



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 7th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Statements were made by:

Mr. Kravets (Ukrainian SSR)
Mr. Fan Guoxiang (China)
Mr. Adeniji (Nigeria)
Mr. Marinescu (Romania)
Mr. Morel (France)
Mr. McDowell (New Zealand)

*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 DC2/750, 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.1/41/PV.7
20 October 1986
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. KRAVETS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The Ukrainian delegation is particularly pleased to see you, Sir, the representative of the German Democratic Republic, guiding the work of the First Committee. We congratulate you most cordially and sincerely on your election to the chairmanship, and wish you all success in carrying out your duties. Our good wishes go also to all the other officers of the Committee.

Today, the United Nations bears the major historical responsibility of breaking mankind's nuclear deadlock. It was plain from statements in the general debate in the General Assembly that this task has emerged as one of the major high-priority areas for decision. The First Committee too is devoting a debate to the subject. Halting the arms race, decreasing the danger of war and eliminating the threat of nuclear catastrophe are vitally important and necessary today. Clearly, these goals can be attained only through joint effort and action: action by States, their Governments and their peoples.

Obviously, it is not enough to confine ourselves to appeals for peace. We need concrete actions. That is the approach of the socialist countries to resolving urgent problems of world development, as proven by the numerous major foreign policy initiatives put forward by those countries.. The position taken by the Soviet Union in its talks with the United States sets an example of flexibility, restraint, courage and patience in pursuing the noble goal of maintaining and strengthening international peace and security. That was demonstrated in the Reykjavik meeting between the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, and the President of the United States, Mr. Ronald Reagan.

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

The USSR and the United States of America have recognized their special responsibility as regards the maintenance of peace. At Geneva they stated jointly that nuclear war must never be waged and cannot be won. They stated also that neither side would strive to achieve military supremacy. All subsequent steps, actions and unilateral measures by the Soviet Union have been in unswerving pursuit of that foreign policy course.

At Reykjavik, the Soviet Union put forward a package of new major proposals. Had they been adopted, these would have initiated a new era in human history, a nuclear-free era. The proposals involved not merely limiting the nuclear-arms race - as was the case of the first and second strategic arms limitation Treaties and other treaties - but rather the elimination of nuclear weapons in a relatively short time. That is the essence of the major breakthrough in the world situation, which was a clear and genuine possibility. At Reykjavik the prospect was opened for agreement on 50-per-cent cuts in strategic offensive nuclear weapons: land-based strategic missiles, submarine-based strategic missiles and strategic bombers. Great progress was made towards agreements on medium-range missiles, and total clarity was reached on questions of verification.

In a number of areas the Soviet Union made considerable concessions. For example, it agreed not to count the nuclear potential of the United Kingdom and France. As a result of that constructive position, conditions were created for the adoption of far-reaching political decisions. Naturally, the Soviet Union made the point that in the course of considerable genuine reductions in and the subsequent elimination of nuclear weapons the USSR and the United States should not destroy the machinery that had been curbing the arms race - such as the anti-ballistic missile Treaty - but should rather strengthen it. The Soviet Union proposed that for the next 15 years neither side should exercise its right to abrogate the

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

anti-ballistic missile Treaty, during which time an end would be put to strategic weapons. The essence of that proposal was to guarantee compliance with the provisions of the Treaty prohibiting the development, testing and deployment of space weapons. The Soviet Union did not even call for a halt to work on the strategic defence initiative, but for an understanding that the provisions of the anti-ballistic missile Treaty would be complied with: research and testing in that area would be confined to the laboratory.

That seems to be an entirely logical and correct approach to the question, consistent with the interests of both sides. However, it gave rise to sharp disagreement by the United States of America. The United States Administration was adamant that the United States should have the right to engage in research and testing on everything relating to the strategic defence initiative, not only in the laboratory but in outer space. That would lead to a new spiral in the arms race, with ruinous consequences for peace and civilization.

It was clear that the Soviet Union could not agree with an approach that would open up outer space to weapons. In any event, how can there be agreement on the elimination of nuclear weapons if the United States continues to work on improving them? That is the essence of the fundamental difference between the two sides, and it proved to be an obstacle to agreement.

Yet the positions of the Soviet Union and the United States had never before been so close as they were at Reykjavik. The two sides were on the brink of adopting far-reaching historic decisions, but because of the unyielding position of the United States the opportunity was missed.

What are the true reasons for what occurred? Apart from anything else, they lie in the United States military-business establishment, which everyone knows is greedy and ruthless. Yesterday it demanded millions of dollars; today it demands

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

billions. Tomorrow it will demand trillions. It is the vision of those trillions of dollars generated by the strategic defence initiative, otherwise known as "star wars", that has bedazzled the big wheels of the military-industrial complex of the imperialist countries, particularly the United States. "Star wars" has become the symbol of the aggressive designs of United States imperialism. Some people in the United States have simply been hypnotized by the very notion of "star wars"; the powerful hypnotist here is not a psychiatrist, with his penetrating gaze, but the astronomic amounts of loot, which is irresistible to the arms merchants.

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

Der Spiegel, the West German weekly magazine, has called the star-wars programme the spawn of the American monopolies. We must agree with this assessment. The magazine reports that as long ago as the 1970s Rockwell International, the large aircraft manufacturer, published a pamphlet entitled "Outer Space, the American Frontier for Growth, Leadership and Freedom". Today, the United States military-industrial complex is playing the decisive role in nurturing and promoting the growth of its offspring. Twelve major Pentagon suppliers determine the rate of the star-wars programme. More than 240 American military-industrial firms are busily filling orders for the strategic defence initiative, and they have let contracts to thousands of subcontractors. All of this information is derived from American sources.

An American Senator has calculated that the creation of the star-wars system will cost in excess of \$2 trillion, and that its maintenance and modernization will cost another \$200 billion to \$300 billion per year. Those figures come from a debate held in the United States Congress. Thus, when speaking of the sinister strategic defence initiative we must make something very clear: there are many people, even in the United States itself, who are highly skeptical about the purported defence value of the strategic defence initiative, and people throughout the world are coming to a greater understanding of the threat that initiative represents as an attempt to destroy the existing strategic balance and achieve decisive strategic advantage by extending the arms race into space.

The path to international security lies in the elimination of weapons, not in their continuing technological perfection. Imperialism's political ambitions as reflected in the strategic defence initiative are designed to ensure that the United States will gain military supremacy over the USSR and the socialist countries to erode the Soviet Union economically and, ultimately, to ensure a commanding world position that can enable them to pursue their imperialist

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

ambitions to rule and plunder the weak. Frankly, such ambitions and designs are totally senseless. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR is of the opinion that we must all increase our efforts to establish conditions that will allow us to turn away from confrontation and towards the constructive search for ways and means of normalizing international relations, for resolving conflicts by political means and for improving the international situation as a whole.

That is the approach upon which the practical policy of the socialist countries is based when dealing with questions of disarmament and of limiting and halting the arms race. Motivated by such considerations, the socialist countries have proposed as one of the high-priority tasks in creating a comprehensive international system of peace and security the cessation of all nuclear-weapon testing. The importance of an immediate solution to this particularly urgent problem resides in the fact that, according to specialists, scientists, politicians and military leaders, an end to testing would effectively close off any possibility of improving nuclear weapons. In his reply to the message issued by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, stressed that

"Such a measure would contribute effectively towards halting the qualitative and quantitative growth of nuclear arsenals, and, in our view, it would constitute the point of departure for a movement leading mankind towards a world without nuclear weapons." (A/41/541, Annex, p. 2)

The problem of nuclear testing is clearly at the heart of the discussions we hold in the First Committee. The statements made by many members have stressed the fact that, given the political will of States, this is the one question upon which agreement can be achieved at an early date. In this connection, we recall the words of the United Nations Secretary-General, who described the achievement of a

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

comprehensive test ban as a litmus test of the determination of the nuclear-weapon States to halt the arms race.

The problem of the prohibition of the dangerous testing of nuclear weapons has a long history. As early as April 1954, a prominent political figure of the time, the Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, proposed the conclusion of an agreement on the cessation of nuclear testing as a separate step to lead to more radical future initiatives towards nuclear disarmament. The USSR was the first of the nuclear Powers to support that idea, and on 10 May 1955, in the sub-committee of the United Nations Commission on Disarmament, it submitted proposals that, as one of the high-priority measures in drawing up a programme for the reduction and prohibition of nuclear weapons, States possessing atomic and hydrogen bombs should, inter alia, undertake to halt the testing of such weapons. That proposal is contained in document DC/SC.1/26/Rev.2.

The Western States set up obstacles to the implementation of those proposals. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries continued to attempt to find a solution to the problem of halting nuclear tests. This was of decisive significance in the conclusion, in 1963, of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water, which has become an important element in the international system of agreements in the arms-limitation and disarmament field.

A new stage in the international community's struggle to find a comprehensive solution to the question of nuclear-weapon testing was reached with the basic provisions of a treaty on that subject submitted by the USSR at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. In this connection, it is interesting to note that that document reflected the viewpoints of many States, particularly on questions of verification. In resolution 37/85 of 9 December 1982, the General Assembly referred the USSR proposals to the Committee on Disarmament and called upon

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

all nuclear-weapon States, as a gesture of goodwill, not to conduct any nuclear explosions, starting from a date to be agreed among them and continuing until the conclusion of a treaty. Owing to the obstructionist position of a small group of States - and particularly the United States - the Conference on Disarmament has to this day not been able to undertake negotiations aimed at producing such a treaty.

The trilateral talks between the USSR, the United States and Great Britain came very close to achieving agreement on nuclear testing. It would appear that only one further step was needed, one more small effort, and the problem that is the source of such anxiety to all mankind could have been solved. Statements issued by the American side also gave assurances to this effect. Speaking at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Vice-President of the United States, Mr. Walter Mondale, stated, inter alia:

"A comprehensive test ban would make a major contribution to curbing the clear competition between the super-Powers. It would lessen incentives for the development of nuclear weapons by States which do not now possess them, and thus would reinforce the non-proliferation Treaty."

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

He went on to say:

"All nations must be persuaded to forswear testing." (A/S-10/PV.2, p. 26)

The fruitful development of trilateral negotiations was reported by the world press. On 18 November 1980 The New York Times, for example, published an article that included the following statement:

'According to reports it would appear that in the course of the year, a treaty will be concluded on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.'

Unfortunately, all those hopes proved extremely short-lived. The American side sharply changed its position and unilaterally broke off the talks, and in 1982 it made the banning of tests a long-term task which should be resolved only in the general context of the disarmament problem. However, the problem of ending nuclear tests remains unresolved. We cannot permit the position of the United States, which needs tests to create new types and systems of nuclear and space weapons, to doom the whole international community to inaction in such an important long-standing problem. What we need is a new, powerful momentum in order to produce some progress in solving this problem.

A milestone in the many years of struggle for the banning of nuclear testing was the Soviet Union's declaration of a moratorium on all nuclear testing, which has been observed now for more than year. The Budapest Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization in June of this year, the Conference of the non-aligned movement at Harare, the leaders of the Delhi Six, reputable political parties, public organizations and eminent scientists and humanists have taken a very favourable view of what is a very difficult decision for the USSR from the point of view of politics, security and the country's economy. That assessment confirms that the USSR moratorium on nuclear explosions, being an actual deed, not just a proposal, is in keeping with the higher interests of mankind. It makes absolutely clear how serious and sincere

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

have been the appeals for a new policy of realism, peace and co-operation. This is a genuine contribution by a nuclear-weapon Power to the cause of ridding our planet of this deadly weapon.

The Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing has become the most noteworthy event of the International Year of Peace, proclaimed by the General Assembly. Clearly, if it were to become reciprocal on the part of the two major nuclear Powers the moratorium would create favourable conditions for concluding an international treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing.

Unfortunately, the United States has stubbornly taken an unyielding position. In answer to the appeal of the USSR to join in the moratorium we continue to hear nuclear explosions in the State of Nevada. The United States attempts to justify its refusal to end nuclear testing and join in the moratorium by various arguments which have been repeatedly shown to be unfounded by both the Soviet side and independent experts.

Let us, for example, take one of those "arguments" according to which it would be impossible to verify and monitor observance of a nuclear-test ban. Highly qualified specialists, including American specialists, have confirmed that the scientific and technical means that already exist in the USSR, the United States of America and other countries provide the necessary degree of security that a nuclear explosion, even a small one, would be detected. At Mr. Gorbachev's meeting with representatives of the World Forum of Scientists on a Comprehensive Test Ban, a Professor von Hippel of Princeton University, referred to a seismograph which registered a nuclear explosion of only 0.5 kiloton carried out 2,000 kilometres from the actual measuring device. That shows it is possible to detect even the smallest nuclear explosions.

