

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
FORTIETH SESSION
*Official Records**



MAY 19 1987

FIRST COMMITTEE
31st meeting
held on
Thursday, 7 November 1985
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 31st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia)

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE
(continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. van Schaik (Netherlands)
Mr. Janku (Albania)
Mr. Halachev (Bulgaria)
Mr. Sutowardoyo (Indonesia)
Mr. Garcia Robles (Mexico)
Mr. Tinca (Romania)
Mrs. Engman (Sweden)
Mr. Granderson (Trinidad and Tobago)

*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 DC-2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/40/PV.31
8 November 1985
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 48 TO 69 AND 145 (continued)

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands): I wish on behalf of the States members of the European Community, as well as Portugal and Spain, to devote some thoughts to the subject of United Nations studies on disarmament.

The Ten, Portugal and Spain wish to recall paragraph 96 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which says:

"further steps in the field of disarmament and other measures aimed at promoting international peace and security would be facilitated by carrying out studies by the Secretary-General in this field with appropriate assistance from governmental or consultant experts". (resolution S-10/2, para. 96)

We continue to believe that United Nations disarmament studies can serve a useful purpose in three broad areas. They relate in particular to ongoing negotiations, possible new areas of negotiations and efforts to bring the issues involved in arms limitation and disarmament to the attention of the public in general.

In our view, United Nations disarmament studies as a whole have thus far been successful. We are pleased to note that, since 1979, a significant number have been completed. Nevertheless, it is of some concern to us that in two cases groups of experts could not reach agreement on a final report to be presented to the General Assembly.

We continue to believe that careful consideration should be given to the selection of subjects for study. It is also our view that studies undertaken should, to the extent possible, aim at consensus. Where this is not possible, it is important that the study reflect differing views in a balanced manner.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

The Ten, Portugal and Spain welcome the fact that the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies has already begun consideration of some of the questions relating to United Nations studies in the field of disarmament. It is our belief that the views, suggestions or proposals of Member States would facilitate the continuing debate on this important subject.

An example of a study successfully completed was the United Nations study on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces. We continue to believe that this study represents an important contribution to efforts to identify practical approaches and realistic measures aimed at limiting and reducing conventional weapons and armed forces, contributing to general and complete disarmament under effective international control. In addition, concrete measures in the field of conventional arms control and disarmament would have a positive effect of their own on international relations. The study on conventional disarmament, moreover, rightly points out that progress in conventional disarmament would improve prospects for nuclear disarmament and consequently for international security in its broadest and most significant sense.

A considerable number of the present and future members of the European Community have, in accordance with resolution 39/151 C, given their views with respect to the study on conventional disarmament. That is further proof of the fact that we value its contents. We have noted with interest that in almost all replies thus far received, due attention was given to possible regional approaches to conventional disarmament. We hope that additional States will present their views in the months ahead on various points, including the regional dimensions of conventional disarmament.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

In his statement, delivered on 17 October 1985 on behalf of the 10 member States of the European Community, Portugal and Spain, my colleague, Ambassador Max van der Stoep, observed, inter alia, that:

"We believe that a regional approach such as is now being taken in Stockholm can have an important role alongside bilateral and multilateral negotiations. We believe that it can also be effective through new efforts in other regions of the world wherever feasible". (A/C.1/40/PV.7, p. 7)

We welcome the growing awareness, as manifested in the debate in this Committee thus far, that a regional approach to conventional disarmament can be a promising one.

In short, we hold the view that, along with progress in the field of nuclear disarmament, progress in conventional disarmament is also important. We should therefore devote greater attention to conventional disarmament. This question deserves to be retained on the international disarmament agenda.

Another example of a useful result is the United Nations study on the naval arms race (A/40/535). Most member States of the European Community, as well as Portugal and Spain, are coastal States. Historically, seas and oceans have played an important role in their development - important not only in terms, for instance, of their marine industries, but also as far as their sea lines of communication are concerned. We therefore welcome that study, which was completed this year under your able guidance, Mr. Chairman. For decades, multilateral consideration of issues relating to multilateral naval arms limitation and disarmament had been lacking. The present study is therefore a valuable contribution to the debate on many problems connected with the question of naval armament.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

In our view, the content of the study, both with regard to the factual information on military and other naval activities as well as its conclusions, provides a source of material to draw upon in considering possible further action by the international community in this field. We look forward to hearing detailed and timely comments from Member States on the study, so as to permit its further multilateral consideration in a manner acceptable to all of us.

Mr. JANKU (Albania): In this statement, I shall deal with agenda item 71, "Strengthening of security and co-operation in the Mediterranean region".

It is a very disturbing fact that, as time passes, the military and naval activities of the super-Powers in the Mediterranean region increase, and indeed have become one of the main elements of their global policy of gunboat diplomacy. By further increasing both their military air and naval presence in this area and the activities of their fleets in these waters, the United States of America and the Soviet Union have become permanent residents of the region, as though it were a United States or Soviet basin. Consequently the Mediterranean has been turned into one of the important areas where the super-Powers play an important role in the military field. The Mediterranean has been changed into an arena for severe confrontations between them, which cannot but be a potential source of threats and blackmail against the freedom and independence of the peace-loving and freedom-loving countries and peoples of the region.

The most obvious and concrete expression of this aggressive activity is the continuous and systematic increase in the number of warships comprising the fleets deployed by the super-Powers in the region. Those ships are so many facts that cannot be denied, because their obvious physical presence cannot be hidden. Last year, for example, more than 100 military manoeuvres, with the participation of more than 1 million men from various countries, took place in the waters of the

(Mr. Janku, Albania)

Mediterranean. These represent half of all the military drills performed in the European continent in the course of the year.

