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

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): As I speak for the first time in this vital Committee, I want to pay a tribute to you, Mr. Chairman, and your predecessors, who have guided the immensely difficult work of making progress in arms control and disarmament measures. I also remember with respect my predecessors who have represented Canada. This Committee has been enriched by many representatives from many countries who have devoted themselves to the elusive search for solutions to the complex problems of peace and security. But, despite those valued efforts, the facts and figures recount in telling detail the armed world in which we live; they bear witness to the modest nature of what has been achieved.

As I begin my work here, I ask myself: Will one more speech, one more analysis, one more resolution, change this situation? Do the Governments represented in the Committee need more ideas, more commitment, more passion for a solution? Should we devote more time, more energy, more money to the problem? I have concluded that none of these is really needed. What is needed is the political will of nations to start implementing the 129-paragraph Final Document of the first special session on disarmament. That document was agreed to by a historic consensus. We must seek to rediscover that consensus through the exercise of political will. That is the essence of the problem we face today.

Therefore, my first task is to report to this Committee that the new Government of Canada intends to exercise that political will to work with other nations towards the prevention of war in the nuclear age and the inauguration of an era of assured peace for all the world. These are the central issues confronting our generation, as Canada's Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Brian Mulroney, pointed out recently. In doing so, he said:

"There can be no let up in our efforts to reduce the threat of war. No matter how frustrating or difficult, negotiations must be pursued ... The exercise of political will is nowhere more important than on this issue, on whose outcome the lives of our children and of humanity depend."

Those words were articulated by the Canadian Prime Minister, but the sentiment comes equally from the Canadian people. International tension and the accumulation of weapons, those links in a deadly chain, are deeply troubling to all Canadians — and, as recent studies have shown, even to our children.
Canada is a member of a defensive alliance. We are not neutral. We stand for freedom. We also stand for negotiations, all negotiations, particularly those on the reduction of nuclear arms. In company with its allies, Canada has reaffirmed its willingness to reverse, halt or modify the Euromissile deployment, including the removal and dismantling of missiles already deployed, upon the achievement of a balanced, equitable and verifiable agreement calling for such action. We are for the resumption of negotiations, unconditionally, at the earliest possible date. That many others share this desire and concern is confirmed by the General Assembly's resolutions on this subject.

We have a common interest in survival. We have a common interest in peace. The United Nations is an irreplaceable instrument through which that supreme goal must be pursued.

The United Nations is not a disarmament negotiating body, but it can set the stage and define the atmosphere. We meet to set priorities; we meet to encourage the dialogue on arms control and international security among all Members of the United Nations. That was the fundamental achievement of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament. Let us build on it.

A first step might be to recognize the depth and breadth of our common interests, which go beyond the daily issues that so often divide the international community.

Nuclear wars cannot be won and must not be fought. We must be liberated from the fear of nuclear war by accident or surprise. The proliferation of nuclear weapons is a common, constant concern. The dangers of destabilizing weapons are recognized. Confidence-building in all its forms, from improved methods of crisis management to effective and balanced means of verifying arms control agreements are essential. Armaments build-ups involve high costs for development, nationally and internationally. All States have legitimate security interests.

These common concerns, these common principles, already appear in various forms of international law. There is, as I have suggested, an opportunity to build on them. The two super-Powers have, for example, long recognized the devastating consequences that a nuclear war would have for all humanity. This recognition is also reflected in the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Final Document of the first
special session of the General Assembly on disarmament and it has been give added poignancy by scientifically-based scenarios of a nuclear winter affecting the entire planet.

I have spoken of the commonality of our interests. In the course of our deliberations we shall be setting out in detail Canadian views on issues on our agenda. In the mean time I should like to emphasize a triad of measures which would offer hope.

First, we call for an immediate, unconditional resumption of talks between the United States and the Soviet Union. We welcome recent moves already taken to resume that dialogue, which is essential to security. It is only at the negotiating table that agreement can be achieved.

Secondly, we call for renewed commitment to non-proliferation. The opportunity to make such a commitment will arise at the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1985.

Thirdly, we call for practical steps to be taken towards a nuclear-test ban. That is an unwavering objective of successive Canadian Governments and in this we join with many others.

There are two other vital areas of common interest.

We call for urgent efforts towards preventing an arms race in outer space. This is one of Canada's highest priorities. We therefore welcome the prospect of talks between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. We should all give full support to getting these talks started.

We also call for the earliest possible ban on chemical weapons. The tragic evidence of the recent use of chemical weapons shows that existing international law is not enough. The United States draft treaty on this subject is a valuable contribution towards achieving a comprehensive ban.

These are steps which must necessarily be part of any grand design of arms control and disarmament. There are other practical steps that we could take to translate words from principle to action. I shall mention a few measures we have taken.

Together with others, Canada is participating in the International Seismic Data Exchange, which is now in progress. Should this project succeed, it will mark an important step towards the verifiability of a test-ban treaty.
Canada is studying the feasibility of developing a system of "space to space" surveillance to assist in monitoring compliance with any future agreement to prevent an arms race in space.

Canada is devising means to determine with accuracy, both technically and organizationally, whether or not chemical weapons have been used.