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

At the same time, in order to eliminate entirely so-called verification difficulties, the USSR has proposed to supplement national technical means by the strictest verification measures, including on-site inspection. Agreement to the installing of American monitoring apparatus in the Semipalatinsk area and the visit of foreign journalists to Soviet nuclear testing grounds is clear proof of this. Of great importance also is the proposal of the leaders of the six countries that experts from those countries should meet Soviet and American specialists to look for possible means of verification of a nuclear-test ban. The Soviet Union has expressed its readiness to make use of that proposal. The ball is now in the court of the United States Administration.

Recently, the United States has been arguing strenuously that test explosions are necessary to test the reliability and effectiveness of nuclear weapons. Here, again, specialists have given very cogent proof that testing and verifying the reliability of existing nuclear arsenals can be done just as effectively and far more cheaply and safely without explosions by confining oneself to verifying the non-nuclear components of bombs and warheads, and long experience has demonstrated that. It is well known that since 1974 the United States and the USSR have not been carrying out tests of a yield of more than 150 kilotons. At the same time, in the United States weapons that exceed that threshold constitutes 17 per cent of the nuclear arsenal - and no less, it would appear, in the USSR. Therefore the Soviet and American sides can be sure of its reliability. There exist no technical or negotiating problems; only the protagonists' will and common sense are necessary.

The overwhelming majority of States hope that agreements on ending the destructive nuclear-weapon tests can be achieved at a very early date. This

(Mr. Kravets, Ukrainian SSR)

would be a very important step towards the cessation of the arms race. It would be a kind of prologue to progress in negotiations on nuclear armaments and their elimination and a radical improvement in the whole international environment.

In the Ukrainian delegation's view efforts in this field should be undertaken in all areas. In this regard, we believe that the United Nations - where for more than three decades we have been discussing the question of ending nuclear-weapon tests - has not yet exhausted all its possibilities, and it should bring its resources and possibilities to bear more actively. In the International Year of Peace we are entitled to expect that the General Assembly will take a decision of a kind that will fully reflect the demand of the international community for an end to the senseless perfecting of the means of mass destruction and the adoption without further delay of realistic measures in the fields of limiting nuclear weapons and of disarmament.

Mr. FAN Gouxianq (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. My congratulations go also to the other officers of the Committee. I am convinced that, under your able and experienced guidance, the Committee will achieve satisfactory results. I hereby pledge the Chinese delegation's full co-operation.

The year 1986 has been designated the International Year of Peace. Yet the peoples of the world are still deeply worried about the turbulent international situation. In working energetically for the maintenance of international peace, they have put forward many proposals and ideas on reducing armaments and opposing war.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

It is the common desire of various countries that the two super-Powers will set store by the overall interests of world peace and the security of all nations and take concrete measures on disarmament. Such a desire was reflected in the Mexico Declaration by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania last August and in the Political Declaration of the eighth summit meeting of the non-aligned countries held in Harare, Zimbabwe, last September.

The past year has seen a summit meeting between the United States and the Soviet Union. In their joint statements the two countries affirmed that nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought and acknowledged that they bear a special responsibility for the halting of the arms race and the reduction of nuclear arms. In the bilateral negotiations on arms control and disarmament, each side has put forward a series of proposals and plans, including a proposal for a 50-per-cent reduction of their strategic nuclear stockpiles. This is a welcome development. We have also noted the recent achievements of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures in Europe. Like everybody else, we hope that these results will help bring about a disarmament agreement that will help ease tension in Europe.

Many countries had hoped that the summit meeting between the United States and the Soviet Union in Iceland could result in some agreements on disarmament. What happened there, however, was that the meeting ended in a stalemate as a result of the wide divergencies in their respective positions. It is fully understandable why people are disappointed over such a result. We believe that in today's world dialogue is better than confrontation. The United States and the Soviet Union should continue their negotiations in real earnest so as to reach substantive agreements that are conducive to world peace and the relaxation of tensions.

It ought to be pointed out that, as disarmament concerns the security interests of all States, every country should have a say in this matter. The

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

great number of small and medium-sized countries, whether they are aligned or non-aligned, developing or developed, should and could play a role of their own on the question of disarmament and urge the United States and the Soviet Union to negotiate in real earnest. The United Nations and other multilateral disarmament meetings and negotiations have provided important forums in which countries can participate in settling disarmament issues. Their positive role should be given greater play.

Nuclear disarmament has always been a matter of utmost concern for the international community. It is a universal desire that the two major nuclear Powers will stop their nuclear-arms race and reach an early agreement on drastically reducing their nuclear weapons so as to lessen the nuclear threat to all countries. People also ardently hope that the Conference on Disarmament will play its role in nuclear disarmament.

To our regret, neither bilateral nor multilateral negotiations have so far been able to achieve any real progress in this regard. Although informal discussions were held earlier this year by the Conference on Disarmament on the agenda item of nuclear disarmament, many countries still want to see the early establishment of an ad hoc committee on this issue.

China consistently holds that the ever-escalating nuclear-arms race constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security and that the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament should be the complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons. As a first step towards that goal, the two major nuclear-weapon States, which possess more than 95 per cent of the nuclear weapons in the world, should take the lead in halting the testing, production and deployment of all types of nuclear weapons and drastically reduce all types of nuclear weapons they have deployed anywhere inside and outside their countries and destroy them on the spot. After that is achieved, a broadly representative

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

international conference on nuclear disarmament should be convened, with the participation of all the nuclear-weapon States, to work out measures for nuclear disarmament by all nuclear-weapon States and the complete destruction of nuclear weapons.

In the past year both the United States and the Soviet Union have expressed their readiness to take the lead in reducing their stockpiles by 50 per cent. China attaches importance to that gesture and hopes to see an early start of the process of nuclear disarmament. Mindful of these developments, my delegation is to submit this year a draft resolution on nuclear disarmament, which we hope will receive careful consideration from other delegations.

Before nuclear disarmament fully materializes, all nuclear-weapon States should, for the sake of reducing the risk of nuclear war, undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances and unconditionally pledge not to use, or threaten to use, nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones, and, on such a premise, an international convention with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States should be concluded to ban the use of nuclear weapons.

Over the past year or so both the United States and the Soviet Union have made proposals on reducing their medium-range missiles in Europe. As an Asian country, China has every reason to feel concerned about the nuclear threat existing within its own region. As the security interests of various regions are interrelated and influence each other, the mere reduction of intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe will not make Asian countries feel safer if the question of Asian-based intermediate-range nuclear forces is left undealt with. It is our position that the medium-range missiles deployed by either the Soviet Union or the United States in both Europe and Asia should be reduced and destroyed simultaneously and in a balanced way.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

For several years the issue of conventional disarmament has received increasing attention in many countries. China always attaches importance to conventional disarmament and believes that it should be pursued side by side with nuclear disarmament. Like many other countries, we regard the reduction of nuclear arms as the top priority. On the other hand, we are of the view that, while emphasizing the importance of nuclear disarmament, we must not overlook the importance of conventional disarmament, for the two are interrelated and influence each other.

First, both nuclear and conventional arms are basic components of the total military build-up of the two super-Powers and the two major military blocs. Secondly, in a nuclear age there is no insuperable barrier between a conventional war and a nuclear war. Should a conventional war break out in an area with a high concentration of nuclear and conventional weapons, there would be a possibility of it escalating into a nuclear war. Moreover, with the advances in science and technology, conventional weapons tend to become more and more destructive. Hundreds of thousands of lives have been lost in wars and conflicts fought with conventional weapons since the end of the Second World War. Furthermore, conventional arms have time and again been employed to intervene in, to subvert, to invade or to occupy sovereign States.

For all those reasons, conventional disarmament is of crucial significance. We are of the view that the countries possessing the largest conventional arsenals bear a special responsibility for conventional disarmament. It is reasonable for them to take the lead by cutting down their conventional arms and troops.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

At present, huge numbers of sophisticated conventional weapons are concentrated in areas where the two major military blocs are confronting each other, thus posing a threat to international security and stability. Therefore, drastic reductions should first and foremost be carried out to redress that situation. In the meantime, other countries, while maintaining necessary defence capabilities, should also exercise restraint with respect to conventional armaments.

At present more and more countries are expressing the hope that the United Nations will give greater attention to deliberations on conventional disarmament. The Organisation has already produced a study on conventional disarmament, thus paving the way for the consideration of that question by all Member States. With a view to accelerating the conventional disarmament process, the Chinese delegation will submit to this Committee a draft resolution, which we hope will be subject to serious discussion.

The prevention of an arms race in outer space is attracting ever increasing attention from the international community. The two countries with the largest space capabilities remain far apart in their positions on this question and are engaged in fierce rivalry. Already possessing some space weaponry, both of them are carrying out research and development on new types of space weapons. If the outer space arms race is allowed to gain momentum, it will not only exacerbate the existing nuclear and conventional arms race, thus touching off a qualitative escalation, but will also make the world situation still more tense and turbulent.

China has consistently opposed an arms race in outer space, no matter who carries it out or what form it takes. Outer space is the common heritage of mankind, and it should therefore be used for peaceful purposes only, not becoming a new field for the arms race. To prevent the arms race from being extended to outer space has thus become an imperative task. China stands for the demilitarization of outer space. To achieve that objective we could start by considering a

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

comprehensive ban on all forms of outer space weapon systems to remove weapons from space. At the same time, there should be a ban on the use or threat of use of force in outer space, whether emanating from Earth or from space, and on engaging in hostile acts or the threat of such acts. Earlier this year the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva re-established its Ad Hoc Committee, which held preliminary discussions on issues relating to the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Despite wide differences in the positions held by various parties, we believe that those discussions are worthwhile. We hope that the Conference on Disarmament will set up the Ad Hoc Committee again at the start of its 1987 session, so that an agreement can be reached through negotiations on the complete prohibition and total destruction of all outer space weapons. We propose that in order to create a favourable atmosphere and conditions for the negotiations all countries with space capabilities should refrain from developing, testing and deploying outer space weapons.

The prohibition of chemical weapons has long been the aspiration and demand of the peoples of the world. This Committee has been considering this issue for many years and has adopted numerous resolutions calling for the speedy conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition and total destruction of chemical weapons. At the second review Conference on the biological weapons Convention, held last month, many countries expressed their dissatisfaction at the prolonged absence of a convention, their serious concern over the continued use of these barbarous weapons, and their demand for an acceleration in the process of negotiations on the convention.

It is reassuring that thanks to years of endeavour by various countries, the negotiations on chemical weapons at this year's session of the Conference on Disarmament held out a more encouraging prospect and achieved tangible progress. The two countries possessing the largest chemical arsenals have expressed their

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

willingness to accelerate their negotiations. Many countries have put forward constructive proposals. All these are welcome developments. However, we must be aware of the fact that despite some progress in negotiations a large amount of work needs to be done and many differences remain to be resolved before a convention can be concluded. It is our hope that the two major Powers will take into serious consideration the reasonable proposals from various quarters, remove their differences on some crucial issues, and demonstrate their sincerity with concrete actions. The Chinese delegation will, as always, take an active part in negotiations and consultations on chemical weapons and will make its contribution to achieving the complete elimination of chemical weapons from the earth.

Disarmament is an important issue that bears on world peace and security, but it is not the only one. Disarmament efforts should be combined with endeavours to preserve world peace and security, as the two are interrelated and mutually complementary. It is hard to imagine achieving genuine disarmament in an international environment fraught with tension and turbulence and devoid of mutual trust. To preserve world peace and stability we need not only to achieve effective disarmament, but also to oppose hegemonism and power politics, to check acts of aggression, expansion and occupation against sovereign States and to eliminate regional conflicts.

Peace and development are the two major issues facing the contemporary world. The effort towards disarmament is an important component in the cause of maintaining world peace. Progress in achieving disarmament and development will benefit peace and security, and the consolidation of peace and security will serve efforts towards disarmament and development. The International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development is therefore of importance, and has attracted widespread attention in the international community. Regrettably,

despite a good deal of preparatory work the Conference was postponed. We hope that the Conference will be convened and the necessary preparations continued.

It is the basic State policy of China to promote steady and sustained economic growth by carrying out reforms and a policy of opening to the outside world, and to ensure the successful and uninterrupted development of economic construction by pursuing an independent foreign policy of peace. That policy will extend into the next century. Construction and development require a sound, peaceful environment. As we are concentrating our efforts on economic construction, and working for the gradual improvement of our people's livelihood, we have neither the will nor the capacity to take part in the arms race. China opposes the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and stands for the complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear, chemical, biological and space weapons, and for a drastic reduction in conventional armaments. At a mass rally held on 21 March this year by the Chinese people to mark the International Year of Peace, Premier Zhao Ziyang outlined the Chinese Government's nine-point basic position on disarmament and declared that China would no longer conduct atmospheric nuclear tests. In June last year the Chinese Government decided to cut the number of its troops by 1 million, a process which will be completed by the end of this year. Meanwhile, China has shifted a considerable portion of its military industry to civilian production and has turned some military installations over to or shared them with civilian institutions. The Chinese Government and people are ready to make - and indeed have been making by concrete action - their contribution to the relaxation of international tension and the maintenance of world peace.