But what attracts attention the most is the intensification of the efforts by the two super-Powers to gain and maintain more bases at which they can anchor their fleets, so as not to have to leave them in the open seas. In this respect, the increasingly frequent "friendly visits" paid by the United States and Soviet fleets to Mediterranean ports have become a preferred aspect of their policy. Regardless whether or not the super-Powers have military bases in the region, groups of their warships can be seen in this or that Mediterranean port. That provides them with the possibility of a permanent presence and of a land base which, in certain conditions, can be exploited for military aims as if it actually were a super-Power base. That is why the policy of granting bases and port facilities to the naval fleets of the super-Powers in the Mediterranean constitutes a great and serious danger not only for the country that grants them, but also for the neighbouring countries and peoples and the other countries in the Mediterranean region.

(Mr. Janku, Albania)

What makes the super-Powers' actions ever more dangerous and reveals their anti-Mediterranean nature is the open claim of American imperialism and Soviet social imperialism to arrogate to themselves the role of tutor of the region. Not only do they not allow any questioning of their right to be present with their fleets in the Mediterranean but with unscrupulous demagoguery also make every effort to institutionalize their presence on such a scale as would allow them to behave as if they were the real masters without anybody having the right to ask them for an account of the reasons why they have brought their fleets in these waters, thousands of kilometres away from their own countries.

Moreover, under the guise of strengthening "measures of trust", there are efforts to turn the Mediterranean into a zone of co-ordination of their military activities, to turn it into a piece of imperialist merchandise in keeping with their interests. Such slogans as "the Soviet and the American presence in the Mediterranean is a factor of stability" or "that it is in conformity with the interests of the Mediterranean peoples", and so on, are mere demagoguery and out of fashion. The presence of their fleets and bases in the Mediterranean, as well as in other regions, has no moral or legal basis at all.

The intensification of the aggressive actions of the super-Powers in the Mediterranean not only increases the rivalry between the imperialists in the area but also aggravates tensions and confrontations by stirring up existing regional disputes.

It is obvious that, through their interventions and interference in the region, the Americans and the Soviets are trying to manipulate these disputes to the benefit of their expansionist interests and ambitions. That is why Washington and Moscow make use of the tense situation prevailing in the Mediterranean, among other things, as offering them the opportunity of being present there and ready for any intervention, machination or bargaining at the appropriate time.

(Mr. Janku, Albania)

In such a situation the Mediterranean peoples are rightly and gravely concerned by the growing number of military actions of the super-Powers in the Mediterranean, a concern that is expressed by all the peoples since the dangers inherent in the presence, actions and policies of the super-Powers threaten all of them. Nothing good has ever come out of the imperialist gunboat policy, which has resulted only in further destabilizing the situation there and creating zones of tension and confrontation.

Current developments in the Mediterranean clearly testify to the correctness of the stand socialist Albania has always maintained with regard to the expulsion of the military fleets and bases of the super-Powers from the Mediterranean. Our country and Government allow neither the establishment in Albanian territory of foreign military, air and naval bases nor the granting of any port or other facilities to the fleets of the imperialist super-Powers. The attitude we have maintained towards the situation and the development of events in the region is clear and irrevocable, as is all of our foreign policy. The United States of America and the Soviet Union constitute the most dangerous and destabilizing factor of the situation in the region, for their policies have always created tension and increased insecurity. It is in this framework that the attitude of our country towards various initiatives that have been taken in relation to the Mediterranean, as well as those to demilitarize the Mediterranean Sea and turn it into a sea of "peace" and "fruitful co-operation", should be understood.

We hold the view that before such meetings and conferences are organized proper conditions should be created not to allow the presence of the military and naval fleets of the super-Powers in the Mediterranean. As in the past, we continue to maintain the view that the tense situation prevailing in the Mediterranean is closely linked with the situation in other neighbouring regions, such as the Middle East or the European continent. There can never be partial security in Europe

(Mr. Janku, Albania)

without the security of the Mediterranean and other areas or vice versa, for international peace and security is one and indivisible.

As a Mediterranean country, my country always followed with great attention and concern the development of events in the Mediterranean region; it has analysed them in an objective and realistic manner and has drawn the appropriate conclusions. It has done so because this is closely linked to the lofty interests of our freedom and independence and to the defence of the victories achieved in the socialist construction of our country and because this is linked also to the destiny of other sovereign peoples of the region.

A synthesis of the position our country has adopted on this question is what the beloved and unforgettable leader of the Albanian people Comrade Enver Hoxha stressed in his book, Reflection on the Middle East:

"Time confirms that the refusal to accept foreign fleets is in the interest of the country which makes no concession and, at the same time, in the interest of other countries, in the interest of the peoples who desire to live in good-neighbourly relations with all the other peoples and, in the specific case, the peoples who live on the shores of the Mediterranean."

Mr. HALACHEV (Bulgaria): I should like at the outset to extend the heartfelt congratulations and best wishes of the Bulgarian delegation to the delegations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic on the occasion of the sixty-eighth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which marked the beginning of the epoch of socialism.

In its statement today my delegation would like to dwell on two specific items - "World Disarmament Campaign" and "Relationship between disarmament and development".

(Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

The People's Republic of Bulgaria is pleased to note that the World Disarmament Campaign has successfully developed and intensified. The Campaign has been increasingly embraced by the broadest circles of the world community.

The unparalleled anti-war movement has shown convincingly that the time when the issues of peace and war were being solved in government offices and military headquarters is long past.

The danger of nuclear catastrophe has rallied to the ranks of the anti-war and anti-nuclear movement people from all walks of life and various professional, political and ideological affiliations. They are well aware of the source of this danger as well as of what has to be done to eliminate it. Their basic demands come down in essence to preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on Earth, to halting the squandering of vast resources for military purposes and diverting them to the solution of the acute socio-economic problems of the world.

In such conditions, it is becoming increasingly difficult to sow enmity and distrust among peoples, to disseminate disinformation and to distort the policies of other States in the field of disarmament. It is still harder to ignore important proposals aimed at averting nuclear war and achieving disarmament.