I wish to conclude by quoting two of my colleagues who have spoken in this Committee recently. Ambassador Maj Britt Theorin, Chairman of the Swedish Disarmament Commission, observed that a nuclear conflict between the super-Powers would affect every nation on this globe and that no nation, large or small, could escape its consequences. Ambassador Imai of Japan noted that arms control and disarmament are inseparably linked to an individual country's national security policy and that it is not possible to expect unilateral disarmament to emerge at the expense of a country's own national security. Together those two statements define the necessity for measures of mutual security; measures reached through the process of agreement; measures in the interests of all. We pledge to work with others to this end.

The message I bring is this: the Canadian Government is determined to take practical measures, at home and abroad, to make inch-by-inch progress in meeting the threat of war, particularly nuclear war. We believe in sure-footed steps towards collective security and mutuality of interests in equitable development.

None of us can work alone. The problems of our time will be insurmountable if any country relies on unilateral action. New multilateral efforts could help to improve the atmosphere and put specific, workable ideas on the international agenda.

It has been said that no man is an island. The same is true of nations. Let us search for new beginnings, however modest these may be. Let us work towards enhancing the credibility of the United Nations and its ability to fulfil the aims and purposes of its Charter. Let us, in short, begin the search for common solutions to common problems.
Mr. LACLETA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure for me to follow the precedent established by all delegations which have spoken in the debate and to congratulate you on your election to the chairmanship of the First Committee. I wish to express my best wishes that under your expert leadership our work will be well guided towards the attainment of fruitful results. I wish also to extend these congratulations to the other officers of the Committee. Sir, your task, like ours, is not an easy one, but your well-known personal qualities give my delegation hope that our final result will be satisfactory.

I also wish to convey the gratitude of the delegation of Spain to Ambassador Vraalsen of Norway for the excellent work he did last year as Chairman of the Committee.

In his statement to the General Assembly on 26 September this year, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain, Mr. Fernando Morán, in referring to the tension in international relations which unfortunately exists at present, mentioned that that tension has been:

"made worse by the break in the dialogue between the major Powers and by the arms race." (A/39/PV.9, p. 67)

It is imperative to put an end to that progression without further delay. My delegation is aware that the end goals which have been established with regard to disarmament are very ambitious and cannot be attained in one fell swoop. The progressive and balanced reduction in weapons, maintaining a level of security acceptable to all, is a slow task in which we will have to make progress step by step. But what we find alarming is that such regression in the level of arms and in the enormous costs required by such a level cannot begin so long as the possibilities still exist for a new upward spiral in the development of new techniques of unfathomable scope, especially as regards the possible military use of outer space. My delegation is fully convinced that it is possible to attain a balance at a lower level of armaments without thereby endangering the security of any of the States represented here.

For that reason, in the statement to which I have already referred, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Spain reiterated the call of the Government of Spain for the United States and the Soviet Union to resume their talks as soon as
possible. Encouraging indications have not been absent recently showing that that
dialogue may resume; this is all the more necessary in the world today, where the
responsibility of the major nuclear Powers is decisive for any effort to halt the
arms race and subsequently to undertake a progressive reduction in weapons.

It was in this spirit that the President of the Government of Spain stated his
support for the initiative launched this spring by the Heads of State and
Government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania.

However, that greater responsibility on the part of nuclear-weapon States does
not exempt the rest of us from redoubling our efforts whenever the occasion arises.

In this connection, Spain is taking an active part in the Stockholm
Conference, which, within the multilateral process begun at the Conference on
Security and Co-operation in Europe and in keeping with the mandate entrusted to it
at the Madrid meeting, is devoted to the negotiation and adoption of a series of
confidence- and security-building measures. As is well known, these measures,
applicable to Europe as a whole, should be militarily significant, politically
binding and coupled with appropriate forms of verification. Such measures aimed at
reducing international tension and strengthening rationality and stability in
international relations, are of crucial importance for the disarmament process.

I should like now to make a few brief comments on concrete items specifically
related to the Conference on Disarmament. My Government continues to be firmly in
favour of all efforts intended to bring about a total nuclear-test ban at the
earliest possible moment. Spain, which is a party to the partial ban Treaty
currently in force, would like to see that ban extended to all tests involving
nuclear explosions. While it realizes the unquestionable demands that such a ban
should be accompanied as an inseparable condition by an appropriate verification
system, it considers that the obstacles in the way of adopting such a system should
not be insurmountable. We await with the greatest of interest the results of the
tests which are currently under way in the area of seismological proof and the
degree of security which such proof may offer.

My delegation fully shares the concern expressed by many other delegations in
the debate about the danger of the extension of the arms race into outer space. We
also believe that such a development would have obvious destabilizing risks,
especially with regard to the anti-satellite systems - and this, of course, in
addition to the negative implications for the overall system of the peaceful use of outer space. For that reason we also consider it necessary for negotiations to begin between the United States and the Soviet Union in order to avoid such dangerous developments. At the same time, and in parallel, the problem should be considered by the Conference on Disarmament as the only multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. Interesting proposals have already been made in that forum which in our view could be useful as an appropriate framework for the prevention of an arms race in outer space. We trust, in short, that the Conference will be able to establish an ad hoc committee to consider that important question. While on the questions that I have mentioned so far the major Powers bear a primary responsibility, there are other questions in which all States must participate actively; the agenda item on chemical weapons continues to merit the greatest attention. The Government of Spain attaches great importance to the efforts of the General Assembly aimed at preserving the authority of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. To that end, the authorities of my country at an appropriate time conveyed to the Secretary-General the names of the experts and laboratories as requested in paragraph 5 of resolution 37/98 D.

