between disarmament and development would highlight the need to reallocate to civilian purposes resources which were currently being squandered. The special session should consider possible arrangements, with special reference to the needs of developing countries.

70. At the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, the international community had demonstrated its concern over developments which might result in the stationing of weapons of any kind in outer space. A nuclear-arms race in outer space was prevented by the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, and a similar treaty or a protocol to the earlier one could again preclude any new threats to the peaceful uses of outer space. Its effectiveness was likely to depend on its being concluded at an early date. The special session should take the urgency of that question into account in its deliberations.

71. The United Nations should continue to play a central role in disarmament. Its institutional arrangements should be adequate to enable it to carry out the activities entrusted to it, and the special session should consider the most effective means of maintaining and enhancing their effectiveness.

72. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh) said that the momentum generated by the first special session devoted to disarmament had evaporated because of the subsequent deterioration of the international situation. The current session was therefore extremely important, and his delegation believed that the Committee should start immediately to exchange views on the substantive issues under agenda item 4. The establishment of an informal working group on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament would be a useful first step. The report of the Working Group of the Committee on Disarmament was available and should be examined.

73. Equally important was the question of the relationship between disarmament and development, but very little had been accomplished by the international community in that connexion. Peace and prosperity were inseparable, and the deleterious effects of the arms race in that connexion were well known. Little progress had been made in establishing a new international economic order, and the gap between North and South had widened in the past 20 years. International security was only temporary, because there could be no political security without economic security.

74. Because of the wasteful arms race, mankind was drawing closer to a dangerous confrontation. Most of the developing countries would face increasing tension because of population pressures and depletion of their economic resources. The redeployment of any such resources for non-military purposes was no answer to their plight because they were meagre. In the future, primary attention must be focused on the deleterious social and economic consequences of the arms race for the developing countries. The working group should start negotiations as soon as possible on substantive matters, including increased involvement by the United Nations system in arms control efforts.

/...
75. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that his Government had submitted to the Secretary-General its views on the substantive issues related to the special session, as requested in General Assembly resolution 36/81 A, and a report containing its views on the prevention of nuclear war, as requested in resolution 36/81 B. He hoped that the Secretariat would issue them as addenda to the relevant documents, without waiting for more than two or three such reports to be submitted. Resolution 36/81 A and resolution 36/81 B were equally relevant and should be accorded the same treatment.

76. On the question of documents to be adopted at the special session, his delegation's view remained unchanged. The special session could produce either a final document or a final act, but in any case it should adopt only a single document.

77. His delegation saw no argument against the establishment of a working group on the Comprehensive Programme, but urged caution so as not to create the impression that the group was a subsidiary body. The Chairman should be allowed to seek the best way of reaching a consensus on the group's mandate and method of work, for which a consensus was extremely important.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.