Last year the world community and non-governmental organizations undertook numerous actions and activities in this field. I should like to recall in this respect the thirty-fifth Pugwash Conference in Campinas, Brazil, the twelfth World Youth Festival in Moscow, the World Baptist Congress in Los Angeles, the International Trade Unions Meeting in Ulan Bator, the International Conference on Avoidance of an Arms Race in Outer Space in Hanover, Federal Republic of Germany, the International Meeting of Agrarian and Affiliated Parties in Warsaw, the Conference on Space Weapons and International Security in Stockholm, the fifth Congress of the World's Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War in Budapest,

(Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

and others. There have been many events commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the victory over nazism in the Second World War and the foundation of the United Nations, as well as the anniversaries of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

(Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

I should like to point out that, for its consistent activities on behalf of peace, the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War has been awarded, deservedly, the Nobel Peace Prize. That award is an acknowledgement of the active role that public opinion in general can play in support of efforts to maintain peace and achieve disarmament.

The Bulgarian public has participated actively in the World Disarmament Campaign and the pursuit of its objectives. To illustrate this point, I shall cite a few examples. On the initiative of Bulgarian youth the month of May 1985 was declared a month for action on behalf of peace and disarmament and the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Balkans. A meeting of young authors from the Balkan countries was held in Sofia on the theme "Peace, friendship and co-operation and turning the Balkans into a nuclear-weapon-free zone". The Union of Bulgarian Artists organized an exhibition devoted to the struggle for peace and disarmament. United Nations Day and Disarmament Week were marked throughout the country, as was the Trade Unionist Day of Peace on 1 September.

The Bulgarian delegation has studied closely the Secretary-General's report on the World Disarmament Campaign in document A/40/443. We express our gratitude to the United Nations Secretariat for its substantial and versatile work in implementing the activities of the Campaign during 1985. We commend in particular the efforts made to acquaint public opinion with the action taken by the General Assembly in the field of disarmament and the intention to publish an annual newsletter on this question.

I wish to recall the visit of the fellows of the United Nations Disarmament Fellowship Programme to the People's Republic of Bulgaria as my country's contribution in implementation of the programme of activities for the World Disarmament Campaign.

(Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

My delegation notes the intensive character of the programme of activities of the World Disarmament Campaign for 1986. Its implementation will obviously require considerable efforts by the United Nations Secretariat. One should also bear in mind the fact that the General Assembly has proclaimed 1986 as the International Year of Peace. That implies co-ordination of the efforts of the relevant Secretariat departments so that the activities contemplated can have the maximum effect.

In our view, the World Disarmament Campaign could be made more effective if information and other activities were intensified on special dates and anniversaries closely connected with problems of peace and international security. Experience, including that acquired in connection with Disarmament Week, has demonstrated that their commemoration helps to increase public awareness of the issues of disarmament and peace. In this connection, my delegation reaffirms its support for the idea of making 6 August "Disarmament Day". Not only would that be an expression of sympathy for the Hiroshima victims but it would also provide momentum for action to prevent a nuclear war and pursue disarmament.

I should like briefly to touch upon the second item under consideration.

From the outset I wish to reiterate the particular importance which the People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches to the relationship between disarmament and development. In our view, the escalation of the arms race and increasing military expenditures certainly constitute the most serious impediments to the solution of the main economic and social problems faced by mankind today. A necessary condition for successfully resolving the complex problems confronting the majority of States, including recently liberated ones, is the prevention of nuclear war, the cessation of the arms race and measures for the reallocation of the resources thus released to economic and social development.

(Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

We note with regret, however, that vast material, intellectual and human resources continue to be wasted on the production of ever more sophisticated weapons. Suffice it to mention that each year between 5 and 8 per cent of world production is devoted to military purposes and that tens of millions of persons are engaged directly or indirectly in military activities that inevitably hamper economic development and delay by many years the solution of mankind's global problems. International problems, such as the elimination of poverty, hunger, illiteracy and disease, the industrialization of developing countries and achieving the growth rate necessary for them to catch up with the developed States, environmental protection, the harnessing of new and renewable resources of energy for those purposes, require stable international relations, peace and security, cessation of the arms race, and disarmament.

Studies prepared by individual countries, as well as by the United Nations in document A/36/356, categorically reject the validity of theories alleging that military expenditure has a certain positive effect on the economy by creating new jobs and stimulating technological progress. On the contrary, those studies show that the military sector of the economy undermines the overall economic mechanism by driving up non-productive costs and absorbing colossal material and human resources, thus increasing in the final analysis unemployment and inflation. The reallocation of even part of the resources of the military industrial complex to civilian sectors of the economy would increase economic growth rates and employment, help to eliminate economic discrepancies, and improve the quality of civilian production.

The specific proposals of the socialist countries to limit and reduce military budgets, both in relative and absolute terms, and their readiness to resolve, on a

(Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

mutually acceptable basis, the problem of the initial point of departure for those budgets provide an opportunity for the reallocation of significant financial and material resources to constructive purposes, for socio-economic development.

The forthcoming International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, to be held in Paris in 1986, should deal constructively with the task of charting ways to release additional resources for the goals of development on the basis of practical arms limitation measures. The People's Republic of Bulgaria is ready to work for the success of that Conference.

Mr. SUTOWARDOYO (Indonesia): Today the Indonesian delegation will deal briefly with some specific agenda items.

Let me begin with the question of disarmament and development, in which we have evinced a long-standing interest. They both, and each in its own right, compel attention and are meritorious. None the less there is also indisputable value in considering disarmament and development jointly. The reasons are twofold: first, drawing attention to the benefits that each offers to the other strengthens the argument for achieving both; and, secondly, by anticipating the ways in which the links between them might be established or strengthened helps to lay the groundwork for making the most of the development opportunities that could be created by disarmament.

The United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and development has made an important contribution in this regard by addressing such crucial questions as resource utilization, impact of the arms race, conversion problems, and possible measures for reallocation of resources.