At this session we have available the final report of the group of experts which was established under the above-mentioned resolution. The procedures devised by the group are a valuable contribution towards the attainment of the common objective which we have set for ourselves.

The present situation merely increases the need for the Conference on Disarmament to conclude as quickly as possible its negotiations on the elaboration of a convention to prohibit chemical weapons which would be the necessary supplement to the 1925 Protocol. Progress this year allows for a certain degree of optimism and we hope that existing differences may be overcome in order to attain a positive result.
The Government of Spain also attaches great importance to the other questions on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. Unfortunately, in the year which has elapsed since our last General Assembly session, no significant advances have been made in such areas as the prevention of nuclear war — including all related matters — the comprehensive programme of disarmament, and the prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction, including radiological weapons.

The delegation of Spain welcomed with satisfaction the publication of the study on conventional disarmament in document A/39/348. We have expressed our concern on repeated occasions in this Committee over the stockpiling of conventional weapons and our sincere interest in reducing the levels of such weapons — an interest which is understandable in a European country. It is, therefore, very important for us to see for the first time in the framework of the United Nations consideration being given to the nature, causes and effects of the conventional arms race.

Whereas, on the one hand, we have no doubts whatsoever about the priority to be given to measures aimed at reducing nuclear arsenals, on the other hand, and as that study also points out, we believe that there is a pressing need to adopt measures to halt and reverse the conventional arms race and to prevent conventional war. This need is evidenced by the great number of victims — more than 20 million — of the armed conflicts which have broken out since the end of the Second World War and by the high economic cost of such weapons, to which four fifths of the $800 billion allocated to military expenditures in 1983 were devoted.

Nevertheless, my delegation clearly sees the relationship between conventional disarmament and the cessation of the nuclear-arms race. Within a global balance guaranteeing greater security at lower cost and with less risk that a conflict begun with the use of conventional weapons could lead to a nuclear conflict, a balanced reduction of conventional weapons, including those of the nuclear Powers, seems to us to be a necessary complement to any other efforts which may be made.

As indicated in chapter IV, "Conclusions and recommendations", of the study I mentioned previously:

"Concrete measures of conventional arms limitation and disarmament would do much to reduce distrust and fear among nations and thus would have a
positive effect of their own on international relations; in turn, such a
development could improve prospects for measures of nuclear disarmament ..." 
(A/39/348, para. 186).

It is easy to make statements and to spell out desirable objectives in the
area of disarmament. We do not believe that anyone could doubt that avoiding the
danger of a nuclear war, halting the arms race and reducing the level of armaments
are desirable objectives, but their attainment requires preserving a balance,
together with the necessary guarantees to ensure compliance with the obligations
entered into. That second task is not as easy. It requires decisive technical and
political efforts; my Government is ready to make such an effort and hopes that it
will be a joint undertaking which will guarantee peace and security for future
generations.

**Mr. Kunda** (Zambia): Since my delegation is speaking in this Committee
for the first time during the current session of the General Assembly, permit me to
express my delegation's satisfaction on your unanimous election as Chairman of the
First Committee. I also extend similar sentiments to the other officers of the
Committee, who have been elected unanimously.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the most intractable issue on the world's
peace and security agenda today is that of disarmament. The arms race has reached
an unprecedented scale because of the qualitative and quantitative sophistication
of nuclear weapons in terms of their speed, accuracy and destructive power. The
proliferation of nuclear and conventional weapons, with the concomitant incentive
and urge to utilize them, seems to be the rule rather than the exception. We are
thus poised on the brink of a nuclear holocaust.

The unbridled arms race is only matched by a creeping paralysis in both arms
control and disarmament negotiations. For one year now, for example, the two
super-Powers have shelved negotiations on the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) and
the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) in Geneva. We attach great importance
to these negotiations because, although they are designed to control the arms race
between the two super-Powers, they also contribute to the creation of a sane
political climate and they are, in the final analysis, indispensable collateral
disarmament measures. It follows, therefore, that the United States-Soviet
relations need to be restored immediately to defuse the current horrendous tension, which could easily ignite a nuclear holocaust since both Powers are more than sufficiently armed already to destroy the world many times over.

The current stalemate characterized by an exchange of mutual recriminations as to which side was responsible for the discontinuation of the INF negotiations and for the holding in abeyance of the START negotiations is understandable but certainly not helpful in defusing the explosive situation in which we find ourselves. One super-Power has deployed some of its new Euromissiles whereupon the other super-Power has announced the immediate implementation of countermeasures. There is therefore no winner and no loser. We urge them to end their mutual accusations and counter accusations as to who is responsible for the current state of their troubled relations. It is now time, at least in the new year, to turn over a new leaf and go back to the negotiating table in Geneva.

