

Disarmament in Europe which will be starting its work in Stockholm in January. Our hope is that the development of confidence through a régime of confidence- and security-building measures covering Europe may result in transparency and predictability in military affairs which, in turn, could induce a degree of security among participating states that would make a balanced reduction of armaments a viable option.

For our part, we here in this Committee have our own contribution to make to the creation of a stable environment of increased security.

In this forum, our objective is surely to reinforce the multilateral approach to arms control and disarmament. What we do must contribute to multilateralism and not detract from it. Our efforts, essentially, must be directed to establishing consensus and to working out practical frameworks for negotiations which will result in tangible arms control and disarmament measures. We must continue with the necessary preliminary work for the time when an improved atmosphere permits the successful conclusion of these negotiations. It is our responsibility to resist the tendency in these times of deteriorating international climate to take up the "politics of the megaphone" where confrontation is valued over consensus and where debate serves not the purposes of dialogue but rather to divide and disunite. The challenge for multilateralism is to reverse these trends.

There is another challenge before us in the arms control and disarmament process and that is to recognize the contiguity of interests in moving toward common agreement among developed and developing countries on international security issues. Nowhere is this truer than in the case of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the strengthening of which poses one of the most urgent challenges to multilateralism.

Each of us has a responsibility to maintain and support the arms control and disarmament process. The degree to which that responsibility is exercised is reflected in the voting patterns of the General Assembly. Unfortunately our agenda has become overcrowded over the years and there is a tendency towards duplication of effort in the race for resolutions. Priorities have to be set if we are not to dilute and divide our efforts.

We, of course, have our views on this subject. Our priorities are: (1) to support strongly negotiations to limit and reduce nuclear arms; (2) to promote early progress towards the realization of a multilateral comprehensive test ban treaty; (3) to assist in preparing a convention which would completely prohibit chemical weapons; (4) to promote the evolution of an effective non-proliferation régime based on the Non-Proliferation Treaty; (5) to work towards the objective of prohibiting the development, testing and deployment of all weapons for use in outer space; and (6) to participate actively in negotiations to limit and reduce conventional forces.

On the urgent nuclear issues, our objective is twofold: the inhibition of the development of new weapons systems and the reduction of nuclear arsenals designed to achieve a stable balance at lower levels. We are also considering making proposals for other international agreements which could help to restrict destabilizing qualitative developments in strategic technology.

---