(Mr. Sutowardoyo, Indonesia)

A global perspective on the relationship between disarmament and development, as elaborated in the study, views this relationship at two fundamental levels: the economic consequences of the arms race on international economic exchanges, whether they pertain to finance, trade, technology, development assistance or other forms of international transactions; and the impact of national military expenditures on economic performance, such as in the areas of employment, inflation, rates of economic growth, capital formation and other aspects. Taking the position that military expenditures by definition fall into the category of consumption and not investment, the report established the relationship between disarmament and development as a two-way street wherein development not only benefits from, but also contributes to, disarmament because sluggish economic performance, lack of development or under-development represent non-military challenges to national and international security.

In view of these far-ranging ramifications inherent in the relationship between disarmament and development, my delegation had since the very beginning endorsed the proposal for the convening of an international conference for a comprehensive and integrated discussion of the issues involved. We were pleased that, in pursuance of resolution 39/160, the Preparatory Committee was established and that, at its very first session, it agreed on a provisional agenda as well as on modalities and other recommendations for the substantive work of the conference. The smooth functioning of the Preparatory Committee augurs well that future sessions will focus constructively on, among other things, a detailed analysis of the disarmament-development link for the quantification of the economic and political costs and benefits involved, and their impact on the economy, employment and production patterns of both arms-producing and recipient countries. In this way, a clear definition of the mutual interest equation could be obtained,

(Mr. Sutowardoyo, Indonesia)

opening the way for the elaboration of concrete proposals for adjustments or revisions in political and economic priorities to be taken up, we believe, at the Conference in Paris next July.

The next question to which the Indonesian delegation would like to address itself today is that of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Indonesia is among the countries which attach great importance to this question. As a matter of fact, the Indonesian Government has long advanced the idea that the zone of peace, freedom and neutrality to be created by common agreement in South-East Asia should incorporate, as an essential element, the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

My delegation therefore regrets that the Group of Experts on Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones was unable to reach agreement on the study as a whole.

Regional peace and security are essential elements for the security and well-being of the countries and peoples of the region concerned. Regional conflicts, on the other hand, have a destabilizing effect. It is furthermore an unfortunate reality in today's life that all too often regional conflicts are aggravated by external factors, in the form of direct or indirect involvement by competing outside major Powers, thus posing a threat to the sovereignty, independence and/or territorial integrity of the countries of the region. This is where the threat of the use of force, including, possibly, the threat of the use of nuclear weapons, may come into play. And this is where the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone becomes, from the regional perspective, relevant and essential.

It is our conviction that regional arrangements voluntarily entered into by the countries in the region concerned - which may find expression in the creation of a zone of peace or a nuclear-weapon-free zone - may prove essential for

(Mr. Sutowardoyo, Indonesia)

bolstering the collective resilience of smaller Powers in facing the effects of major Power rivalry in their region.

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world, under agreements freely arrived at by the regional States concerned, will definitely contribute to the promotion of peace and security not only in each of the regions but world-wide as well, through the effective exclusion of nuclear weapons from the territories of the States in the region. At the same time, it will contribute to the objectives of nuclear non-proliferation, and in particular to curbing the spread of nuclear weapons, including their so-called "geographical proliferation".

As to the question of conventional disarmament, in particular conventional disarmament at the regional level, let me begin by stressing that we are not against it and can give it our support since we believe that the less money that is spent on armament the better. We also believe that the developing, non-nuclear-weapon countries, at which the proposed measure seems to be aimed, are the ones which can least afford to divert their meagre resources from much-needed economic and social development efforts.

Indonesia itself has exercised utmost restraint in this respect. As a matter of fact, there has been no appreciable increase in Indonesia's military expenditure in the past 15 years. In proportion to the size of our population and our territory, Indonesia's military establishment is certainly among the smallest in comparison to that of other nations. And only recently we effected certain changes resulting in a simplified organizational structure of our armed forces. In our own subregion, within the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), restraint in military matters is a mutually observed policy goal.

(Mr. Sutowardoyo, Indonesia)

Having said that, I should immediately add that nuclear arms continues to be our highest priority concern and that nothing should distract us from our pursuit of the primary objective, which is nuclear disarmament. On the matter of conventional disarmament, the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement, in their Declaration at Luanda last September, said that "conventional disarmament should also be pursued, at the global, regional and sub-regional levels as appropriate within the context of progress towards general and complete disarmament." The undeniable fact is that there has not been much progress toward general and complete disarmament, and there has certainly been no progress in the field of nuclear disarmament.

Moreover, as my Deputy Foreign Minister for Political Affairs stated in his address this Committee on 16 October, citing the report on the study on conventional disarmament of 23 June 1984, "negotiations on the reduction of conventional armaments should focus on the major producers and users rather than on seeking to deflect attention by interjecting issues that are secondary to the primary cause of the conventional arms race" (A/C.1/40/PV.6, p. 41).

In the same address my Deputy Foreign Minister already noted the modest progress made in the elaboration of common texts for the future convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and the advances made towards agreement on such questions as the elimination of stocks and production facilities as well as the non-use of herbicides. Today my delegation wishes only to express its thanks and appreciation to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons of the Conference on Disarmament, Mr. Turbanski of Poland, and to state the view that what had been so painstakingly achieved, in view of the complexity of the problems involved, constitutes a valuable asset which should be taken advantage of in further work on the convention.

(Mr. Sutowardoyo, Indonesia)

As regards a comprehensive nuclear test ban, my Deputy Foreign Minister was emphatic when he declared that such a ban "would constitute an integral phase in the efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race" (ibid., p. 34), adding that only a lack of political will prevents the materialization of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

On this occasion I wish merely to recall that, at the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Indonesia was among the countries which took a strong position on this matter and only reluctantly agreed to join in the consensus on the adoption of the Final Document because of the difficulty we had with the wording of the paragraph on the comprehensive test-ban treaty. We hope that at this late stage those who reserved their position at the time would now give heed to the increasing clamour of the overwhelming majority and agree to the initiation of negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty before the end of the current year.