In order to maximize the outcome of the INF and START negotiations, it is the feeling of my delegation that serious consideration should be given by the two super-Powers to the idea of merging the two negotiating processes - that is the INF and START negotiations - into one. We believe this merger would eliminate the need to return formally to the hitherto discontinued INF negotiations. Aside from that institutional suggestion, it is my delegation's considered view that these East-West negotiations should also cover tactical short-range nuclear weapons, which have hitherto been "grey area" nuclear weapons not covered in the INF or START negotiations prior to their suspension.

My delegation subscribes to the view that nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. It is essential to halt and reverse the arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons. The ultimate goal in this context must be the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.
The complete elimination of nuclear weapons will remain a forlorn dream as long as the nuclear-weapon States religiously continue to adhere to the highly questionable doctrine of deterrence. The runaway nuclear-arms race is, in fact, a function of the flawed doctrine of deterrence. It goes against the grain of arms control and disarmament, for if, indeed, it has prevented a nuclear conflagration, then it has done so at the cost of such an increase in the stakes that nuclear war, if it should come, would now virtually annihilate the human species and all other forms of life on earth. We must accept the fact that armed peace through deterrence is no guarantee against war and that the unrelenting nuclear-arms race that deterrence engenders is in itself a source of mutual fears and suspicions that paralyse the will to peace by mistakenly seeking peace and security in stockpiles upon stockpiles of nuclear forces and other weapons of mass destruction.

The idea of wittingly drifting towards the nuclear abyss through the maintenance of the frenetic arms race is revolting. The only prescription for this revolting phenomenon is general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Zambia's commitment to general and complete disarmament is total. Only general and complete disarmament can make war no longer an instrument of foreign policy for settling international disputes.

Nuclear disarmament is truly an international responsibility, but the greater responsibility for such disarmament rests with all the nuclear-weapon States, especially the two super-Powers, which possess a lion's share of those dreadful weapons. My delegation urges them to discharge their responsibilities to pave the way towards general and complete disarmament. For a start they must assign highest priority to the prevention of nuclear war. Prevention of nuclear war calls for a total prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and we believe that it is a matter of life and death for the entire human race that nuclear war be prevented at all cost. The arms race and the human race cannot coexist any longer. However, since general and complete disarmament is the ultimate goal, we believe that there are other indispensable intermediate steps that need to be taken if only to slow down, halt and then reverse the creeping arms race in addition to the prevention of nuclear war. A nuclear freeze is one such step. It would stop the arms race because it would embrace a complete cessation of the manufacture of such weapons and their delivery systems, as also a ban on all further deployment of nuclear weapons and a cessation of the production of fissionable material for
weapons purposes. It would also hold constant the existing rough nuclear parity between the two super-Powers and thus serve the cause of humanity in a tangible way through the conversion of nuclear industries into civilian industries. Besides, it would result in the creation of labour-intensive programmes, thus facilitating more employment opportunities for the general public, and it would save funds that are currently being squandered on sustaining the nuclear-arms race.

The current arms race can also be arrested by a comprehensive test ban. A comprehensive test ban promises to put an end to the introduction of new weapon designs into the armories of the nuclear States. It would also limit the qualitative improvements in weapons at present owned by the two super-Powers which are based on nuclear explosives. Additionally, it would restrain new systems designed around those that are already in existence, with the resultant end to the arms-escalating practice of designing new systems around existing warheads.

Nuclear disarmament deserves our highest priority, but it should not be done at the expense of conventional disarmament. On the contrary, conventional disarmament should be pursued in conjunction with nuclear disarmament in order to avoid the perpetuation of asymmetries in the security of States in favour of those States which possess nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction. My delegation attaches highest priority to conventional disarmament as well, for the simple reason that it evokes practical concern for the countries in the third world where conventional weapons are in everyday use.

Since 1945, for example, conventional weapons have accounted for more than 20 million deaths in 150 armed conflicts. This is not to mention the wanton destruction of property that has always attended these conflicts. Today, conventional weapons have come to represent a staggering 80 per cent of the world's annual military expenditures. Meanwhile current trends relative to conventional arms transfers and purchases do not give us any reason to believe that there will be a decrease in the incidence and severity of such engagements. It is therefore imperative that, just as efforts are expended towards the realization of nuclear disarmament, similar efforts should be exerted to find effective measures of conventional disarmament in order to assist in diverting the sinews of war towards the better goal of social and economic progress.
My delegation wishes to emphasize that conventional warfare has manifested itself not only in various regional hotbeds of conflict but also in a wide network of military bases in many parts of the world - which has led to the common feature of the emergence of client States in various regions providing bases and other support systems where large numbers of foreign military forces belonging to the great Powers are maintained. Within many third-world countries, the conventional-arms race is by and large being propelled and aggravated by the ever-ready supply of conventional weapons from the great Powers. The great Powers cannot therefore escape the charge that they promote local conflicts around the world and are running an unparalleled race in conventional weapons. It is only logical then that the obligation to reduce conventional forces and arms should rest with the militarily strong, especially the two super-Powers.

