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GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ROCHE (Canada): I should like to repeat the felicitations I offered you, Sir, on behalf of my delegation when you assumed the chair of this important Committee and to extend Canada's greetings and support to you and the other officers of the Committee, as well as convey our compliments to the Secretariat for the continued excellent job it does in servicing the wide-ranging needs of this Committee.

One year ago when this Committee last met a sense of frustration predominated. Nuclear-weapon negotiations were at a standstill, while the engine of nuclear weapons development roared ahead. The work of disarmament, given such a ringing endorsement in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, seemed to be going nowhere. The Secretary-General even took the extraordinary step of voicing his alarm at the global chess game that characterized the activity of disarmament forums.

Today the situation has changed. The United States and the Soviet Union are preparing for next month's summit meeting. The United States-Soviet bilateral negotiations are in their third round, with specific proposals on the table. The international community has witnessed the highly successful conclusion of the Third Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

As a further reflection of the acceleration of world momentum to disarmament, the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize has been awarded to the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, for the joint work of American and Soviet doctors in helping the world to understand the medical consequences of nuclear war.
These events are of the highest importance, filling a landscape that has been gloomy for too long with new light. Of course, it would be misleading to raise false expectations of quick success. Very substantial problems remain and difficult negotiations are in store. None the less, what we are witnessing is the opportunity for a new beginning in the long, sensitive process of ensuring global security at lower levels of arms, nuclear and conventional.

Canada warmly welcomes this improved atmosphere. We have, with others, helped to build a more promising political climate and we will go on doing so. Canada believes that technical or political obstacles must not be allowed to obstruct the progress now possible in this work of paramount global importance. The time is certainly long overdue for us - East and West, North and South - to work together for the common security of the human family. Let us resolve that our work this fall in the First Committee will enhance the prospect for progress.

The NPT Review Conference provides an example of global responsibility in action. The consensus Final Declaration of the Conference demonstrated in an impressive manner the significant gains that can be achieved in multilateral diplomacy when co-operation replaces confrontation as the basic negotiating stance. The consensus Declaration reaffirmed the vitality and viability of the NPT as an essential international security instrument underpinning the global non-proliferation régime. The Review Conference strengthened the 130-nation Treaty and the multilateral process as well. The super-Powers have contributed significantly to this process. Even greater progress in arms control and disarmament is possible if this same bilateral co-operation is maintained.

Of course, the world cannot simply stand by and watch the super-Powers negotiate. Since everyone is affected by the implications of nuclear war, everyone must participate in building the conditions for peace. In the nuclear age, we share
a common ground on the planet, and each nation, large and small, has a role to play in collective security.

Canada, which has a seat at every multilateral disarmament forum, is determined to strengthen the multilateral process in building an enduring peace. We bring to these forums a Canadian policy on arms control and disarmament, which focuses on the following six areas: first, negotiated radical reductions in nuclear forces and the enhancement of strategic stability; secondly, maintenance and strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation regime; thirdly, support for a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a fundamental and abiding objective of Canadian foreign policy; fourthly, negotiation of a global chemical-weapon ban; fifthly, prevention of an arms race in outer space; and, sixthly, confidence-building measures to facilitate the reduction of military forces in Europe and elsewhere.

To support this policy, the Canadian Government has developed a Programme of Action for the remaining half of the Second Disarmament Decade. Concentrating on practical measures, the programme aims at laying the ground work for the creation of confidence and trust vital to achieving disarmament agreements.

With an annual budget of $1 million, the Department of External Affairs, Verification Research Division, is concentrating on several key issues relating to a comprehensive test ban, a global chemical weapons convention, and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

We have noted that both the Final Declaration of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the Declaration of the Second Disarmament Decade have recognized that arms control and disarmament agreements must provide for adequate measures of verification. Some allege that verification is a smokescreen to prevent agreement, but that is not Canada's view. We believe that verification is indispensable, because meaningful arms control agreements that will endure cannot be negotiated on the basis of trust alone.
To advance work on the verification of a comprehensive test ban, Canada will expand seismic research by upgrading our large seismic facility in Yellowknife, in northern Canada. We are also continuing work designed to differentiate between small earthquakes and underground nuclear tests. We have participated substantially in the International Seismic Data Exchange.

In addition to the support negotiations on a global chemical weapons ban, Canada has lent its expertise to investigating allegations of chemical weapons use and will shortly present to the United Nations a manual of procedures for use in such investigations. Canada has also undertaken specialized research on a potable kit for the detection, identification and quantification of certain mycotoxins. During its past session, the Conference on Disarmament's progress towards concluding a chemical weapons convention was minimal. Hence call upon all members to redouble their efforts in the urgent conclusion of a global chemical weapons ban.

On the outer space question, Canada welcomed the establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group to discuss this complex issue in greater detail. In support of the Conference on Disarmament's deliberations, Canada has submitted a comprehensive study of existing international law relating to arms control and outer space. This survey identifies a number of important themes for examination if an international treaty preventing an arms race in space is to be successfully written. It also serves as an excellent example of the evolution and contemporary relevance of international law to the disarmament process. Canada is also working on the application of space-to-space remote sensing for arms control and disarmament purposes. Follow-up work on the application of space-to-ground sensing is also planned.