This year the First Committee is faced with many difficulties and challenges in its deliberations on disarmament and security issues. On the other hand, there also exist opportunities for making headway. It is the hope of the Chinese delegation that through the concerted efforts of all quarters this Committee will achieve positive results in its work.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I would like to extend to you, Sir, my sincere congratulations on your unanimous election as Chairman of the First Committee. It is a recognition of your personal qualities and your professional capabilities. It is also a tribute to your country for the positive contribution it has made to issues of peace and security since it joined the United Nations. I assure you of the support and co-operation of my delegation in the discharge of your onerous duties.

I should also like to take this opportunity to convey to the other officers of the Committee my delegation's felicitations and best wishes for a successful tenure.

If our debate had commenced last week, we would have basked in a euphoria which, unfortunately, has proved all too ephemeral. The positive end to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe last month had given us the impression that a fresh beginning to the hopes of peace and security, not only in Europe but in the world at large, was in the offing. The disposition for making concessions at a crucial time in negotiation proved to have been the decisive factor in the conclusion of an agreement at Stockholm. Perhaps it was because they read the signs as we did, as positive, that the super-Powers announced that they would hold a summit - or, rather, a pre-summit - meeting at Reykjavik. The agenda of that meeting was of great relevance to the work of the First Committee and, of course, to the peace and security of the world. It is no surprise, therefore, that hopes and expectations were raised that, at last, the persistent entreaties of the international community, as expressed in the draft resolutions annually recommended by the Committee to the General Assembly, might have touched the right note. Disarmament, it was thought, was going to have the greatest boost since the United Nations proclaimed that the arms race, particularly the nuclear-arms race, was the most serious problem confronting humanity.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Today, following the failure of the Reykjavik meeting to achieve positive results, the world, in my view, is not back to the precarious position of last week: it is in a more perilous position. First, the arms race, as we were told on 12 October when the meeting broke up, is entering an irreversible and more perilous stage. Secondly, we have been shown that, no matter what the international community says or thinks, the decisive factor in the final analysis is the local erection of a protective shield against nuclear weapons. That may render nuclear weapons obsolete for those in the locality of the shield, but for the rest of us, for the rest of humanity, the reality of the effect of the use of nuclear weapons will still remain.

Perhaps we should recall that a major factor in considering and finally deciding on the use of nuclear weapons in 1945 was the perceived inability of the enemy to retaliate in kind if the nuclear explosion was successful. As Sir Winston Churchill put it, "the bombs were to give peace to the world ... they were to be a miracle of deliverance ... the end of the whole war in one or two violent shocks." But now, it is clear that anyone who contemplates the use of nuclear weapons will have to be willing to sacrifice millions of his own citizens, if not risk global destruction. The consideration in 1945 that, "Now all this nightmare picture had vanished" - which described the preservation of the lives of those who used the crude nuclear bomb of those days - no longer stands the test of the nuclear age. Is it possible that a protective shield could bring us back to the situation of 1945? My delegation doubts this, given the capacity of both super-Powers to produce weapons of great accuracy and very high yield, and given the ability of one super-Power to match the other in technological achievement. That is why we believe that the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems should be upheld.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

International interactions in outer space are fast degenerating into a situation which will place the arms race squarely in outer space. With increasing space technologies, especially in the field of military communications and reconnaissance satellites, anti-satellite weapons and space-based ballistic missile defences have sprung up, with the result that outer space may soon become an arena for an unbridled arms race.

In the view of the international community as a whole, outer space should continue to be the common heritage of all mankind, and its uses should be restricted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all. My delegation would of course be pleased to learn from the experiences of those countries with space technologies, but we would like to learn only of the peaceful uses of outer space. The prevention of an arms race in outer space should be of the greatest concern to the First Committee.

We are convinced that the safe route to the preservation of global, as well as national, security is through nuclear disarmament effectively verified to allay the fear of cheating. Some degree of mutual trust is involved, but human technological ingenuity is also capable of providing the reasonable assurance that will be required.

It is therefore important that genuine efforts be made by the super-Powers to reach agreement on deep reductions in their nuclear arsenals. That would involve the resumption of the detailed and promising negotiations that were aborted in Reykjavik. Those Powers should also show greater commitment to halting the spread of nuclear weapons, qualitatively and quantitatively, as well as horizontally and vertically. My delegation has always taken the position that the foundation of the nuclear non-proliferation régime is being progressively undermined by the failure of the nuclear-weapon States to see the régime - particularly the Treaty on

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) - as imposing on them an obligation to halt vertical proliferation and to set in motion the process of nuclear disarmament. Their present nuclear policies demonstrate total disregard for their treaty obligations. They do not, therefore, have the necessary moral authority to insist on horizontal non-proliferation. Vertical proliferation will have to be halted if horizontal proliferation is to be prevented.

An effective component of the process of nuclear disarmament is the discontinuation of nuclear tests. The importance of that step has been emphasized over and over again by the General Assembly. A comprehensive test-ban treaty will not only lessen dependence on nuclear weapons and render modernization impracticable; it will also reduce reliance on the concept of nuclear deterrence.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

My delegation recognizes the importance of the establishment of a satisfactory system of verification to ensure compliance. However, that should not be used as an excuse to avoid negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. After all, verification arrangements will have to be part and parcel of any agreement that will be concluded. In this connection, my delegation calls upon the nuclear-weapon States, particularly the super-Powers, to consider seriously the offer made in the Declaration of the five-continent Committee in Mexico, in August 1986. It is proof positive that the international community is willing to offer its good offices for an agreement that does not prejudice the security of either super-Power.

The Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing is commendable. We appeal to all other nuclear-weapon States to take similar action, which would become the forerunner of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Such a measure, coupled with genuine multilateral negotiations, will give positive indications of the seriousness of the super-Powers to eliminate nuclear weapons from the face of the earth.

Chemical weapons constitute another type of weapons of mass destruction that is gravely injurious to mankind. As stated in paragraph 75 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, one of the most urgent disarmament measures is the complete banning of their development, production and stockpiling, as well as the destruction of chemical weapons.

My delegation therefore welcomes the efforts at the Conference on Disarmament to conclude the convention on chemical weapons and appreciates the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee at the Conference's last session. It was encouraging to note that three important working groups were established and that some progress was made in the negotiations.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

It is of course disappointing that the super-Powers were still unable to resolve their differences over compliance, verification and modalities for inspection. Those issues, including the approaches to declaration of the locations of chemical-weapon stocks and production facilities, could be resolved if there were a genuine willingness to facilitate the conclusion of a convention on chemical weapons. My delegation hopes that the chemical weapons convention will not create the "have" and "have-not" system, which is the bane of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The NPT's experience, where there is continuous vertical proliferation in the absence of horizontal proliferation, should not be allowed to repeat itself. Every Member State should be in a position to abide by its treaty obligations.

The General Assembly recognized the significance of the suggested review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament in order to ensure the Organization's effectiveness in that field. Consequently, resolution 39/151 G was adopted in December 1984 with a directive that the United Nations should consider, as a matter of priority, the question of its effectiveness in the area of disarmament. The central role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament is no doubt unquestionable. It is therefore gratifying to note that some progress was made by the Disarmament Commission during its consideration of the item at its 1986 substantive session. That reflected the apparent desire of the international community to strengthen the primary role of the United Nations in all disarmament matters. We hope that the areas of divergence regarding the substantive aspects of the draft proposals on the subject will be resolved at the Commission's 1987 session.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Regarding the effectiveness of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, we have noted with considerable interest the views expressed by some representatives on the rationalization of the working methods of the First Committee. We ourselves share the concern to make the First Committee more efficient, its decisions clear, consistent and, if I may borrow the word, "non-proliferated". Perhaps you, Mr. Chairman, should undertake an exercise, with the assistance of the Bureau and a small representative group of delegations, to explore possible areas for improvement of the Committee's work. Some of your predecessors have made suggestions which, somehow, were never followed up. It may be time for us to begin to see what can be done.

The United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament, which was established on Nigeria's initiative, has continued to provide an avenue for gaining expertise in the field of disarmament, particularly with regard to the needs of the developing countries. It is pertinent, indeed, to say that such is the Programme's popularity that practically every Member States - including even the super-Powers themselves - have nominated candidates to participate at one time or another. We note with appreciation the co-operation of Member States to ensure the Programme's successful operation, in particular those which have invited the fellows to their countries for study tours.

The financial difficulties of the United Nations have precluded full implementation of the Programme in 1986. We note, for instance, that the number of fellowships for this year has been reduced from 25 to 20. We also note that the Programme's duration has been reduced from six months to something like three and a half months. It means that for 1986 the Programme will conclude when the First

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

Committee is in the general debate stage. That will deprive the fellows of the opportunity to observe and learn from the negotiations that usually take place during the adoption of resolutions by the First Committee.

While we appreciate the problem posed by the United Nations financial crisis, we express the hope that it will not affect so severely a Programme whose usefulness is a matter of general agreement. We look forward to the Secretary-General's report and the proposal which he may make on the implementation of the Advisory Services and Training Programmes contained in resolution 40/151 H of December 1985.

Social and economic development in all its ramifications and general and complete disarmament under effective international control were recognized as vital objectives of the United Nations by its founding fathers. Article 26 of the Charter refers to

"... the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources ...".

The adverse impact of armaments and the arms race on development has been documented in several studies commissioned by the the United Nations.

(Mr. Adeniji, Nigeria)

The General Assembly itself, at its tenth special session, devoted to disarmament, stated in the Final Document:

"In a world of finite resources there is a close relationship between expenditure on armaments and economic and social development".

(General Assembly resolution S-10/2, para. 16)

That relationship has remained basic and has been given high priority in disarmament considerations since the first special session. The Panel of Eminent Personalities on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, a panel convened as part of the preparatory efforts for the International Conference on Disarmament and Development, stated in paragraph 18 of their Declaration:

"In a world of finite resources, the desirability of reallocating resources away from military purposes towards socio-economic development should move beyond the moral plane and become a political and economic imperative." (United Nations Publication, Sales No. E.86.IX.5)

The General Assembly was therefore being alive to its responsibilities regarding its pursuit of the twin objectives of disarmament and development when it adopted its resolutions 38/71 B of 15 December 1983 and 39/160 of 17 December 1984, on the relationship between disarmament and development.

My delegation commends the outcome of the deliberations in the Preparatory Committee established pursuant to resolution 39/160 of 1984. The Preparatory Committee has done the job assigned to it by the General Assembly, but we regret that the Conference envisaged on the subject has had to be postponed. Bearing in mind its main objective, my delegation firmly supports the holding of the International Conference in 1987 and would co-operate with other delegations to make recommendations to the General Assembly to that effect.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): It is a very great pleasure for me, Sir, to address to you on behalf of the Romanian delegation warmest and most sincere congratulations on the occasion of your election as Chairman of the First Committee. The active role in international relations played by the German Democratic Republic, a country with which Romania maintains very close links of friendship and co-operation; your well known qualities as a diplomat and negotiator; and your wide experience in the field of multilateral diplomacy offer every assurance that under your guidance the work of the Committee will be fruitful.

I should also like to express our congratulations to the other officers of the Committee and to wish them every success in carrying out the responsibilities entrusted to them.

A lucid and realistic analysis of the present international situation shows that it remains serious and complex. The arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race is still accelerating. Increasing quantities of weapons, both nuclear and conventional, are being added to already gigantic arsenals and, what is even worse, the qualitative improvement of such weapons is making all these weapons increasingly costly and more lethal.

As the President of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu has repeatedly said, the fundamental task of our time is to halt the arms race, to change the dangerous direction of events, now headed for a nuclear catastrophe, and to guide it instead towards a new policy of détente, disarmament, co-operation and peace in the world.

The lack of resolute action to promote disarmament, at this turning point in man's destiny, would be a historic blunder for which no one would want to assume responsibility.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

We have been told that in Iceland the leaders of the USSR and the United States of America came very close to an unprecedented agreement, which went as far as the elimination of all nuclear weapons. All meetings of that kind, as indeed any political actions, should be assessed in terms of their results. Like other delegations, we regret that the historic opportunity, which was within our reach, was not seized, a development that would have fulfilled the hopes of all the peoples of the world. In fact those hopes were disappointed, and the meeting ended virtually in failure. The lack of results has shown that the policy of tension, armament and militarization of outer space prevailed, at the expense of specific progress along the road to disarmament.

We had expected the two great Powers to reach agreements both on the substantial reduction of nuclear weapons and on the cessation of the militarization of outer space. Similarly, the conclusion of an agreement on the withdrawal of nuclear medium-term missiles from Europe would have been of great importance. Another expectation was the initiation of negotiations on a general agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests. Unfortunately, none of these agreements was reached, which is all the more incomprehensible and regrettable in that in the discussions the positions of the two parties had for the first time come very close.