Chemical and biological weapons constitute yet another area of grave concern to Zambia. Since these weapons possess some characteristics of both conventional and nuclear weapons, they have the property of blurring the distinction between conventional and nuclear warfare, thereby increasing the danger of one sliding into the other. We thus call for an early conclusion of a chemical weapons convention in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Such a convention is imperative, as failure to have a chemical and biological convention would incrementally fuel the arms race all the more.
Outer space is incontestably a common heritage of mankind and must not be abused by the two super-Powers, which are hell-bent on turning it into yet another track for a new dimension of the arms race. Anti-satellite weapons add a qualitatively but perilously dangerous dimension to the arms race in that they serve to increase the risk of a nuclear war.

The development of an arms race in outer space contravenes the letter and spirit of the 1967 outer space Treaty, which lays down principles governing peaceful activities of States in the outer reaches of space. Article IV of that Treaty prohibits the placing in orbit around the earth of any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction. It also prohibits the installation of such weapons on celestial bodies or the stationing of them in outer space in any other manner. The establishment of military bases, installations and fortifications, the testing of any type of weapons and the conduct of military manoeuvres on celestial bodies are also forbidden.

It is also important that outer space be declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone so that even such things as the flight through outer space of ballistic missiles carrying nuclear weapons from one point to another on the earth's surface can be proscribed.

Zambia attaches great importance to the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons - sometimes known as negative security guarantees - as that touches upon the security of an overwhelming majority of States and peoples. Those guarantees must be incorporated into an international convention. The Conference on Disarmament should expedite such a convention without any further delays.

Zambia, like all African countries, is gravely disturbed by the growing nuclear threat posed by the racist minority régime in South Africa. South Africa's nuclear weapons industry mocks the General Assembly's calls for the implementation of the 1964 Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa of the Organization of African Unity. South Africa's intentions are clear. The racist minority régime wants to hold Africa hostage to its nuclear superiority and in doing so retard the process of the decolonization of Namibia and the democratization of South Africa itself. South Africa, in a nutshell, is aiming at forever subjugating the African continent to its repugnant racial policies and unprovoked wars of aggression in defence of the obnoxious system of apartheid, which is a crime against humanity that must be banished from the face of this planet.
Regrettably, certain Western countries have actively collaborated with the racist Pretoria régime in the creation of the apartheid nuclear bomb. Africa sees this collaboration as a perfidious act against all its people and all those in the international community who are genuinely opposed to apartheid. Those Western countries cannot, therefore, escape the charge that they are accomplices in the development of South Africa's diabolic nuclear weapons industry and indeed in the perpetuation of the anchonistic system of apartheid.

African States have demonstrated their peaceful intentions through their commitment to the denuclearization of the continent. It is in the interest of South Africa and its collaborators to co-operate fully in the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

Furthermore, my delegation ascribes high priority to the creation of zones of peace and security in the world because, when such zones are formed, they could constitute the substance of unfettered world peace and security. It is for this reason that my country has constantly supported the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace. At present, the ever-increasing militarization of the Indian Ocean, especially by the presence therein of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, runs counter to the objective of proclaiming the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. To this end, my delegation supports without qualification the convening of an international Conference in Colombo on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Zambia calls upon all those States that have thus far placed pre-conditions on the convening of the Colombo Conference to abandon their negative attitude so that the Conference, which has been postponed several times in the past, can take place in 1985.

Mr. TINCA (Romania) (interpretation from French): In our preceding statement we submitted the views of the Romanian delegation on the whole range of disarmament problems, emphasizing at that time the central role which we attach to the cessation of the arms race and disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, as a part of the efforts of the international community to improve the current international atmosphere and to consolidate world peace and security.

Today, in keeping with our agenda, I should like to dwell more specifically on a particular item which has been of constant concern to the Romanian Government. I am talking about the reduction of military budgets, an item which has been on our agenda for some years now.
The debates which have taken place in many plenary meetings of the General Assembly and in our Committee have conveyed the deep disquiet which is felt at the enormous proportions now reached by military expenditures. Never before have so many resources been squandered in order to develop and stockpile new weapons and weapons systems of ever-increasing destructive power. This phenomenon reflects and, at the same time, aggravates international tension, fans the embers of conflicts in various parts of the world, impedes efforts to improve the political climate, intensifies the feeling of insecurity and increases the danger of a nuclear war.

That is all the more tragic in that mankind has never so urgently needed such vast resources for its economic and social development and for resolving the serious problems facing the international community, and particularly the developing countries, as a result of the economic, energy and financial crises caused by the widening gulf between the rich and the poor countries. In the past, economic development was never so closely linked to the achievement of true progress in the field of disarmament.

The prospect of a continuing rise in military spending for the future is even more disturbing. If one looks at the curve of military spending in the last few years, in particular, and at the foreseeable trends of those expenditures for the future, we shall see that by the year 2000, another $15,000 billion will have been spent on armaments, trade in armaments will amount to $100 billion annually and the destructive power of those weapons will be twice as great as it is at present.
(Mr. Tinca, Romania)

The forces controlling the arms race, the interests it promotes and the various forms in which it manifests itself have turned it into a political phenomenon affecting global options in economic and social affairs. This conclusion applies not only in the case of the developing countries; indeed its impact is felt all the more acutely and increasingly by the highly industrialized countries. The constant increase in arms spending and the military competition it feverishly engenders have a suffocating effect on the economic life of those countries also and poses an increasingly difficult obstacle to improving the world economic situation. The excessive pace of the growth of military spending maintains and accentuates budgetary deficits, reduces the funds available for productive investments and has the effect of keeping unemployment at a very high level, casting a pall of uncertainty over the prospects for genuine recovery.