(Mr. Sutowardoyo, Indonesia)

I would not feel it right if I concluded my statement without referring to one of the concerns repeatedly expressed by the General Assembly over the years emanating from the situation in South Africa as a result of the policies and actions of the apartheid régime, especially the efforts to consolidate and perpetuate racist domination of the country. The Assembly has in the past called on South Africa to abandon its despicable policy of apartheid and called upon Member States to refrain from collaborating with the racist régime and its apartheid institutions.

Concurrently, the General Assembly, aware of the dangers of South Africa acquiring nuclear weapons, called for the implementation of the 1964 Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, and has since repeatedly urged Member States to respect the continent of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and terminate any nuclear collaboration with South Africa.

In a parallel action, the Security Council, recognizing that the policies and acts of South Africa were fraught with danger, imposed an arms embargo and enjoined States from co-operating with South Africa in the manufacture and development of nuclear weapons.

Despite those actions, however, there are several reasons for our continued concern with the racist régime's nuclear capability. First, it is now generally acknowledged that Pretoria is on the nuclear threshold. The implications are indeed considerable both as a threat to the security of African States as well as to international peace. Secondly, the steadfast refusal of the racist régime to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place all its nuclear installations under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. Such a refusal has ominous implications considering South Africa's technical capability and other infrastructure it possesses to manufacture nuclear weapons. Thirdly, the racist

(Mr. Sutowardoyo, Indonesia)

régime's far-reaching military strategy include the extension of its strategic zone beyond its borders and into neighbouring States, and it is even seeking alliances with certain States by stressing its geostrategic importance. Fourthly, the danger that South Africa, which has consistently defied the overwhelming will of the international community, casts yet another shadow with regard to the use of its nuclear capability to promote its nefarious objective of perpetuating apartheid and colonialism. Finally, it stands as the only insurmountable stumbling block to the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The apprehension and fears of the international community have been fully borne out by South Africa's reliance on brute military force in its relations with regional States and in suppressing the people within its own borders. South Africa must therefore be compelled to accept an internationally-binding commitment to non-proliferation and to respect the continent of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. To that end, the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa must be extended to cover all aspects that may contribute to the further development of its nuclear weapons capability, including transfers of relevant equipment, materials, technology and personnel. Finally, those States that have turned a blind eye to the perilous consequences of the situation, should henceforth terminate any assistance that either directly or indirectly would augment the racist régime's nuclear weapon capability. To do anything less would be tantamount to abrogating the collective responsibility that devolves upon us all.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): It is my honour today to introduce three draft resolutions.

The first resolution A/C.1/40/L.17 is sponsored by the delegations of Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Yugoslavia and Mexico, and deals with item 61 (a) of the programme relating to the World Disarmament Campaign.

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

The draft begins by recalling that in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, it was declared that it was essential "that not only Governments but also the peoples of the world recognize and understand the dangers in the present situation and stressed the importance of mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament".

In the subsequent preambular paragraphs, reference is made to all the main resolutions of the General Assembly on this question, as well as the main reports of the Secretary-General on that subject.

The nine operative paragraphs of the draft are clearly self-explanatory, and this enables me to confine myself to recommending that they be read and to emphasize the statement made by the Secretary-General on 24 October, last year, to the effect that co-operation and the participation of all States which was expressly recommended by the General Assembly implies that adequate funds be provided for the campaign and that consequently, I quote from paragraph 3 of the draft resolution "the criterion of universality also applies to pledges, since a campaign without world-wide participation and funding will have difficulty in reflecting this principle in its implementation".

That is why the draft reiterates what was stated by the Assembly in its 1984 resolution to the effect that it regrets:

"that most of the States which have the largest military expenditures have not so far made any financial contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign;"

(General Assembly resolution 39/63 D, para. 4)

Those States, like the ones which have not yet announced any voluntary contribution to the Campaign, will have a further opportunity to do so at the fourth United Nations Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign, the holding of which is specifically provided for in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

The second of the three drafts which, as I stated at the beginning, I shall be introducing on this occasion is draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.18, sponsored by the delegations of Indonesia, Pakistan, Peru, Sweden, Uruguay and Mexico, the preamble of which recalls a number of declarations of the General Assembly concerning the dangers inherent in nuclear weapons, the mere existence of which, as was stated rightly at the first special session devoted to disarmament, represents a threat to the very survival of mankind.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

Of course the freezing of nuclear weapons which it is sought to bring about, as stated in the draft, is not "an end in itself", but rather, as the draft states, "would constitute the most effective first step to prevent the continued increase and qualitative improvement of existing nuclear weaponry during the period when the negotiations take place".

With respect to the procedures and scope of the freeze, as defined in operative paragraph 1 of the draft, I am happy to state that, as we understand clearly from the fact that it is explicitly stated that the freeze should be proclaimed "through simultaneous unilateral declarations or through a joint declaration", it is obvious that, to that end, it will be necessary for both sides, that is to say, the United States and the Soviet Union, to arrive first at an agreement on that question, since the declarations in question would be inconceivable without that prior requirement.

The third and last of the drafts that I am introducing is contained in document A/C.1/40/L.19, and is sponsored by the following 11 delegations: Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Indonesia, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Uruguay and Yugoslavia.

This draft deals with an objective that had already been defined in paragraph 109 of the Final Document of 1978 namely:

"a comprehensive programme of disarmament encompassing all measures thought to be advisable in order to ensure that the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control becomes a reality in a world in which international peace and security prevail and in which the new international economic order is strengthened and consolidated."

As is well known, and as I myself have learned at first hand since it had been my privilege to be the Chairman of the Working Group, which is now called the Ad Hoc Committee, dealing with this matter in Geneva, "despite intensive efforts,

(Mr. García Robles, Mexico)

only modest progress was achieved" in this field, as stated in operative paragraph 1 of the draft.