Those specific opportunities were not translated into practical results because the American side insisted on continuing the Star Wars project, including the testing of its various components not only in the laboratory but also in outer space. That could only lead to a new and dangerous spiral in the arms race.

Thus a great opportunity was missed to take an important step along the path of disarmament and to move on to disarmament measures. It is, however, encouraging to see the two parties state that the door remains open and that the negotiations in Geneva will continue on the basis of proposals put forward in Iceland.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The points on which agreement was reached in Reykjavik represent something gained: a good point of departure that should not be wasted. No effort must be spared to ensure that those points of agreement are given final form in the various negotiations. In view of the role of the Soviet Union and the United States in the world arena and their responsibility for the fate of peace, everything possible must be done to ensure that the high-level dialogue between the USSR and the United States continues.

At the same time, since nuclear weapons threaten the whole world and the problem of peace affect all peoples, all States must take a clear stand and make their contribution in seeing that effective action is taken to promote disarmament. It is high time to move on from words to deeds; it is high time to translate good intentions into real and lasting agreements capable of halting the arms race on earth and in outer space.

The favourable results achieved at the Stockholm Conference, which at one time seemed inconceivable, are of special importance because they show that understanding is still possible when the approach is one of patience, perseverance and responsibility.

It is more important than ever that this ray of hope be regarded as a beginning, as a first step along a path of more resolute action, because if we are to break out of the present serious and complex situation there is no alternative to negotiation.

It is in this spirit that my delegation wished, in this first statement, to express some views on some aspects of actions pertaining to disarmament, which Romania considers of particular importance.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

My first remarks relate to the formulation and implementation of a complex programme of disarmament. It is well known that Romania attaches the highest priority to nuclear disarmament, because in a future nuclear world war there would be neither winners nor losers: nuclear weapons would pay no heed to differing social régimes and would virtually destroy our planet.

In that connection, my country supports the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of this century and for the cessation of the arms race in outer space. Romania considers also that a whole range of proposals put forward by the United States of America and other States constitute a real basis for disarmament agreements. Romania is in favour of the cessation of nuclear tests, which is a prerequisite for slowing and halting the nuclear arms race, especially in its qualitative aspects.

As a European country, Romania has continued to express its concern at the deployment of new nuclear missiles in Europe, and has put forward specific proposals for the reduction and complete elimination of such weapons in Europe.

My country is working steadily to build confidence and co-operation among all the Balkan countries and to bring about the establishment of a zone free of nuclear and chemical weapons and free of foreign military bases. We also support the establishment of nuclear- and chemical-weapon-free zones in northern and central Europe and on other continents.

We support and give constructive consideration to all other proposals for nuclear disarmament, from whatever source, because, as emphasized by the President of my country, nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons from our planet are fundamental objectives which we must do all in our power to achieve

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

While recognize the priority of nuclear disarmament, it is a fact that the peace and security of peoples can be assured only through appropriate measures involving the whole of the arms race and disarmament. In our view, the priority nature of nuclear disarmament should be seen in the framework of the organic interdependence that exists among nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons.

Thus, Romania thinks it necessary that a complex programme of disarmament be formulated, to include - apart from the elimination of nuclear weapons, which must be the principal aim - measures for the elimination of chemical weapons and for the substantial reduction of conventional weapons, troops and military budgets and other measures leading to general disarmament. The programme should lead to the step-by-step elimination of all nuclear weapons by the end of the century and, simultaneously, to a 25-per-cent reduction over the next five years in conventional weapons, troops and military expenditures. There should also be efforts to achieve a 50-per-cent reduction by the year 2000.

In our view, the complex approach which forms the basis of such a programme would permit better co-ordination and correlation among various total or partial measures in all spheres of disarmament by subordinating them to the single goal of general and complete disarmament. The formulation of such a complex programme on the basis of proposals by all States would make it possible to take into account the interests of all countries, thus assuring their right to equal security. The programme should include and stimulate the disarmament efforts of States on the world and regional, bilateral and unilateral levels. Negotiations based on the principles of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should be so ordered as to develop simultaneously on several levels and so that those efforts can influence one another with a view to identifying new disarmament measures.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

Because it would include measures for the reduction of military expenditure and forces, the complex programme would also stress the interdependence between disarmament and development. It is obvious that any reduction in the burden of military expenditure can lead to an increase in the human and material resources available to carry out economic and social development programmes for the benefit of all countries, in particular the developing countries.

The formulation of such a programme can be accomplished only with the participation of all States. That is why we favour intensified negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva on the draft comprehensive programme of disarmament and its adoption at a third special session on disarmament, the convening of which should be called for by the General Assembly at the present session.

We wish to speak also of unilateral disarmament measures. While we shall return to this question, we wish at this stage to stress the special contribution of unilateral action to building trust among States, to better understanding of intentions among partners and to the creation and improvement of a climate conducive to negotiations. The importance of such unilateral actions is all the more obvious when they are followed by similar reciprocal measures.

The final purpose of disarmament efforts should undoubtedly be the conclusion of negotiated agreements to halt the arms race and to reduce or eliminate various types of weapons. However, at certain stages in the negotiating process - especially when fear, mistrust and misunderstandings appear to move the sides further apart - unilateral action enables the parties to express their sincere desire to overcome these difficulties. The positive effects of unilateral measures must be considered not only in terms of disarmament negotiations but also in terms of their positive influence on the international political climate.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

It goes without saying that the value of unilateral measures is even greater in regions where weapons and missiles are most highly concentrated. We are clearly thinking of the situation in Europe, where we see the highest concentration of weapons, where the two largest military blocs confront each other, and where questions of confidence and disarmament give rise to the most complex problems.

Given this situation of the relationship of forces in Europe and given the decisive role Europe could play in achieving disarmament, first and foremost nuclear disarmament, President Nicolae Ceausescu recently appealed to all the States of Europe, to the United States of America and to Canada to proceed to a unilateral reduction of at least 5 per cent in weapons, forces and military expenditure, even before adoption of a relevant agreement. Given the extremely high level of weapons in Europe, the 5-per-cent reduction my country has proposed would in no way jeopardize the balance of forces, and would not endanger the security of any State or group of States whatsoever.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

We express the hope that other States will join us in similar joint measures. For its part, Romania is prepared between now and the end of this year to undertake a 5-per-cent reduction in its weapons, troop-strength and military expenditure, after the proposal has been submitted to the people in a national referendum.

Like other unilateral measures my country has taken over the years for the reduction of military expenditure, at the root of Romania's recent initiative is its desire to contribute to the initiation of a true disarmament process in Europe in which it would be possible to move from words and statements to concrete deeds. We are convinced that the adoption of measures for unilateral reduction in troops, weapons and military expenditure by European States would be a promising beginning that would open the door to serious negotiations in total accord with the aspirations of European and world public opinion. That is the objective of Romania's initiative, and we would rejoice to see other States join us in similar efforts.

The enormous human, material, financial and scientific resources squandered each year to create deadly weapons should be used to speed up economic and social progress. Based on that goal, Romania, together with Sweden, has taken the initiative within the United Nations of identifying the principles governing the activities of States in negotiations with regard to a freeze and a reduction of military expenditures. As is well known, this year the Disarmament Commission reached general agreement on such principles, with the exception of the one relating to transparency and data communication. We trust that, based on the progress achieved by the Disarmament Commission, it will be possible at this session of the General Assembly or at the forthcoming session of the Commission to find a formula acceptable to all on the principle still under discussion. While reserving the right to return to this question at a later date, I should like to reaffirm that such principles are intended to harmonize the views of States and to

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

consolidate mutual confidence among them in order to give new impetus to activities undertaken on the international level to achieve a freeze in and reduction of military budgets.

Qualitative developments that have occurred in the field of armaments, first and foremost projects aimed at the militarization of outer space, call for urgent action. The production of ever-more advanced weaponry has unfortunately been a constant characteristic of the arms race. Extremely dangerous at the present stage, however, is the fact that the application of the most recent developments in science and technology to military purposes is radically changing the entire situation while at the same increasing the scope of the arms race and its harmful effect upon society as a whole. All of this casts doubt upon the very relevance of the entire concept of disarmament and even arms control as an instrument of the peace and security of States.

The arguments adduced to justify the programme of placing new strategic-weapons systems in outer space are no longer convincing, for in the nuclear era the security of all States, including the nuclear States, is not a problem of technological supremacy but, rather, a political problem. From its inception, the decision to move towards the development of the strategic systems in space has acted to accentuate mistrust, tension and animosity, a corollary to the policy of recourse to and use of force.

An ever-growing number of politicians and experts are coming to believe that the passage from the creation of such systems to a dangerous destabilization of international relations is cause for considerable alarm. In fact, the placing or even the intention of placing strategic systems in space increases the danger of the use of nuclear weapons, either because of a superiority or inferiority complex or by accident. The militarization of outer space is also a factor that stimulates the technological improvement of conventional weapons. It is no accident that in

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

the context of the development of such weapons there should be increasing talk about the need to strengthen and modernize conventional stockpiles.

We should like to take this opportunity to reaffirm Romania's firm position against any measure aimed at the militarization of outer space and to state that all nations should be allowed to make use of outer space solely for peaceful purposes. In this connection we support the convening of an international conference on the question of the use of outer space for peaceful purposes, which would be entrusted with drawing up a comprehensive programme for the use of outer space and space technology on behalf of the economic and social development of all countries and, first and foremost, of the developing countries, with adopting a treaty in this field and with creating within the United Nations, a special body to deal with questions relating to outer space.

In a broader context we are of the opinion that the time is ripe for the United Nations to deal seriously with the deep implications of progress in modern science and technology for international relations as a whole in coming decades and to adopt appropriate measures to ensure that scientific research will be used solely in the interests of the peace and development of all peoples.

My last remarks relate to the intensification of activities in all existing disarmament forums. The role and responsibility that devolve upon the nuclear Powers - primarily upon the USSR and the United States - in achieving disarmament are well known and recognized. The dialogue between the two great Powers is undoubtedly a positive factor whose impact on the international political climate cannot be disregarded.

However important the role of the two great Powers may be, it must be clearly stated that international problems, the problems of disarmament and peace, cannot be solved by them alone. Experience has shown that real and lasting disarmament agreements and the guaranteeing of international peace and security must be

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

achieved with the participation of all States, without distinction as to size or military potential.

The lack of concrete results in the dialogue between the two great Powers must not lead to despair. On the contrary, such a state of affairs demands that all the world's States - and where Europe is concerned, all European States - act and assume their direct responsibilities in order to work out the implementation of the agreements needed for disarmament and peace.

In this connection an appropriate opportunity will be provided by the forthcoming Vienna Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, which should mark a new milestone in the process begun in Stockholm, this time devoted to disarmament measures. We believe that through the intensification of efforts by all parties the negotiations, also held at Vienna, on the reduction of military forces and armaments in Central Europe could soon lead to the conclusion of an agreement.

The participation of all States in the disarmament process calls for the maximum use of the multilateral, democratic mechanism of debate and negotiation in the field of disarmament, based on the principle of the equality of all States as established by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Thus, there is a need to act in a constructive spirit at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, taking into account existing proposals, in order to reach a successful conclusion of negotiations on questions on the Conference's agenda, in particular the drawing up of an international convention on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

The United Nations, whose central role and primary responsibility in the field of disarmament have been affirmed and reaffirmed repeatedly and solemnly, must be implicated even further in all debates on disarmament and must further direct its main effort towards promoting the political will of all States, first and foremost the nuclear-weapon and other strongly armed States, in order to arrive at concrete agreements for the cessation of the arms race and disarmament.

It is unacceptable that, on the pretext of financial difficulties, ideas or proposals are put forward to reduce the activities of the multilateral mechanism in the field of disarmament, especially at this crucial time that calls for the intensification of all such activities.

Those were the views that my delegation wished to put forward in the context of this general exchange of views. They are based on the need to make a joint effort to take a qualitative turn in our activities, thus establishing real negotiations and effective disarmament measures, first and foremost nuclear disarmament measures. That is realistic, because it is at the very root of the will clearly expressed by the peoples of the world to live in peace and devote their efforts and resources to their free and independent development, safe from any threat of war.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call on representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the following decision of the General Assembly:

"Delegations should exercise their right of reply at the end of the day whenever two meetings have been scheduled for that day and whenever such meetings are devoted to the consideration of the same item.

"The number of interventions in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation at a given meeting should be limited to two per item.

"The first intervention in the exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting should be limited to 10 minutes and the second intervention should be limited to five minutes." (Decision 34/401, paras. 8-10)

I shall not read out those rules on every occasion, but I thought it advisable to do so on the first occasion that the right of reply is being exercised in the Committee during this session.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to reply briefly to the statement made this morning by the representative of New Zealand, who called into question the very principle of our nuclear tests in the Pacific. For my part, I wish only to recall here the following reply given by our representative in the Special Political Committee in the course of the examination of item 70 on the effects of atomic radiation:

"With regard to the position of principle expressed by the speakers on the continuation of French nuclear tests in the Pacific, I note that this is discriminatory political opposition against my country, and a request not in keeping with the elementary norms of international law. France does carry out, on French territory, in accordance with its right and in the exercise of its sovereignty, actions necessary for its security. This does not affect peace in the region, the security of States in the region, the health of the people, or the environment."

Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): New Zealand accepts France's right to provide for its security. What we do not accept is that France has the right to do so by undertaking testing activities in the South Pacific that bring a real sense of apprehension and insecurity to the people and countries of the region. We are interested in the observation of the representative of France that there is some contravention of international law involved in our stand and would be fascinated to examine that at some future time.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform the Committee that the following delegations are inscribed on the list of speakers for the meeting tomorrow morning: Singapore, Norway, Zaire, Canada and Tunisia.

The meeting rose at 5.05 p.m.



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 8th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Statements were made by:

Mr. Hong (Singapore)
Mr. Vraalsen (Norway)
Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya (Zaire)
Mr. Roche (Canada)
Mr. Bouziri (Tunisia)

*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 2/50, 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.

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE ON ALL DISARMAMENT ITEMS

Mr. HONG (Singapore): My delegation would like to congratulate you, Sir, and the other officers on your election as Chairman, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteur. We note that the Bureau strikes an ideal balance of German efficiency, Japanese harmony, Canadian impartiality and Burkina Faso uprightness.

That international character reminds me of a story from the Second World War. There was a group of soldiers, two Oriental and one Western, members of the Allied forces, walking along a jungle path on patrol. Suddenly they came to a bridge across a stream. The two Orientals inexplicably began bowing to each other, each cordially inviting the other to precede him. This went on for about half an hour. The Western soldier was at first amused, then bemused, then confused. Finally he became impatient. He said, "Since neither of you can agree to proceed, I shall go ahead." With that, he strode onto the bridge and, alas, went up in an explosion. He had triggered a booby-trap.

The point of the story is simply that there is a need for patience and caution when facing unknown and potentially dangerous situations. This Committee is charged with the heavy responsibility of convincing nations either to disarm or to reduce their national means of protection and survival. We must therefore expect to spend a long time in this noble effort, probably decades. Millions of pages and thousands of resolutions will be composed in the effort to beat swords into ploughshares. Essentially, what we are saying is, "After you," and the echo is always, "No, no: after you." As our martial arts instructors always tell us, watch the eyes, not the words. We know the intention is found in the eyes, so we always need to look behind the resolutions for the motives.

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

Small States such as Singapore face particularly acute problems of security. We are not the prime movers; the great Powers are. For us the framework of global and regional security is a "given". We are not and never will be nuclear Powers. We understand that the central nuclear balance is basically determined by the two super-Powers and other nuclear nations. Nuclear disarmament is therefore a function of the relations between those great Powers.

That does not mean, however, that small States should sit idly by and watch while the great Powers negotiate. The rest of the world constitutes the gallery of public opinion, to which the nuclear Powers are accountable for the safety of the planet Earth and the natural environment. While world opinion is a nebulous thing, it is nevertheless effective when great Powers feel the need to be understood, to be supported and to enjoy approval. No nation is an island, sufficient unto itself. That holds true even for great Powers.

Thus, it behoves small States like Singapore to understand what is going on, to analyse and follow trends, to add whatever small pressure we can in the pursuit of world disarmament and, in our own national and internal actions, to behave responsibly. We view with regret a certain South-East Asian country that has a very low standard of living and is oppressed by poverty and underdevelopment, and yet possesses an army of 1 million men, is heavily armed, and commits aggression against and occupies nations which are even smaller, poorer and more defenceless than itself, such as Kampuchea.

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

To such a nation, our message is very simple. To it, we say: Your security is not to be found in armed violence, neither in oppressing others. Your security cannot be established at the expense of the insecurity of others. Violence begets violence; it is more productive to negotiate whatever problems exist, as spelt out in the United Nations Charter. Ultimately, you are the loser, because you have lost time for development whilst other nations are racing ahead, and you are becoming dependent on the supplier of your arms, thereby opening yourself to outside influence.

In our opinion, therefore, smaller nations should behave responsibly in the international network of relations and obligations. Each of us should arrange our own internal affairs so as to minimize excuses for external Powers to interfere. Each of us should assiduously exercise the art of good-neighbourliness. As the American poet Robert Frost said, "Good fences make good neighbours". Thus, each of us must understand our regional responsibilities and strive continuously to develop friendly and co-operative relations with our neighbours.

In this context, Singapore is aware of its international obligations to disarmament and world security. Our beliefs are demonstrated in our signatures on the following treaties: the Treaty Banning Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water of 1963; the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) of 1968; the Convention on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and Ocean Floor and in the Sub soil thereof, 1971; the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction of 1972 and the Agreement for the Application of Safeguards in connection with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Protocol of 1977.

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

We are studying other international agreements and, in due course, we shall be acceding to those relevant and applicable conventions. We are also, as part of our regional responsibility, studying, together with our colleagues members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the question of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South-East Asia. Similarly, we support various United Nations resolutions on arms control and disarmament discussed in the First Committee, according to our criteria of seriousness, balance and fairness, applicability and non-compromise of our national security and that of our friends and allies.

Here, we should like to state that we are disappointed that the United Nations Disarmament Commission has been unable to conclude its consideration of the review of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament in accordance with the mandate entrusted to it in General Assembly resolution 40/94 G, which was the initiative of a group of African States. We urge that at its next substantive session in 1987 the Disarmament Commission expeditiously conclude its consideration of that item, which is at the core of the United Nations primary responsibility in the field of disarmament. We hope that the Commission will submit its findings and recommendations on this important issue to the General Assembly in 1987.

We also welcome the establishment of the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. We think that, operating under the mandate entrusted to it in General Assembly resolution 40/151 G, the Centre can indeed make a useful contribution to the cause of peace in that region. It is, we believe, a major step and will lead to arrangements that will give rise to confidence and security building measures and disarmament on the subregional and regional levels.

In 1984 the Singapore representative in the First Committee addressed the issue of the central nuclear balance and its impact on the third world. In 1985 my

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

predecessor addressed the issue of conventional weapons. He pointed out that more than 150 armed conflicts have occurred since 1945, costing perhaps 20 million lives, creating 8 million refugees and resulting in untold damage to property and the environment. He stressed that the cost of the conventional arms race has increased, in constant 1981 prices, from \$20.3 billion in 1972 to \$34.3 billion in 1982. Of the \$800 billion spent in 1983 on military activities, at least 80 per cent was absorbed by conventional arms and armed forces. The world's armed forces are estimated to total more than 25 million personnel and to possess over 140,000 main battle tanks, over 35,000 combat aircraft, 21,000 helicopters, 100 naval vessels and 700 attack submarines.

In our view, therefore, the danger from conventional war is as great as from nuclear war. The fact is that 150 conventional wars have occurred, while no nuclear war has yet broken out. The dreadful example of the Chernobyl accident, however, reinforces our conviction that nuclear war is both unwinnable and totally destructive.

The nuclear Powers are soberly aware of the nuclear danger and, hence, they are negotiating on how to control and limit the danger of nuclear war. In this context, we regret that the two super-Powers were not able to come to an agreement at Reykjavik. Our regret is tempered by the sober realization that arms control will now have to proceed in a cooler atmosphere. We urge both sides to continue their negotiations. We hope that there will not be an arms race of a new kind, which would suck in resources at a time when the world cannot afford it.

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

We are not saying that nations do not need weapons for self-defence. We are not so naïve as to believe that all men are righteous. We have heard of groups of mercenaries trying to hijack power in small States. We think that small nations should have the right to protect themselves against those pirates and mercenaries, against covetous small imperialists and latter-day neo-colonialists.

The example of Switzerland comes to mind. It is a small, well armed nation which trusts its own citizens to the extent of allowing them to keep at their homes their rifles and ammunition. Yet it is a nation which has prospered in peace for centuries. This is an interesting example of a well-armed nation which has yet managed to live in peace with its neighbours, thus proving that it is the intention behind the arms that is most important. Other wise nations have renounced militarism altogether and their economic success is testimony to their wisdom.

At the same time, we are aware that what is considered adequate armaments for a small nation would not be adequate for a great Power leading an alliance which it is committed to protect. We agree that it is hard to draw a line between what is adequate and what is over-armament, but we believe that the inexorable iron law of economics will dictate the limits. There are of course examples of nations which have preferred to sacrifice their peoples' standard of living in order to pursue their imperialistic ambitions. We have one well-known case in South-East Asia. But in general no nation is so rich that it can afford these expensive modern weapons by the thousands and at the same time cater to the expanding needs and demands of its citizens.

We are pragmatic in recognizing that the problems of arms control and disarmament will last for decades; and we understand that because these problems relate to national security they will last as long as men do not change. As Saint Augustine said: "Lord, make me chaste, but not just yet." Men have faced

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

these problems for centuries. In its time the cross-bow was considered too powerful and un-Christian, and there were efforts to ban it.

Small States faced with perennial problems of ensuring security in dangerous regions may opt for the same solutions as the ancient Greek city-States did when faced with the might of Sparta or the threat of invasion from the Persian kings: they formed alliances and tried diplomacy to settle the problems. Similarly, the ancient Chinese States formed the vertical alliance when faced with the expanding Chinese State called Chin, which was the first to unify China. The State of Chin, in turn, formed its client States into the horizontal alliance. Modern equivalents are the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) alliances. Such alliances bring with them incipient dangers of automatic linkage, whereby the tail wags the dog and small allies drag the others into a bigger war. Such alliances also bring the usual problems of alliance management: who is to do what for whom.

The answers to all those problems are very clear; they are within our grasp, but the political will is lacking. As one of the Tang dynasty Zen masters has said: "Searching for the truth is like riding a buffalo to look for a buffalo." To trust and love our fellow men, whether as individuals, families, tribes or nations, that is the ultimate answer to arms control and disarmament. That has been the answer since the time that Cain slew Abel. But that is the idealistic answer.

Perhaps a more practical answer is shown by the example of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) of which Singapore, Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand are members. It is instructive to compare the "before" and "after" pictures. Before ASEAN was created our region suffered from violent conflicts, border wars and territorial claims; each nation, ignorant of the other, oriented towards the former colonial Power; trade, communications, tourism

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

and other people-to-people ties were at a minimum. Now we can sincerely say that, because of ASEAN, there is more peace, more stability and more interaction in all forms between the member States. One interesting point to note is that we have in ASEAN's charter provision for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The founding fathers of ASEAN were also wise in realizing the need to move slowly, at a pace comfortable for the slowest, to concentrate on the more achievable sectors, to be aware of sensitivities, to involve not only the Governments but also the peoples, the media, the academics and the private sectors.

Frequently, ASEAN is compared to the European Community, but we should note one vital difference: the member States of that Community have been nation-States for centuries, while the ASEAN member States have achieved independence only since the Second World War. Also, our goals are different, our pace, systems and institutions are different. But what we have similarly achieved is regional peace and stability. The example of ASEAN is matched by regional associations in the Caribbean, Latin America, South Asia and Africa. In a turbulent world, these regional associations have created oases of peace and fostered habits of peaceful co-operation.

My argument can be summed up in a phrase: regionalism is a positive form of confidence building. The following is stated in the United Nations "Study on conventional disarmament":

"Although confidence-building measures, whether military or non-military, cannot serve as a substitute for concrete disarmament measures, they can play an important role in progress towards disarmament in that they can encourage a climate of trust and international co-operation, whether they are taken unilaterally, bilaterally or multilaterally. By assisting in the development of an improved climate of international relations, they can help to create conditions conducive to the adoption of measures of limitation of conventional arms and armed forces and disarmament." (A/39/348, para. 10⁷¹)

(Mr. Hong, Singapore)

This view reinforces our points, which are: first, small States cannot effectively do much about the central nuclear balance that is negotiated between the great Powers; secondly, small States, however, are affected by the conventional arms race and are often the victims and/or proxies of great Powers in conventional wars; thirdly, before getting involved in conventional conflicts, small States should consider the option of regionalism and good-neighbourliness and the peaceful settlement of conflicts: regionalism is a positive form of confidence-building or a form of preventive arms control; fourthly, ASEAN is a good example of a healthy regional association which has contributed much to the maintenance and preservation of peace and stability in South East Asia.