Far from inspiring sentiments of resignation, this grave phenomenon merely emphasizes the high priority and urgency of measures to halt the arms race and bring about the freezing and reduction of military budgets.

In this spirit, Romania, together with other States, has constantly advocated the reduction of military spending in percentage and absolute terms. My country has several times proposed a 10 to 15 per cent reduction in world military spending and, having itself reduced its own military spending in three consecutive years, Romania decided to freeze that spending at the 1982 level until 1985.

At the same time it is an advocate of dialogue and negotiations between the members of the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to halt the arms race, build trust among nations and bring about disarmament, and therefore Romania attaches special importance to the starting of negotiations between the States of the two blocs in order to freeze and reduce military budgets, as provided for in the proposals the Warsaw Treaty countries have presented to the members of NATO.

Of course, disarmament cannot be achieved by a single country, still less by small and medium-sized countries and developing countries. Solution of the problems of disarmament, including the freezing and reduction of military budgets, requires the political will of States, primarily the nuclear Powers and the most heavily armed countries, to sit down at the negotiating table and take upon themselves concrete obligations pursuant to agreements negotiated and implemented in good faith. It is our firm conviction that all States, big or small, whatever their military significance, can and must make their contribution to encouraging that political will.
It is in this spirit that Romania and Sweden have proposed to the Disarmament Commission that it identify and elaborate principles to govern the actions of States with regard to the freezing and reduction of military budgets. This initiative is designed to facilitate real negotiations in order to arrive at international agreements on the freezing and reduction of military budgets, because the identification and elaboration of those principles can make a distinct contribution to harmonizing the points of view of States and establishing trust among them.

At its session this year the Disarmament Commission reached an advanced phase in the elaboration of those principles, which are contained in a working paper annexed to the Commission's report (A/39/42). We welcome the fact that that document clearly sets forth a fundamental idea that seems to have the support of all States, namely that the objective of the work of the United Nations in this field is the adoption of measures for the freezing and reduction of military spending under appropriate international control as agreed upon in international agreements.

In this regard, it would be extremely helpful if all States, primarily the most heavily armed States, were required to show moderation in drawing up their military budgets. This idea is contained in a principle whose political significance has been reconfirmed by numerous General Assembly resolutions. We cannot overemphasize the wide-ranging positive effects such moderation would have in the improvement of the international political atmosphere, and it would be seen as concrete evidence of the desire of States to move on towards real negotiations on the cessation of the arms race and on disarmament.

Two other ideas whose value is in our opinion beyond dispute also deserve to be regarded as fundamental principles. The first is that the realization of measures to freeze and reduce military budgets should in no sense adversely affect the right of States to equal security and the balance of forces at the regional and world-wide level. The second is that this balance should be sought and established at ever-lower levels of military spending and accordingly at lower levels of armed forces and armaments.

The need for the most heavily armed States to be the first to commit themselves to the process of limiting and reducing their military budgets is also expressed in one of the most important principles. Those States are of course at the top of the spiral of military budgets. Their place in the whole range of
military spending in the world and their policies determine the pace and
development of military spending world-wide. We feel that the adoption by those
States of measures for the reduction and freezing of military budgets would have a
particularly great impact in helping to halt the arms race and build trust among
States.

Like many others, my country attaches great importance to the fact that the
working paper clearly and precisely reaffirms the relationship between the
reduction of military spending and development efforts at the national and
international levels. The funds released by the reduction of military spending
should be allocated to support the efforts of the developing countries in the field
of economic and social development.

In this regard, we support the proposal of France concerning the relationship
between disarmament and development, which is aimed at eventually reaching
agreement on concrete modalities for such a transfer of resources to be used in
economic and social development.

In our opinion, two ideas are essential to maintain the basic thrust of this
proposal. First, the source of the money to be paid into a development fund should
above all be measures of real reduction of military spending on armaments.
Secondly, the assistance to be granted to developing countries from this fund
should facilitate the elaboration of projects for the solution of difficulties
confronting those countries in the economic and social fields.
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The fund should not be merely symbolic; it should take away from destructive purposes a large part of the resources squandered, in a manner commensurate with the present vast expenditures on armaments which are constantly rising, particularly in the most heavily armed countries, and devoted those resources to the peaceful purposes of development.

Like all disarmament agreements, those dealing with the freeze and reduction of military budgets should provide for a verification system ensuring strict compliance with commitments entered into. That is why we feel one of the principles governing the activities of States in the reduction of military budgets should be to guarantee that those agreements will be monitored by appropriate measures. The provisions of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament providing for verification measures to be appropriate and deemed satisfactory by all the parties concerned must be applied also to agreements on the reduction of military expenditures. It seems self-evident to us that aspects relating to verification and comparability should constitute integral parts of any negotiated convention. The content of an international agreement and the arrangements for verification of its implementation constitute an integral whole which must be the subject of negotiations held in good faith and with a determination to reach genuine measures for the reduction of military expenditures.

All technical aspects having to do with verification, comparability and exchange of data - which should be carefully studied - cannot be regarded from an exclusive point of view, let alone as a prior condition for any practical step in this field. We wish to emphasize again that the Romanian delegation favours a constructive and flexible approach capable of identifying potential areas of agreement between States in the field of the reduction of military budgets.