That is why we believe it timely and opportune to include the recommendation in operative paragraph 2 of the draft, which:

"Urges the Conference on Disarmament to resume the work on the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament at the beginning of its 1986 session with the firm intention of concluding that task and submitting to the General Assembly a complete draft of the programme at its forty-first session;".

Mr. TINCA (Romania): In our previous statement, we presented the Romanian delegation's views on the entire range of disarmament items, emphasizing the central role that we attribute to the cessation of the arms race and to disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, and the fundamental importance of disarmament for improving the current international political climate as a means of maintaining world peace and security.

Today I should like to dwell more specifically on a particular item which has been of constant concern to the Romanian Government. I am talking about the reduction of military budgets, an item that has been on our agenda for some years now.

While the prevention of nuclear war and the implementation of genuine measures aimed at halting the nuclear arms race and achieving a substantive reduction of existing nuclear arsenals remain the high priority goal of the present disarmament strategy, the debate taking place at this session, and especially the discussions during the commemorative period in which a large number of Heads of State or Government participated, emphasized more than ever the growing concern about the increasing military spending that constitutes a heavy burden for the economies of all nations and has extremely harmful effects on world peace and security.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

Here in this Committee hardly a delegation takes part in the deliberations without referring to the pressing need to halt or restrain the alarming waste of human and material resources now engulfed by the arms race and military rivalry. The firm opinion shared by an impressive majority of us, if not by all of us, is that the present world economic situation, in particular the economic situation in developing countries, requires an urgent reorientation of the flow of resources. This need has been consistently emphasized by Romania and other countries which, over the years, have been calling for negotiations with a view to freezing and reducing military budgets and reallocating the funds thus saved to the economic and social development of countries, in particular to the developing countries. As the President of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, stated recently, "The reduction of military expenditures is an objective necessity for a general cessation of the arms race and for peace, as well as for improving the standard of living of all peoples and contributing to their economic and social development." My delegation's position on this matter rests on two basic considerations.

On one hand, the increase in military spending is based on the mistaken belief that national security can be maintained and strengthened by the perpetual acquisition and improvement of weapons. Experience shows that the constant increase in military expenditure has not led to more security for any nation or for mankind as a whole. On the contrary, this phenomenon reflects and, at the same time, aggravates international tensions, fans the embers of conflicts in various parts of the world, impedes efforts to improve the political climate, intensifies the feeling of insecurity and increases the danger of war which, in present circumstances, would inevitably result in a nuclear catastrophe. On the other hand, increased military expenditure represents an irrational and often

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

immoral waste of vast resources vitally needed for development and for a healthy world economy. The forces controlling the arms race, the interests it promotes and the various forms it takes have turned it into a major factor affecting global options in economic and social affairs. This conclusion applies not only to the developing countries; indeed, its impact is also felt by the industrialized countries. The constant increase in arms spending and the feverish military competition it engenders also have a suffocating effect on the economic life of those countries and maintain and accentuate budgetary deficits and reduce the funds available for productive investments.

It appears - and the present session is the most relevant in this respect - that ongoing arms spending and the monstrous waste of resources it involves cannot be reasonably justified by any argument. This statement is probably more pertinent today than ever before as plans and programmes to create new weapons and new systems of such weapons are setting the stage for an even greater acceleration of world military expenditure in the next decades to come. We therefore need to act urgently and resolutely to put an end to the present situation and adopt concrete measures to freeze and reduce military budgets. There is absolutely no doubt that such measures would have a beneficial effect on all aspects of international economic and social life.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The measures would contribute substantially to stimulating development and accelerating the progress of all countries; release an impressive amount of the financial and other resources so badly needed for the elimination of underdevelopment and of the existing gap between developed and developing countries; and contribute decisively to slowing down the growth of unemployment all over the world. They would also play an essential role in combating the hunger that strikes large regions of our planet; facilitate the efforts now being made to eliminate illiteracy; and make possible a global campaign to combat disease and ensure adequate health conditions for all people.

It is also beyond doubt that measures to reduce military expenditures would contribute to removing the persistent effects of the present economic crises and to the betterment of the world economy. They would have a positive impact on the international political climate, as they would generate confidence among States and stimulate détente; make possible the implementation of vast world scientific programmes for the benefit of all; and they would reduce the risk of war and represent a decisive step towards the elimination of other dangers menacing the world.

The nuclear Powers and other militarily significant States undoubtedly have the primary responsibility for initiating a process leading to the attainment of that objective. At the same time, we are convinced that all States, large and small, whatever their military potential, can contribute to the same end.

In that respect, I would recall that Romania, after several times proposing a 10-15 per cent reduction of world military spending, and having itself reduced its own military spending in three consecutive years, has decided to freeze that spending at the 1982 level. As a steady advocate of dialogue between the parties to the Warsaw Treaty and the members of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) designed to halt the arms race, build trust among nations and bring about

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

disarmament, Romania attached special importance to the commencement of negotiations between the States of the two blocs to freeze and reduce their military budgets. We also appealed to the Soviet Union and the United States of America, as these two great Powers account for the greatest part of world military spending, to undertake negotiations with a view to freezing and reducing their military budgets. This also explains why Romania considers it particularly important that the recent Declaration of the States Parties to the Warsaw Treaty, while formulating a comprehensive set of disarmament and arms limitation proposals, emphasized that a mutual non-increase of the military budgets of the Soviet Union and United States of America starting with the next fiscal year, would be an effective measure to limit the arms race in all its aspects.

Other countries, too, have advanced concrete proposals regarding the reduction of military budgets, and, as the Committee was informed last year, and has been informed again this year, a number of States have unilaterally decided to cut their armed forces or their military spending. We welcome these measures as a positive development.