In conclusion, our message to small States faced with overwhelming problems of security and arms control is that it is more productive to build better and closer relations with neighbouring States than to continue buying arms in a futile pursuit of security. At the same time ... should arrange our internal affairs so as to provide no excuse for outsiders to interfere. Good government begets peace, which is the goal of disarmament and arms control. The paths to peace are many, and small States can take the low road of confidence-building through co-operative regionalism while the great Powers take the high road of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway): Last year, during the discussions on disarmament questions in this Committee, we sensed a more constructive approach than during preceding sessions of the General Assembly. That development resulted mainly from improvements in the East-West relationship as demonstrated by the summit meeting in Geneva between the leaders of the United States of America and the Soviet Union. It is the hope of my delegation that that trend will continue and be reinforced at this session of the General Assembly and, of course, particularly in this Committee.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

My Government attaches great importance to the agreement that was reached at the Stockholm Conference on a new generation of security and confidence-building measures in Europe. We believe that this outcome is an important contribution to the efforts aimed at enhancing security on the European continent. At the same time it is our hope that such regional measures might be of significance also in a global context. On the multilateral level we welcome the agreement at the recent Review Conference on the biological weapons convention.

The results obtained in some limited fields should not however obscure the fact that the main problems before us are still to be solved. Major breakthroughs still elude us in the most fundamental disarmament issues.

We therefore share the disappointment expressed in this Committee that the meeting last weekend in Reykjavik between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev did not bring about concrete progress in the fields of arms control and disarmament despite the great efforts undertaken. Such progress would have been of great importance to the bilateral nuclear and space talks in Geneva as well as in other forums of arms control and disarmament.

We share the view that the United States and the Soviet Union now face the real challenge to continue their search for new solutions. Agreements of potentially major significance seem to have been in prospect in Reykjavik with regard to strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons as well as other aspects of the East-West relationship. This has shown that agreements are possible. On the basis of what was achieved in Reykjavik the super-Powers should, despite the regrettable temporary set-back, continue their efforts to create a safer world for mankind.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

Clearly a special responsibility for international security rests with the nations that have the largest military potentials. Arms control and disarmament must not, however, be seen exclusively as a domain of the militarily most powerful States. Questions of such magnitude concern the entire world community; they concern all of us. It must therefore be the responsibility of all the States in this Committee to develop further the atmosphere we experienced last year, thereby giving a strong manifestation of world opinion on these matters and giving impetus to the international disarmament process.

At this stage allow me to point out that the growing number of draft resolutions in the First Committee constitutes a problem that should be considered by all Member States. We seem to be facing a development in which less and less time can be devoted to examining the issues on the agenda.

There is clearly a need to continue the process of streamlining and rationalizing the procedures and practices of the Committee with a view to making them more effective. An overhaul of the Committee's agenda is necessary, and in this connection a further refinement of the cluster system is in order. In this respect I should like warmly to support the views expressed by my colleague Ambassador Alatas in his statement at the organizational meeting on 8 October and his proposal that the Committee's chairmen of recent years, together with this session's Bureau, should meet to discuss ways and means of making the work of the Committee more efficient. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I personally would be ready to participate in such an effort whenever you deem it convenient.

The challenge posed by nuclear weapons remains the most fundamental issue before us. It must be a matter of the highest priority to reduce our dependence upon these weapons. In our opinion a high level of nuclear armaments in itself poses a grave danger and gives ample reason to seek reductions.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

A reduction in nuclear arsenals, however, will not in itself necessarily lead to enhanced international security. The nuclear issue should therefore, in our view, not be seen in isolation from other types of weapons. This is reflected in the question of the prevention of nuclear war - to which Norway, together with its allies, attaches the utmost importance. The question of the prevention of nuclear war cannot be considered separately from the question of the prevention of war in general. A nuclear war could, in fact, be triggered by the escalation of a conventional conflict. What is therefore at stake is the prevention of war in all its dimensions in a nuclear age.

At the same time, we support the increased attention devoted to the question of conventional disarmament, also in the multilateral context. Judging from the European experience, significant nuclear disarmament may, in our view, be possible only if adequate attention is given to the role of conventional forces.

In the field of nuclear disarmament, Norway sees a comprehensive test ban as an important arms control measure, which would play a key role in promoting the nuclear disarmament process. It would be a significant contribution to the prevention of further horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons as well.

My Government therefore welcomes the talks begun in 1986 by the United States and the Soviet Union on the entire scope of issues relating to nuclear testing. We hope that those bilateral talks will pave the way for the removal of the obstacles that have long prevented progress in this field. It is our hope that an early result of these talks will be ratification of the threshold test-ban Treaty of 1974 and the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes of 1976.

A test ban is not merely an issue between the Soviet Union and the United States. The Conference on Disarmament should in the first instance resume its in-depth examination of unresolved practical issues in this field, such as

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

compliance, verification and scope. It is necessary to reach an understanding on the scope of a test ban. Such a ban should include both nuclear-weapon tests and so-called nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. It should thus, in our view, prohibit all nuclear explosions in all environments for all time, and it should be applicable to all States. At this session of the General Assembly, we should seek to arrive at a recommendation to the Conference on Disarmament, based on as wide a base of support as possible, to start concrete work on this issue at its next session.

It is our view that a global seismological network would play an essential role in the verification of a nuclear test ban. In the past few years, significant progress has been made in this field by the scientific expert group of the Conference on Disarmament. Such a network must be operative by the time a test-ban treaty is in force and should ensure a reliable international data exchange on the basis of the most modern technology available at the time of its establishment. Norway thus welcomes the interest shown by the Soviet Union in 1986 in using the exchange of waveform data as part of a global system of verification of a test ban.

For a number of years, Norway has devoted considerable resources to contributing to the development of a global system. Since its establishment in 1970, the Norwegian Seismic Array (NORSAR) has been one of the world's largest seismological observatories. Last year, a new array was inaugurated. The New Norwegian Regional Seismic Array System (NORESS) incorporates some of the most recent technological and scientific advances in the field of seismic array design. Our experience in this field leads us to the conclusion that a large number of questions related to verification of a nuclear test ban are, indeed, solved.

A global and comprehensive ban on chemical weapons is urgently needed. Significant progress has been achieved during negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. In light of the need to intensify negotiations, my Government welcomes the agreement in the Conference on Disarmament to continue work prior to the opening of the 1987 session of the Conference.

My country, which is the candidate of the Western Group for membership in the Conference on Disarmament, has taken an active part in those negotiations. Since 1982, several working papers have been submitted concerning verification of the alleged use of chemical weapons. Those papers have been based on research results from experiments undertaken under field conditions and should be viewed in light of the agreement to incorporate a prohibition of the use of chemical weapons in the global convention. The Norwegian research programme is aimed at developing proposals for full-fledged procedures for verification of the alleged use of chemical weapons on a year-round basis. Such procedures would facilitate implementation of the global convention.

A basic and as yet unresolved question is that of the modalities for handling requests for on-site inspection on challenge. On 15 July, the United Kingdom introduced in the Conference on Disarmament a new proposal which in our view constitutes a genuine and serious attempt to establish a basis for an acceptable compromise on that question.

Another unresolved question concerns the development of effective procedures for verifying the non-production of chemical weapons, although substantial progress has been made in 1986 on the concept of listing chemical substances that would be subject to control. Norway favours a solution whereby the chemical industry would be subject to routine inspection on a random basis and whereby relevant statistical data would regularly be exchanged.

My Government views with the greatest concern and seriousness the repeated use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war, in violation of the Geneva Protocol of

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

1925. The use of those abhorrent weapons is another reminder of the need to conclude a global convention without further delay.

It is therefore the view of my Government that it must be a matter of the highest priority for us at this General Assembly to give the Conference on Disarmament unambiguous support in its negotiations on a global ban. All resources should now be utilized to finalize a draft convention in 1987. Intermediate measures can in no way reduce the need for a comprehensive global ban.

(Mr. Vaaalsen, Norway)

The adoption of a final declaration at the second Review Conference of the States parties to the biological weapons Convention represented a positive step towards strengthening the prohibition of biological and toxin weapons. My Government attaches particular importance to the supporting strengthening measures on which the Conference agreed in order to prevent or reduce the occurrence of ambiguities, doubts and suspicions and in order to improve international co-operation in the field of peaceful biological activities. The holding of an ad hoc meeting of scientific and technical experts in March and April next year to finalize the modalities for the exchange of information and data represents an innovation in connection with the implementation of the Convention.

The Conference on Disarmament managed in 1985 to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on Outer Space. By examining and identifying issues relevant to the prevention of an arms race in outer space, the Conference has done useful and necessary initial work. The deliberations have proved the vital importance of all States parties complying with the outer space Treaty and other treaties relevant to outer space. Apart from the multilateral treaties, the 1972 anti-ballistic missile Treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States represents a corner-stone of the existing régime. A further evaluation of the existing agreements relevant to outer space is required with a view to agreeing on areas which should be dealt with in greater depth by the Conference on Disarmament. Efforts are indeed needed to prevent the spread of the arms race into outer space, and it is the firm view of my Government that outer space should be reserved exclusively for peaceful purposes. That requires both bilateral and multilateral deliberations.

(Mr. Vraalsen, Norway)

It must be a matter of great importance for this Committee to give voice to the concern of world opinion that the militarization of outer space should not take place, and we therefore urge that a determined effort be undertaken this year again to bring about a single draft resolution that can command as wide a support as possible.

In view of the close relationship between disarmament and development, Norway has actively supported the holding of a United Nations Conference devoted to that matter. We all know that such a Conference was scheduled for this year but that it has been postponed until 1987. We earnestly hope that the necessary decisions will be taken at this session of the General Assembly with regard to holding that Conference as soon as possible. Considerable preparations have already been made. A Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development would, in our view, represent a first occasion for United Nations Member States to address that relationship in a comprehensive manner. The International Conference would thus be the beginning of an in-depth consideration of that issue within the United Nations, and it would also offer an opportunity to formulate guidelines for future activities on the national and international levels in the field of the relationship between disarmament and development.

Let me conclude by repeating what I said at the outset: that we hope that at its forty-first session, the General Assembly will be able to carry out an examination of the crucial issues before it in a spirit of good will and co-operation, thereby creating a solid basis for future work in the Conference on Disarmament and in the United Nations Disarmament Commission. At the same time, a constructive outcome of our deliberations would send a powerful signal to other negotiating forums at this vital stage in the disarmament process.

Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA (Zaire) (interpretation from French): When during the election of the Committee officers my delegation proposed the candidacy of Japan for the post of Vice-Chairman, I had the opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship. I shall therefore not repeat my congratulations. However, I wish to say how pleased my delegation is at the outstanding way in which you have guided the work of the First Committee since the beginning of the session, in an unfavourable international climate characterized by deep distrust.

The hopes aroused by last year's meeting between the leaders of the two great Powers, held in November 1985 at Geneva, and by the recent follow-up meeting, held on 10 and 11 October 1986 at Reykjavik, were frustrated by the total absence of any political will on the part of the two great nuclear Powers to reach agreements on even partial or gradual nuclear disarmament. My delegation continues to believe that the two great Powers will be able to overcome their difficulties and resume constructive dialogue leading to the elimination of the military nuclear arsenal, thus creating a climate of trust, dialogue and détente.

The present psychological environment should in no way demoralize the members of the First Committee or, still less, those of the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva, for the international community will eventually bring increased moral pressure to bear on the two great nuclear Powers to meet again and jointly seek ways to reach a nuclear disarmament agreement.

The objectives of this Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament are to eliminate the threat of war, especially nuclear war, to seek ways of halting nuclear testing and the growing military nuclear capacity, and to reverse the nuclear arms race with a view to achieving lasting peace.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adelto Nzengeya, Zaire)

All the nuclear Powers have recognized the negative nature of nuclear deterrence, especially because since 1945 - when the cities of Nagasaki and Hiroshima were destroyed by the first atomic bombs - no nuclear war has taken place. Strategic nuclear superiority and attempts to limit damage in the event of nuclear war would thus appear to be incompatible from the military point of view, for strategic nuclear superiority guarantees deterrence while attempts to limit damage in the event of nuclear war would seem to be futile, the destruction of civilian targets being inevitable in the event of nuclear bombardment.

The theory whereby the role of nuclear weapons is essentially limited to deterrence has been rendered invalid by gradual escalation. The creation of various nuclear-weapon systems - strategic weapons with a 6,400-kilometre range, intermediate-range weapons with a range between 2,400 and 6,400 kilometres, short and medium-range weapons with a range between 800 and 2,800 kilometres, and tactical weapons - cannot guarantee the safety of the areas over which those nuclear weapons pass or that of areas near the target.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

The unfortunate nuclear accident that recently occurred at the nuclear installation at Chernobyl in the USSR was eloquent testimony to the fact that scientists conceive and produce nuclear weapons in an orderly and conscientious way, whereas control over the effects of such nuclear weapons on human beings as well as on the environment is still beyond the power of human intelligence. Hence the incalculable destructive consequences of the explosion of any so-called nuclear weapon, whatever its range.

The international community is constantly aware that 50 per cent of the 50,000 nuclear missiles now in the possession of all the world's nuclear Powers, which represent a potential nuclear explosive power of a million of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima, might have been destroyed had an agreement been reached at Reykjavik. The same would have been true of the arsenals of conventional weapons of the nuclear Powers, that is, more than 140,000 combat tanks, more than 35,000 combat aircraft, more than 21,000 helicopters, more than 1,100 large naval warships and more than 700 nuclear-attack submarines.