The report of the Disarmament Commission, which is now before the First Committee, contains a recommendation, adopted by consensus, to invite the General Assembly to request the Disarmament Commission at its next substantive session to complete its work on the identification and elaboration of principles governing the actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military expenditures.

We believe that the General Assembly should confirm that recommendation and entrust to the Disarmament Commission the task of continuing, at its 1985 session, consideration of the working paper annexed to the Commission's report, as well as other proposals and ideas in order to complete identifying and elaborating
principles governing the further actions of States in the field of freezing and reduction of military expenditures, keeping in mind the possibility of embodying such principles in a suitable document at an appropriate stage.

We believe the Commission, with the co-operation of all countries, is capable of resolving in a generally acceptable manner the few problems that still remain pending and thus completing its work on this matter.

Without wishing to underestimate the difficulties attributable to current international conditions, we are confident that the elaboration and adoption of those principles are possible and that their affirmation in a United Nations document would be a substantial contribution by the Disarmament Commission to the cessation of the arms race and to disarmament.

In this regard I wish to refer to the appeal contained in resolution 38/184 - which was adopted by the General Assembly without a vote - to all States, in particular to the most heavily armed States, to reinforce their readiness to co-operate in a constructive manner with a view to reaching agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain military expenditures.

Any efforts by the United Nations through the Disarmament Commission and other organs established by the General Assembly must be mutually complementary and in harmony with our common effort to achieve the final goal - the conclusion of international agreements for the reduction of military expenditures.

In conclusion, I express the hope that an awareness of our responsibility and of our obligations to the international community will prevail over any differences of views in this area. With that in mind, we look forward to holding consultations on a draft resolution enjoying broad support which will keep the way open to promoting actions by States for the limitation and reduction of military budgets.

Mr. THACH SIRAY (Democratic Kampuchea): It is a real and great pleasure for the delegation of Democratic Kampuchea and for me personally to express our warmest congratulations to you, Sir, on your unanimous election to the post of Chairman of the First Committee. Your brilliant election is a well-deserved tribute to your personal qualities. It is also an honour to your country, Brazil, and its people, which have made great contributions to the cause of global peace and security.

I wish also to congratulate the other officers of the Committee and to welcome Mr. Kheradi as the Secretary of the Committee.
May I also congratulate the outgoing Chairman, Mr. Tom Vraalsen, the Permanent Representative of Norway to the United Nations, for his important contribution in guiding the Committee's work during the last session.

Year after year, session after session, the First Committee of the General Assembly has been, as we all well know, a forum for debates and reflection on the field of arms control, disarmament and global security.

One more year has passed in a climate of international tension and suspicion. The debates and negotiations in the field of disarmament were singularly void of tangible results. In many parts of the world flagrant violations of the principle of the non-use of force enshrined in the United Nations Charter continued unabated. That, in turn, has heightened the sense of insecurity for each and every country in the world.

During the general debate in plenary meetings of the General Assembly, as well as during the debates of the past two weeks in the First Committee, concerns have been voiced about the trend in the state of international affairs. In this connection, my delegation shares the Chairman's concern expressed in his introductory remarks at the start of our work.

With that climate as background, we are now starting to deliberate on how to restore confidence among States and ease the tension, thus leading to a halt of the arms build-up and to disarmament. We are unanimous in saying that we can do so only by strict adherence to the principles contained in the United Nations Charter, especially those of refraining from the use or the threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State; non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States; and peaceful settlement of disputes.

My delegation is gratified to see that the international community has given ever more importance to the regional approach to disarmament, be that in Europe, Africa, Central America, South Asia or South-East Asia.
In South-East Asia, where my country is situated, the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) has proposed the setting up of a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality (ZOPFAN), but the invasion and occupation of Kampuchea by Viet Nam has made this impossible to realize. My country supports the ZOPFAN concept and will spare no effort to bring about its realization. In this context, we see our present struggle against the Vietnamese invasion and occupation as a contribution to making the ZOPFAN concept a reality.

We also support the concept of nuclear-free zones and we shall continue to vote in favour of resolutions calling for the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world. We should like also to see our region, South-East Asia, become one such zone. In this connection, we welcome the endorsement by ASEAN at its last ministerial meeting of the concept of a nuclear-free zone in South-East Asia and the setting up of a working group to study the problem.

My delegation shares the views expressed in our Committee and in other forums on the relationship between disarmament and development. We hold the view that the report of the well-qualified group of experts presented at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly remains valid and of significant importance. We are all aware of the fact that expenditures on armaments have increased each year and have now reached an alarming figure. We are also of the view that these growing military expenditures constitute a heavy burden for the economies of all nations and have extremely harmful consequences for international peace and security. It cannot be denied that the world economy would benefit from the reduction of military budgets.

Another item which commands our close attention every year is that on chemical weapons. We have learnt that progress was made at the last session of the Conference on Disarmament with regard to chemical weapons. We urge the Conference to expedite its work for the earliest possible conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and their destruction.