The broad support for the decision to convene a conference on the relationship between disarmament and development is also a reflection of the widely-felt need to end the present situation, in which so many resources are squandered in order to develop and stockpile new weapons of ever-increasing destructive power. We earnestly hope that next year in Paris the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development will lead to a common undertaking by all States, in particular the most heavily-armed, to engage in a real process of limiting and reducing their military budgets, and set up, at the same time, practical modalities ensuring that resources released as a result of disarmament and the reduction of military spending will be allocated to support the economic and social development efforts of the developing countries.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

But disarmament cannot be achieved by just a few countries, still less by small- and medium-sized developing countries. Solving the disarmament problems, which would include the freezing and reduction of military budgets, requires the political will of States, in particular of the nuclear States and the most heavily armed countries. Here again "the political will" is the key phrase. The most practical task for us all is to discover how to contribute to a process leading to the creation of that political will and how to contribute to a situation in which all concerned have to do nothing but to demonstrate their political will.

Romania and Sweden have proposed to the Disarmament Commission identifying and elaborating a set of principles which would govern the actions of States with regard to freezing and reducing military budgets. It is my delegation's considered view that those principles can make a distinct contribution to harmonizing the views of States and establishing trust among them, which would certainly facilitate real negotiation in order to arrive at international agreements on the freezing and reduction of military budgets. Over the years the Disarmament Commission has reached an advanced stage in the elaboration of those principles, which is properly reflected in the working paper annexed to the Commission's report, now before the Committee for consideration.

As a matter of fact, there is already general agreement on all principles that have been identified, except that relating to verification. There are also divergent views concerning other technical aspects to do with comparability and exchange of data - which should be carefully studied, we admit, but which cannot be regarded as exclusive, let alone as a pre-condition for any practical step in this field. We re-emphasize that the Romanian delegation favours a constructive and flexible approach capable of identifying potential areas for an adequate settlement of all those so-called technical aspects. In that connection, I would point out that Romania has decided this year for the first time to transmit data relating to its military expenditure, using the existing international reporting instrument.

We believe that the Commission, with the co-operation of all countries, can resolve in a generally acceptable manner the few remaining problems; this is all the more important as the Commission has already provided in its recommendations that the identification and elaboration of the principles should be finalized at its substantive session in 1986.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/40/L.12, which I have the honour to introduce on behalf of the sponsors - Austria, Bangladesh, Colombia, Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden and Uruguay - is intended to ensure the required political and procedural framework for the attainment of that objective.

As in the past, the draft views that endeavour on two levels. On the one hand the sponsors consider that the General Assembly must reiterate the appeal it has addressed for five consecutive years to all States - first and foremost the most heavily armed States - to show restraint in their military expenditures, while awaiting the conclusion of agreements on the reduction of such expenditures.

On the other hand, the General Assembly calls on the Disarmament Commission to continue its activities with a view to finalizing the identification and elaboration of the principles which should govern further actions of States in the field of freezing and reducing military budgets. One of the most important provisions of the preamble stipulates that the identification and elaboration of those principles, as well as other United Nations activities related to the reduction of military budgets, should have the fundamental objective of reaching international agreements on the reduction of military expenditures.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The preambular part expresses the concern of Member States at the acceleration of the arms race and the increase in military expenditures, and stresses the need to give a new impetus to the efforts to reach agreements on freezing and reducing military budgets in a balanced manner, including appropriate verification measures acceptable to all interested parties. The preamble also expresses the conviction of the General Assembly that the freezing and reduction of military budgets would have favourable consequences for the world economic and financial situation and might facilitate efforts to increase international assistance to developing countries.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The relevant provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and of the Declaration of the 1980s as the Second United Nations Disarmament Decade, calling for specific measures to reduce military expenditures, are also reaffirmed in the preambular part.

In operative paragraph 1, the General Assembly declares again its conviction that it is possible to achieve international agreements on the reduction of military budgets without prejudice to the right of all States to undiminished security, self-defence and sovereignty.

In paragraph 2, the Assembly appeals to all States to exercise self-restraint with a view to reallocating the funds thus saved to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries. We cannot but stress, here again, the particular importance of that appeal. There is no doubt that under the circumstances, when military expenditures are both a consequence and an aggravating factor of the international situation and are increasing at an unprecedented pace, the call for restraint addressed to all States, in particular to the most heavily armed States, is of great political significance.

In the next paragraph, the Assembly reaffirms the widely accepted view that the human and material resources released through the reduction of military expenditures could be reallocated for economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries.

In the following paragraphs, the General Assembly reiterates the recommendations contained in the report of the Disarmament Commission.

In paragraph 4 the Commission is requested to continue the consideration of the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets" and, in this context, to finalize the principles that should govern the actions of States in the field of the freezing and reduction of military expenditures on the basis of the working paper annexed to its report, as well as other proposals and ideas on the subject-matter.

(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

In the next two paragraphs, the General Assembly draws anew the attention of Member States to the fact that the identification and elaboration of these principles could contribute to harmonize the views of States and create confidence among them conducive to achieving international agreements on the reduction of military budgets, and urges all Member States, in particular the most heavily armed States, to reinforce their readiness to co-operate in a constructive manner with a view to reaching agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures.

Finally, the draft resolution provides that the item entitled "Reduction of military budgets" be included in the provisional agenda of the forty-first session of the General Assembly.

It is the firm conviction of the sponsors that the start, on an urgent basis, of negotiations on specific agreements to reduce military budgets will be possible only through a constructive and flexible approach likely to foster the identification of the elements capable of promoting convergence among the various ways of proceeding in this sensitive area. The draft resolution clearly demonstrates the concern of the sponsors, and their efforts to contribute to the harmonization of the views expressed by States on the question of the reduction of military budgets. Thus, it contains only non-controversial ideas and provisions that have appeared in resolutions and recommendations adopted by consensus by the General Assembly or the Disarmament Commission on the question of the reduction of military budgets.

In conclusion, the delegation of Romania wishes to thank all the delegations which participated in the preparation of the draft resolution, and in particular those which joined in sponsoring it. The consultations we held on the text of draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.12, as well as the non-controversial nature of its provisions, lead us to hope that it will be adopted without a vote.