Finally, the nuclear-arms race represents the desire on the part of certain nuclear Powers to impose upon the planet a new strategic world order, whose prime objective would be to ensure an unparalleled military superiority and an uncontested hegemony over the entire globe.

The nuclear rivalry that has resulted makes the antagonists yearn for a military and technological superiority and thus prevents them from considering the critical economic situation in Africa, the world debt problem standing in the way of development in the third world - in short, the poverty, famine and squalor that afflict a large number of third world countries.

It is striking to note that the total amount of the expenditures on nuclear armaments equals the total indebtedness of all the third world countries. From a strictly economic point of view, the economic growth of the third world countries

and their increased participation in world trade, as advocated in the Fourth Part of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), could act as a stimulant to the economies of all Member States. It would lead to more intensive trade, to stronger economic, industrial and technological relations and to a close co-operation in various spheres between the third world and the industrialized and nuclear Powers.

That statement has been borne out by the prosperity achieved by the countries members of the Atlantic Alliance in the aftermath of the Second World War following implementation of the Marshall Plan, a prosperity that benefited both the Western countries and the rest of the world as well. In 1947, George Marshall stated:

"Our policy is not directed against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, despair and chaos."

If the international community of 1945 could harbour such a concept of goodwill and humanity, dear to the philosopher Kant, is it inconceivable that 40 years later at same international community might give priority attention to the development concerns of some countries over and above the concerns of individual hegemony?

This approach was called for repeatedly by the Chairman of the Group of 77 when introducing in the General Assembly the item on the problem of third world indebtedness. In 1950, the Indian delegation submitted a proposal for a United Nations peace fund aimed at developing the under-developed regions by drawing on funds to be built up from the savings realized through arms reduction. That proposal was followed in 1985 by the initiative of the delegation of Sri Lanka, calling upon the United States of America and the Soviet Union to reduce their military expenditures by 10 per cent in order to alleviate the international indebtedness of the poorest nations.

In this connection my delegation hopes that the First Committee will be able to take a decision on the convening in 1987 of an International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development and to set a site for that

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

Conference. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 40/155, it was to have been held last July at Paris, but, because of pressing circumstances, the French Government, which had in June acted as host to the International Conference on the Adoption of Sanctions against Racist South Africa, was unable to accommodate it.

Given the disarmament desires expressed by many delegations of States Members, my delegation is certain that a candidate will come forward to act as host to that Conference, preparations for which are well advanced in the Preparatory Committee.

General and complete disarmament can be realized only with effective international controls. Therefore, all nuclear Powers, including South Africa, must submit to the authority of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The same obligation should extend to all peaceful nuclear facilities to ensure the implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

In that connection my delegation supports the strict application of the decision taken in 1964 by the Heads of State or Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at Cairo declaring Africa a nuclear-free-zone. The Tlatelolco Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America is already in effect in implementation of that earlier Treaty.

The progress achieved by the Geneva Conference on Disarmament on chemical weapons means that the First Committee should give serious attention to that subject in order to achieve a prompt agreement. My delegation wishes to pay a special tribute to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, His Excellency Ambassador Cromartie of the United Kingdom, for the hard work he has done throughout his term as Chairman to complete negotiations on chemical weapons and for the positive contribution he made to the drafting of a multilateral convention on a total and effective prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of chemical weapons and on their destruction. I hope that his

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nangeya, Zaire)

successor, His Excellency Ambassador Ekeus of Sweden, will be able with equal dedication to work towards the completion of the drafting of the convention.

Within the Conference on Disarmament, the other items on its agenda continue to form the subject of consideration by Conference members. We must note, however, that little progress has been made on questions such as the nuclear-test ban, cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament. Notwithstanding the efforts made by the Group of 21, supported by other Groups, no consensus has emerged on the establishment of a subsidiary body on agenda item 1, "Nuclear-test ban". The efforts of some countries, and even those of the Chairman, to draw up a mandate for the ad hoc committee to be established under agenda item 1 did not evoke a favourable response from the other members of the Conference.

My delegation hopes that those consultations will continue so that those first two items on the agenda of the Conference can be given thorough consideration by subsidiary bodies, as is the case with regard to certain other items on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

In this regard, my delegation wishes to pay tribute to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, Mr. Garcia Ro les, for the enrichment of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament which certainly is a time-consuming task the substance of which requires more active participation from Conference members.

There is also a need to broaden the Conference's membership. My delegation has noted the agreement reached by the Conference to appoint two new members, one representing the socialist Group and the other the Western Group, but consultation continues with regard to the other two members to represent the Group of 21.

My delegation cannot remain insensitive to the concern voiced by numerous delegations at the Conference on Disarmament in the sphere of the prevention of an arms race in space. Space, being the common heritage of mankind, should accordingly be reserved for exclusively peaceful purposes so as to promote the scientific, economic and social development of all nations.

The danger of seeing the research and development programmes of the two leading space Powers and the energy of their military rivalry extend into space has become real since the emergence of the "star wars" age. This new spiral in which the two leading nuclear Powers are engaged may lead them to the development, testing, manufacture and, possibly, even the deployment of weapons systems and their elements which may be used in, extend to or from space and could touch off a new, irreversible competition in the sphere of space arsenals.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of the Nuclear Arms Race in Outer Space should press on unrelentingly with its work so as to induce the nuclear Powers concerned to halt this race.

(Mr. Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya, Zaire)

In conclusion, the delegation of Zaire wishes to congratulate Mr. Martenson, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament, and Mr. Kheradi, Secretary of the Committee, and his entire team for their positive contribution to the preparation of disarmament conferences and the dissemination of publications on disarmament. We are sure that this team will spare no effort to prepare meticulously for the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): Last weekend the United States and the Soviet Union brought a historic disarmament agreement tantalizingly close to achievement. Since then both super-Powers have informed the world that they will persist in this effort and build on the progress achieved at Reykjavik. The negotiators have already resumed their meetings in Geneva.

Those are highly significant developments that have produced a renewed atmosphere of hope as this Committee begins its deliberations. For, as Prime Minister Brian Mulroney told the Canadian Parliament this week, the elements are now in place for an ongoing civilized dialogue in Geneva which, it is hoped, will result in General Secretary Gorbachev's coming to the United States as agreed upon. The Canadian Prime Minister added:

"There are stumbling-blocks on both sides. That is what negotiations are all about - sitting down with open minds, knowing the objections on both sides, and trying to effect an honourable compromise."

The Canadian Government hopes that people of goodwill will achieve a substantive accord which could be signed at an early summit. Arms control, however, is a fragile process; its environment must be protected. It is therefore doubly important to resist all actions which might be seen as weakening or unravelling the existing international framework on which East-West relations and arms control are built. Compliance with existing agreements is essential.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

It is of course a reality of our time that the United States and the Soviet Union will determine the major aspects of any international framework for global security. But security is everyone's business. All of us have a stake in international security, and all of us have a responsibility to play a constructive role in the arms-control process.

Canada will press on with constructive work in every multilateral forum that one day must achieve the basis for a world community freed from the weapons of mass destruction. Iceland showed that the complete elimination of ballistic missiles in 10 years is now seriously discussed at the highest levels. The full implementation of this historic opportunity is our task. Iceland was a moment on the journey, but the journey goes on.

When President Reagan addressed the General Assembly before the Reykjavik meeting he spoke of hope, of a future without weapons of mass destruction. He reaffirmed his country's commitment to peace, to a more stable super-Power relationship, and to substantial progress on arms control and disarmament. The President expressed his Government's willingness to ratify the threshold test-ban Treaty and the Treaty on Peaceful Nuclear Explosions, once agreement was reached on improved verification procedures. He offered to consider other limits on nuclear testing in parallel with arms reductions. It is our hope that the Soviet Union will find it possible to build on this realistic and welcome approach as a firm foundation for real progress.

When Foreign Minister Shevardnadze came to New York earlier in this session he, too, gave us reason for optimism. He spoke of relations with the United States as holding promise - of encouraging outlines of meaningful agreements between his country and the United States. And when we later welcomed him in Ottawa, Mr. Shevardnadze again repeated his country's commitment to more stable East-West ties and to progress on arms control.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

But in this atmosphere of expectation two notes of caution are in order.

First, any sense of new momentum can lead to lasting, effective results, only if it is backed up by patience, quiet negotiation and due attention to adequate verification, which over the long term will assure confidence in compliance. Secondly, our hopes and expectations surrounding the super-Power talks and the bilateral nuclear and space negotiations in Geneva, as important as they are, should not be allowed to distract attention from the necessity for complementary progress in conventional and multilateral arms-control forums.

It is in this context that we are all much encouraged by the successful conclusion of the Stockholm Conference. The results of Stockholm bring new openness and predictability to the conduct of military affairs in Europe. The establishment of agreed procedures for air and ground on-site inspections is a landmark achievement - one which will provide an effective basis for other arms-control negotiations.

More broadly, the United Nations Disarmament Commission has had a relatively productive session. The guidelines for confidence-building measures, on which the Commission will report to the General Assembly, like the Stockholm document, should provide a useful basis for future negotiators. They could be drawn on to ensure those elements of confidence, compliance and verification which will be essential components of all effective arms-control agreements.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

The Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has also had a more productive session. If it has still not achieved agreement on a global chemical weapons ban, detailed negotiations are intensifying and there have been welcome signs that the Soviet Union is prepared to move forward on verification. We have particularly noted the proposal of the United Kingdom on challenge inspection, which we hope will provide a basis for practical progress on one of the most difficult issues associated with the chemical weapons ban.

This sense of positive accomplishment, however, does not extend to other issues on the Conference of Disarmament's agenda. We are frankly disappointed that progress on a comprehensive nuclear test ban has been so slow. We were particularly discouraged at the failure to agree on a practical mandate for a subsidiary body to work constructively towards an agreed test ban. We note and welcome the fact that the Soviet Union has taken a more forthcoming approach on technical matters relating to the establishment of a global seismic monitoring network. The Australian proposal for an international seismic network is both consistent with Canada's concern for a reliably verifiable test ban and an encouraging step towards the objective of a comprehensive test ban. Expert-level talks between Soviet and United States scientists on nuclear testing are a welcome development which all of us hope can provide yet another step towards our common goal.

The prevention of an arms race in outer space is a high priority for Canada. It was thus disappointing that the mandate for the subsidiary body on outer space was agreed so late in the session of the Conference on Disarmament. Once the mandate was agreed, discussion was both sober and thoughtful. The existing mandate is clearly demonstrating its usefulness.

Canada played an active part in the Second Review Conference of the biological and toxin weapons Convention. We are heartened by that Conference's final

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

declaration, its strong reaffirmation of the principles of the Convention and its restatement of the common interest all share in strengthening the Convention's authority and effectiveness through promoting confidence and co-operation.

Now, this activity shows that the world community is not indifferent or impotent in building a safer world. There is still much to do in the international arena, and Canada pledges once again to do everything in our power to strengthen the international machinery of peace. This world-wide activity must reinforce the efforts of the super-Powers to find their bilateral agreements. For we know that, although 86 per cent of the people of the world do not live in the United States or the Soviet Union, we are all caught up in the fall-out from that relationship of the two great super-Powers, which together possess 95 per cent of the more than 50,000 nuclear weapons in the world. Their relationship, as is obvious, affects everyone. It is in the interests of everyone to help improve the entire East-West relationship and, as Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar said in his acceptance speech last Friday, to

"demand of the Governments of States which possess nuclear weapons ... that they reflect upon their responsibility to their peoples and to the planet itself and pursue policies that will lead to the elimination of these weapons". (A/41/PV.33, p. 12)

It used to be said that history would be the judge of one's actions, but in terms of what we are discussing here there will be no history to write, in a non-future for human life, if the means to destroy the human race, now in the possession of the two super-Powers, should ever be unleashed.

Consequently, the role of the United Nations in disarmament is to construct a viable framework of multilateral progress so as to enhance the prospect of major bilateral agreements. More attention should be paid in this Committee to consensus

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

resolutions with as much substance as possible, rather than merely increasing the number of resolutions. At the 1976 session, 10 years ago, there were 23 resolutions, 8 of which were adopted by consensus. In 1985, there were 66 resolutions, 20 of which were adopted by consensus. The growth of non-consensus resolutions, many of which cancel one another out and split apart the Committee, is a dubious achievement and a complete puzzlement to the outside world. Let us not forget that the Final Document of the first special session, which remains the yardstick by which we measure progress, was a consensus agreement. Important advice has been offered by last year's Chairman, Ambassador Alatas of Indonesia, to form a small working group to attempt rationalization of the Committee's work.

What is needed to reinvigorate the concept of collective security, including arms control, is not a new structure or a set of principles, for we have a perfectly adequate framework for peace already in place in the form of the United Nations and its Charter. What needs to be done is to use it effectively.