We have two reasons for making our appeal. The first is because for the past six years the people of Kampuchea have been experiencing untold suffering caused by chemical and biological weapons used by the Vietnamese troops of aggression in Kampuchea. All the information at the disposal of my Government has been sent to
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the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has been circulated in official
documents of the General Assembly. Since they have themselves experienced the
inhuman effects of these weapons, the people of Kampuchea do not wish other peoples
of the world to suffer the same atrocities. The second reason is that we hope the
use of chemical weapons in Kampuchea, Laos, Afghanistan and elsewhere may serve as
a reminder to all of us to spare no effort in speeding up the conclusion of a
convention which would control and eliminate chemical weapons. We earnestly hope
that the new convention would have a mechanism for enforcing its provisions,
otherwise the international community would be powerless vis-a-vis the future use
of chemical weapons, or would be a simple spectator, or would merely be able to
make public condemnation of such use, as it did in the case of the violation of the

May I now turn to the situation in my country, Democratic Kampuchea, where for
six years already a barbarous war of aggression and genocide has been raging, a war
which has disrupted peace, security and stability in the region, caused increasing
tension and mistrust and led to growing military expenditures.

Since December 1978, as a result of the Vietnamese aggression against
Kampuchea many hundreds of thousands of Kampucheans have died, either by massacres
perpetrated by the enemy or by the famine deliberately created, or by chemical and
biological weapons used by the Vietnamese invading forces. This policy of genocide
carried out by Viet Nam in Kampuchea goes hand in hand with its policy of
"Vietnamization" of Kampuchea, namely, the sending of more than 600,000 Vietnamese
settlers and the suppression of the national identity of Kampuchea. This war has
put Kampuchea to fire and the sword.

If the war in Kampuchea has first and foremost brought sorrow, mourning and
suffering to the people of Kampuchea, it has also caused suffering to the
Vietnamese people. Each year several thousand young Vietnamese who had enlisted in
the occupying army have died and several thousand others have been wounded or
disabled in this war.

Another point that needs to be stressed is that to pursue its war of
aggression in Kampuchea Viet Nam has mobilized human and natural resources in order
to maintain its war machine. Thus the economy of Viet Nam is a shambles and the
people have dramatically suffered -
The CHAIRMAN: Will the representative of Democratic Kampuchea please confine his remarks to the subject on the agenda.

Mr. THACH SIRAY (Democratic Kampuchea): According to Paul Kelemen in Asian Survey, vol. XXIV, No. 3, of March 1984:

"To maintain the occupation of Kampuchea, the Vietnamese army depends on the Soviet Union for the supply of weapons -

The CHAIRMAN: Will the representative of Democratic Kampuchea please confine his remarks to the item on our agenda.

Mr. THACH SIRAY (Democratic Kampuchea): It is obvious that Viet Nam cannot maintain its impressive war machine without the enormous Soviet assistance, which is estimated at more -

The CHAIRMAN: I shall not allow the representative of Democratic Kampuchea to continue if he does not abide by the rule that statements must be made to the item on the agenda. This is the last opportunity I shall give him.

Mr. THACH SIRAY (Democratic Kampuchea): The Kampuchean problem can be resolved only through the implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions which call for the withdrawal of all Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea and the exercise by the Kampuchean people of their inalienable right to self-determination, free from outside interference. This year a draft resolution (A/39/L.3) initiated by the six ASEAN countries has been co-sponsored by a total of 54 Member States. We are convinced that the General Assembly will adopt that draft resolution by an overwhelming majority. The adoption of the draft resolution would constitute further encouragement for the people of Kampuchea to continue their just struggle for the complete independence of their country and also constitute a clear indication to Viet Nam that the international community has not lost sight of the Kampuchean problem and has reiterated its call for the total withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea so that the Kampuchean people can exercise their sacred right to self-determination.

Those who support United Nations resolutions on the situation in Kampuchea contribute to preventing the law of the jungle from prevailing in South-East Asia and elsewhere and show that they remain always faithful to the letter and the spirit of the United Nations Charter. As to the people of Kampuchea and the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea, for six years now they have
successfully carried on a struggle for national survival in all fields, and inflicted successive defeats on the enemy, which is now irremediably bogged down in the military field whatever reinforcements it may send to Kampuchea. Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, the President of Democratic Kampuchea, said in a speech yesterday:

"...the Vietnamese aggressors and colonialists will prevail against the armed forces of the tripartite Coalition of Democratic Kampuchea ... Even though numerically fewer than the Vietnamese occupation troops at present, our armed forces of national liberation, by avoiding the waging of conventional warfare against the enemy and instead engaging, with the support of the people, in guerrilla warfare, will be able to create insurmountable difficulties for the occupiers. With the support of the international community, our forces will eventually compel the enemy to respect the just resolutions of the United Nations." (A/39/PV.40, pp. 22 and 23-25)
We are making preparations to commemorate next year the fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations, an Organization which has as its lofty ideal to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". The people of Kampuchea - and they are not alone - could not have been spared the war. For nearly six years they have had to face untold sufferings and to overcome all kinds of difficulties to continue their just struggle against the Vietnamese invasion and occupation in order to regain their national independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. By so doing, they are conscious of their contribution to the cause of peace, stability and security in the region of South-East Asia and in the world at large, and of their contribution to regional and global disarmament.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.