Mrs. ENGMAN (Sweden): I am speaking to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/40/L.32, concerning the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, together with three Protocols: on non-detectable fragments; on land mines, booby traps and other devices; and on incendiary weapons.

The adoption of that Convention on 10 October 1980 was the result of several years of preparation. The fact that it entered into force on 2 December 1983 - that is, just over three years after its adoption - is a very encouraging indication of the desire of the international community progressively to develop international humanitarian law in this field and to give effect to it. The draft resolution reflects the satisfaction felt at that positive development and notes the possibilities laid down in article 8 of the Convention for reviewing the scope and operation of the Convention and its Protocols and for further international standard-setting relating to other categories of conventional weapons not covered.

In this context the Swedish delegation would like to make the following remarks. In our view, some categories of weapons, such as incendiary weapons, should be made the object of further, specific, restrictions. A category like sea mines could, as has been suggested in the United Nations study on the naval arms race, be made the object of restrictions in a new protocol, possibly but not necessarily within the framework of the present Convention. In addition, new developments in laser technology for weapon purposes should be followed closely. There seems to be a possible trend towards developing laser weapons for purposes of close combat. Lasers based on land vehicles could be designed for anti-personnel use, with the possible effect of burning soldiers to death with laser beams or, under certain circumstances, making them lose their eyesight permanently. It is important to prevent such methods of warfare from being developed by declaring

(Mrs. Engman, Sweden)

them to be contrary to international law. With regard to laser weapons specifically designed for such anti-personnel use, a prohibition should be considered.

The Convention and the three annexed Protocols have now been acceded to by 25 States Parties. The draft resolution urges States that have not yet become parties to the Convention and its annexed Protocols to exert their best endeavours to do so as early as possible, so that the instruments might ultimately obtain universality of adherence.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are the delegations of Austria, Belgium, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Yugoslavia and my own delegation, Sweden. On behalf of those sponsors, I should like to express the hope that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/40/L.32 will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. GRANDERSON (Trinidad and Tobago): My delegation wishes to make a few observations on agenda item 69, which deals with the crucial subject of the relationship between disarmament and development.

During the general debate on disarmament items in the Committee, we have heard many speakers emphasize that the accumulation of arms - nuclear or conventional - does not bring security. On the contrary, security is to be found in détente, co-operation, mutual understanding and disarmament. Yet, the outlay of stupendous sums of money on the development and acquisition of armaments continues. Not only does this fuel increasing feelings of insecurity; it ignores the reality that threats to international security are not only military in nature but also cultural, social and economic. Just as great extremes of wealth and poverty in a given society can be a factor of internal political instability, the increasing socio-economic inequities of the global society are morally unacceptable and politically dangerous and constitute a potential source of international tension and conflict.

A few statistics chosen at random give us a more concrete idea of the scandalous disparity between the resources allocated to armaments and those devoted to development assistance. In purely financial terms, world military expenditure by 1980 was 19 times as large as all the official development assistance provided by the countries of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 1980. A few days ago the representative of Austria reminded us that during the 15 minutes that his statement lasted "mankind spent \$27 million for military purposes". While these staggering financial outlays are being devoted to military ends, the basic needs of hundreds of millions of people are not being satisfied, even though mankind at present possesses the technical expertise, the inventive capability and the material resources to do so.

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad
and Tobago)

Even the specialized international agencies which assist in meeting some of the basic needs of the developing world are currently finding their policy choices under question and their efforts hampered by the lack of adequate funding.

The Thorsson report on the relationship between disarmament and development demonstrates that the arms race and development are in a competitive relationship, not only in terms of resources but, more importantly, in terms of attitudes and perceptions. The process of arms accumulation and the process of development both require the allocation of colossal financial, material and human resources. In view of the fact that these resources are finite, both processes cannot be pursued at the same time. Balanced global socio-economic development is sacrificed on the altar of arms accumulation.

These two processes also interact in other more complex ways. The economies of developing countries can be adversely affected by the fiscal and monetary policies established by the industrialized countries to protect themselves from the negative impact of escalating military expenditure on their own economies. For example, at the present moment the fragile economies of developing countries are being unnecessarily burdened by the harmful effects of the misalignment of a major international currency. Despite huge trade imbalances and colossal budgetary deficits to which military expenditure has contributed, this currency remains seriously over-valued, sustained as it is by high interest rates to attract foreign capital.

The reallocation of military expenditure to development purposes will not take place until there is a better understanding among the important actors in the arms race of the complex interplay between the accumulation of arms and the process of development; it will not take place until there is greater awareness of the interdependence of the world in which we now live and the consequent need for

(Mr. Granderson, Trinidad
and Tobago)

structural changes in the international economic order and in international institutions. It certainly will not take place before the required political will is displayed by the main principals in the arms race.

The Trinidad and Tobago delegation is of the view that the provision of data concerning military budgets, military expenditures and arms transfers is essential if the study of the economic impact of the allocation of resources to military purposes is to be carried out in a meaningful manner and with any degree of accuracy.

It is in this context that the Trinidad and Tobago delegation welcomes the convening, under the aegis of the United Nations, of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development. We hope that the in-depth consideration of this vital issue will lead to a better understanding of its ramifications, help reshape attitudes and perceptions and thereby contribute to both the process of disarmament and of development.

My delegation also notes with interest the report of the Secretary-General on the relationship between disarmament and development, in document A/40/618 of 4 October 1985. It gives details of the action undertaken within the United Nations system to incorporate the disarmament-development perspective into its programmes and activities. It also informs of the measures taken by Member States.

Disarmament and development are the two most important challenges facing the international community. They should not be seen as two separate problems facing two different world constituencies. Because of the complex interplay of relationships between them they should be seen, on the contrary, as a dual approach to the objective to which we all aspire: a better world.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.