It is a source of pride to Canada that one of last year's resolutions that was adopted by consensus was a substantive Canadian resolution, "Verification in all its aspects", which highlights the importance of verification as a key element in the arms control negotiating process. Underlying every arms control issue is the question of confidence - of assurance of compliance, and thus of verification. We in Canada are certain that verification cannot be left aside as a subsidiary element of arms control. On the contrary, though the concept of verification must never be seen as an obstacle to be thrown up against serious arms control negotiation, it must be an integral and essential part of all arms control agreements.

Canada intends to take the lead again this year in putting forward a similar draft resolution. Our aim will be to reaffirm the importance of effective arrangements for verification, arrangements based on sound technical competence and

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

principles which can be carefully tailored to fit specific agreements. Canada wants the General Assembly to have the Disarmament Commission consider verification at the earliest possible opportunity. We hope that, as last year, all Member States will join in supporting this important undertaking.

A year ago the Canadian Government developed a programme of action for the remaining half of the Second Disarmament Decade. This programme continues to focus on practical solutions to arms control problems, on laying the essential groundwork for the creation of confidence and trust vital to arms control agreements.

As part of this programme of action the Canadian Government continues to provide some 1 million Canadian dollars to the Verification Research Unit in our Department of External Affairs. That unit has continued its work on key issues relating to a limitation of nuclear testing leading to a comprehensive test ban, a global chemical weapons convention and the prevention of an arms race in outer space. To assist in laying the foundations for a comprehensive test ban, the Canadian Government is upgrading its seismic array in our own Northern Territory. Just last week we hosted a successful technical workshop in Ottawa at which 16 countries, including the United States and the Soviet Union, were represented. Our commitment to the International Seismic Data Exchange remains firm. Verification has now become an international concern, and Canada welcomes the statement issued by the six nations of the five-continent peace initiative at their recent summit meeting in Mexico that they seek co-operation with non-nuclear States in international verification arrangements related to future nuclear disarmament. We in Canada are certain that, in putting our efforts into a programme of action which concentrates on practical solutions and co-operating with other nations, we are on the right track.

Canada's commitment to verifiable and balanced arms control and disarmament remains absolutely firm. The Canadian Prime Minister himself has recently again

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

set out the six policy areas of our Government: negotiated radical reductions in nuclear forces and the enhancement of strategic stability; maintenance and strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation régime; support for a comprehensive test ban treaty as a fundamental and abiding objective of Canadian foreign policy; negotiation of a chemical weapons ban; prevention of an arms race in outer space; and confidence-building measures to facilitate the reduction of military forces in Europe and elsewhere.

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

Again, at this United Nations session - and in the Conference on Disarmament - Canada will be looking for early progress in these areas of crucial concern to us all. Among these, the one perhaps closest to realization is a global chemical-weapons ban. This is a vital issue, on which constructive proposals have been made and in regard to which there should be no insurmountable obstacle to early agreement.

We shall continue to participate in the search for effective means of ensuring that outer space be used only for peaceful purposes. Canada actively continues to seek a comprehensive nuclear-test ban as a fundamental arms control objective. The Secretary of State for External Affairs has told the General Assembly - on 24 September - that a nuclear-test ban is an objective towards which concrete steps can and should be taken now. We believe that what is needed for effective results is to begin work immediately, working step by step, without pre-conditions, towards a lasting, mutually acceptable and verifiable comprehensive test ban. Progress towards the limiting and ending of all testing is essential.

High on Canada's list of priorities is the need to strengthen still further the nuclear non-proliferation régime, to guard against the spread of nuclear weapons technology, and to limit in every way possible the possibility of accidental nuclear weapons disaster. Encouraged as we are by the reaffirmation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) at the 1985 Review Conference, we are also conscious of the need for nuclear-weapon States to implement article VI on the cessation of the arms race.

In the long and complex struggle for peace, two issues stand out above all others - disarmament and development. While it is true that those two great goals require a peaceful atmosphere for their realization, progress must be made in each area to establish the conditions for peace. That is why the forthcoming United Nations International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

Development is so important. The participating nations in the preparatory process have already agreed that disarmament and development, which are in themselves distinct processes, should be vigorously pursued because they both strengthen peace and security and promote prosperity. An international panel of eminent personalities has advised the Conference that current levels and trends in global military expenditures "stand in sombre contrast to the state of the world economy". Canada is heartened by the substantive progress made at the third preparatory meeting last June and believes the main conference should be held in July 1987 in New York.

On my travels across Canada this year, I found a high level of interest in and concern for disarmament. I also met an unprecedented response to the declaration of the International Year of Peace. Canada's International Year of Peace programme has been substantive. Two weeks ago, as happened all around the world, we marked the International Day of Peace: bells rang in communities from coast to coast in Canada in an eloquent peal for peace. And people gathered under the bells of the Peace Tower in Ottawa to mark the International Day of Peace.

A commemorative postage stamp and a fine gold mint coin were issued as part of the Government's International Year of Peace programme, to commemorate what should be a milestone in man's search for peace and security. Two days later, under the same Peace Tower, I accepted the peace torch from athletes participating in the first Earth Run, which is sponsored by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). And, in a moving symbolic act, I handed it on, much in the way that what we have done this year will be handed on in the future. The International Year of Peace will thus be an inspiration to people and Governments everywhere to make their own contribution to peace.

I have spoken of new hope and commitment. I have referred to a new sense of expectation surrounding the super-Power relationship - an expectation merely

(Mr. Roche, Canada)

heightened by the meeting at Reykjavik. If, as we earnestly desire, that leads to substantive agreement on crucial nuclear questions, we must see the success as a spur to greater effort and concrete results on multilateral arms-control issues. And even if agreement on nuclear weapons reductions continues to elude the super-Powers, it will then be all the more important to press on. Wherever and whenever we can - in the United Nations First Committee, in the Conference on Disarmament, in the Disarmament Commission - we must redouble our efforts towards agreement on those important arms control issues where all of us can realistically expect to play an immediate and direct role.

The portents are more encouraging now than they have been for many years. Results will not come without effort, and the stakes are high. But the task - the reward for success and the penalty for failure - is everyone's. Canada, for one, will continue to work in every way possible towards our common goal of a world of confidence, security, trust and peace.

Mr. BOUZIRI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, first let me take this opportunity of saying how happy my delegation is to see you guiding over our work. Your eminent personal qualities, well known to us all, your dedication to the cause of disarmament and your command of international security matters will guarantee that this year our work will meet the expectations of all. I am sure that the competence of the other officers, whom I am pleased to congratulate here, will not fail to provide you the assistance you need in carrying out your important task.

In this International Year of Peace, which the international community is celebrating with such ardent hope, our deliberations on questions of disarmament and international security are taking place in an atmosphere of both anxiety and hope.

(Mr. Bouziri, Tunisia)

There is anxiety, because we continue to witness an international situation still haunted by the existence of focal points of tension endangering international peace and security. The persistence of these conflicts and their inherent risk of geographical expansion emphasize the urgency and the need for political will to find peaceful solutions.

The developing countries, which are the stage for tragic armed conflicts in the world today, have for their part become the area of deployment and testing for increasingly sophisticated and lethal weapons, which daily cause thousands of deaths and injuries. Arms supply contracts, which continue to increase and thus benefit the military-industrial complexes of the military Powers, cannot fail to condemn the developing countries to costly expenditures, thus hampering their own economic and social development.

There is anxiety, furthermore, because the unbridled arms race, the dangers of which Tunisia has often brought to the attention of the international community, continues unabated. Military expenditures by the major Powers are now stated in terms of billions of dollars, thus wasting vast resources in men, money and scientific know-how which our world so badly needs, particularly in the crisis we are now experiencing.

(Mr. Bouziri, Tunisia)

Hunger, poverty and underdevelopment thus persist, while astronomical sums are daily spent in a sphere that can bring us only death and desolation. We cannot allow this inertia to continue; the increasing interdependence of today's international relations should make us all to think about ways of putting an end to this absurd contradiction. The development nations must understand that their economic development in the medium or long term depends on that of the developing countries and that the gap separating the North from the South cannot but have harmful consequences for their own economies.

The gradual reallocation to economic and social development of the massive resources now spent in the military sector would reduce the danger to our planet and ensure the well-being and prosperity of all the peoples of the world, including those of the developing countries. That would be to the benefit of all, including the developed countries, which could then devote all their resources to economic and social development in their own countries, while having reduced the risk of war and conflagration.

This is a noble goal, a challenge that we must all take up, for our collective interest is involved. We hope therefore that this year there will be the necessary political will to ensure the convening in 1987 of the United Nations Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was to have been held last summer. We fervently hope that participation in that important Conference will be as broad as possible so that we can unite our efforts and achieve the results the international community hopes for and expects.

That is not the only area where a common effort is required. We cannot fail to note the alarming proliferation of nuclear weapons that is taking place in the Middle East and in Africa without any firm action being taken. Numerous and consistent reports appear every day about the ever more obvious risk faced by

(Mr. Bouziri, Tunisia)

African and Arab States as a result of the continuing close collaboration between Israel and South Africa in the nuclear field and their acquisition of nuclear weapons, thus nullifying the efforts of Arab and African countries to make the two areas nuclear-weapon-free zones. Can we turn our Mediterranean Sea into a lake of peace and stability when Israel has become the world's sixth atomic Power and possesses an impressive range of nuclear weapons, including neutron and hydrogen bombs?

My delegation does not intend this year to review the various items on our agenda, as we have done at previous sessions. On the one hand our position has been set out and elucidated on several occasions in the Committee, and on the other many earlier speakers, have clearly described the dangers inherent in the present international situation, considered in detail the various phases of the arms race over a period of years, and voiced their grave concerns, which are shared by my delegation. I wish, however, to dwell briefly on a few aspects of the world scene over the past year that give cause for a revival of hope and trust.

Last autumn's summit meeting between the leaders of the two super-Powers was the starting point for a new series of contacts between those two countries. Dialogue has been re-established and proposals and counter-proposals have been put forward; and on the basis of the content and scale of those initiatives we believe we can discern a genuine determination to engage resolutely in a serious negotiating process which could lead, given the necessary political will, to substantial arms reduction or disarmament agreements.

Although no specific results have been achieved, the contacts have not been broken off. The Geneva negotiations continue tirelessly; meetings among experts continue; and, setting aside certain mutual accusations regarding form, both sides continue to reaffirm their readiness to reach agreements given a similar readiness on the other side.

(Mr. Bouziri, Tunisia)

In that context of the relations between the two great Powers, and East-West relations in general, the encouraging results of the Stockholm Conference a month ago should be seen in the light of the positive atmosphere that has characterized the relations between the two blocs for over a year now.

There is thus good reason for the common assessment of the final document adopted by the participants in the Stockholm Conference as historic. For our part we hope it will have beneficial effects both on relations between the two military pacts involved and on international relations in general.

Last weekend's summit meeting between the Soviet and United States leaders monopolized world attention and gave rise to great hopes. Important proposals were put forward and common ground appears to be emerging, particularly concerning medium-range missiles deployed in Europe and Asia. Although, unfortunately, no agreement was reached, the summit clearly showed that, with a minimum of trust and the political will to negotiate and achieve results, even the thorniest problems can be resolved to the satisfaction of all parties. Did not the problem of the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe less than three years ago trigger the most serious crisis in East-West relations since the Cuban missile crisis?

The most serious concern has been expressed for many years now. The Heads of State of six countries from different regions of the world frequently appealed to the United States and Soviet leaders to spare no effort to relieve the world of the nuclear threat and to conclude agreements to that effect. More recently, the Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, meeting in Harare last September, addressed letters to each of the two Heads of State asking them to agree on ways and means to begin a genuine nuclear disarmament process to eliminating the danger hanging over mankind.

(Mr. Rouziri, Tunisia)

We are deeply convinced, however, that the United Nations must play a central role in the question of disarmament. The Organization's universality and undoubted influence predispose it inevitably to play a major role, particularly in the present situation of dialogue between the Powers that shoulder a large part of the responsibility with regard to the arms race.

Hence, it is a prerogative, indeed a duty, of our Organization to take the opportunity provided by the possibility of a forthcoming summit, and by areas of agreement that are obviously within our grasp, to make a solemn and urgent appeal, in its turn and while the Assembly is in session, to the two distinguished leaders to ensure that their next meeting is crowned by substantive agreements covering all the areas where agreements are possible.

The Tunisian delegation therefore hopes that the General Assembly will take this opportunity and join its voice and influence to those of the distinguished personalities and all the non-aligned countries that have been constantly appealing to the two major nuclear Powers to be reasonable and meet the expectations of the whole of the international community.

This endeavour deserves all our attention. It could have positive repercussions, particularly if, as we most sincerely hope, it is given the broadest possible support.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the Committee that the names of the following delegations are on the list of speakers for the meeting this afternoon: Denmark, Mongolia, Bhutan and Burkina Faso.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.