While much of the world's attention is focused on nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, there is a fourth class of weapon of mass destruction, that is, radiological weapons. Although these weapons were identified by the United Nations
almost 40 years ago, there is as yet no international agreement of any kind regarding radiological weapons. Since these weapons do not yet exist, the international community has a rare opportunity to prohibit a potentially devastating weapons system - in fact, to prevent even its conception - and to do so while the political obstacles to such a ban are at a minimum. There is then an urgent need to conclude a radiological weapons convention.

Since 1979 the United States and the Soviet Union have been agreed on the basic text of a treaty to ban radiological weapons. Despite the fact that there has been little or no objection to the substance of the draft treaty, agreement has eluded the Conference on Disarmament, which has tried to meet the concerns of some nations to provide in the same treaty provision for adequate protection of peaceful nuclear facilities. We believe that agreement on a radiological weapons ban should not await the resolution of this particular problem.

Therefore, in his statement to the General Assembly on 25 September the Right Honourable Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs, called on the United States and the Soviet Union to conclude a verifiable treaty banning radiological weapons. He also indicated Canada's immediate readiness to sign such a treaty.

Canada's programme of action, then, is comprised of specific and practical contributions designed to make the arms control process viable and the goal of disarmament realizable.

We know that annual military expenditure is nearly now reaching nearly one trillion dollars. Neither declarations nor lamentations will end this flagrant abuse of the world's scarce resources. Weapons are a symptom, not a cause, of political mistrust. Construction of a climate of trust and political understanding is therefore a prerequisite for disarmament.

The world will have a much needed opportunity further to develop and refine its understanding of these two fundamental concerns of the global community -
disarmament and development - in their relationship to one another, at the forthcoming International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which is expected to be held in Paris next summer. The saddening facts of the arms race and its devastating impact on the lives of millions should stimulate a new awareness about the real meaning of the arms race today. Canada will play a role at that Conference because we believe essentially that the diversion of so much money, resources and talent to armaments is unacceptable in a world where there is so much famine and deprivation caused by endemic poverty.

Thus, Canada recognizes that there are many components in building the global conditions for peace. That is why we also give priority to promoting international understanding through enhanced contacts and communication. It is the development of human relationships at every level - from tourists to diplomats - which will solidify and cultivate the bonds of empathy that universally join us as members of the human family.

Canada recognizes the vital work being done by the United Nations in increasing global awareness on the range of issues relating to disarmament, the arms race and war. It is in this context that we expect to indicate our support again for the objectives of the World Disarmament Campaign, noting that Canada has made two previous contributions of $100,000 each to the Campaign.

Recognizing that the work of the United Nations must be both supported and followed up by national Governments, Canada has established its own fund and forums for furthering the Canadian public's awareness of arms control and disarmament issues. The Department of External Affairs maintains a Disarmament Fund which helps a wide range of Canadian groups, non-governmental organizations and academic institutions discuss, research and disseminate information on disarmament questions in a thoughtful and balanced manner. We are pleased to note that this Fund has
assisted Physicians for Social Responsibility, whose international body is the new Nobel Peace laureate.

The Canadian Government has also established the Consultative Group on Disarmament and Arms Control Affairs, a non-governmental forum composed of 60 individuals who examine in detail specific arms control issues, particularly as they relate to Canada. The new Government-funded Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, which conducts research and information programmes, is yet another Canadian instrument promoting peace and security.

Finally, if in this fortieth anniversary year of the United Nations we are not inspired to greater efforts to build a peace with security and freedom and development, when will we be? The machinery is at hand in the 32 United Nations specialized agencies and world programmes.
Robert Muller, that devoted servant of the United Nations for most of this period who has organized the events marking the fortieth anniversary, has challenged us in his new book, *What War Taught Me About Peace*, not to leave a single stone unturned in promoting world understanding and co-operation. He has written:

"I just do not believe that billions of years of evolution have as their sole purpose a blowing up of this planet and a nuclear holocaust of the human species. It just cannot be."

Here then is the blend of inspiration based on experience, of optimism based on reality, of vision based on faith - all of which serves as a guide to a future of peace. We must all contribute to that future.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has already had an opportunity to speak in the First Committee on the problem of preventing the militarization of outer space and reserving it for peaceful activities, which is of key importance for preventing nuclear war and curbing the arms race. Today we would like to share some thoughts on a number of other issues relating to the elimination of the nuclear threat, curbing the arms race, and disarmament, which require prompt solution.

More than enough problems of this kind have accumulated in the world, particularly in recent years; none of them is simple. However, it does not at all follow from this that disarmament is merely an illusory scheme or nothing more than an idealistic fantasy.

Today, on the eve of the fortieth anniversary of the the United Nations, as we confront the question of how to build a better and more secure world and how to create a healthier international environment, we cannot but see that the main road to this lies through stopping the buildup of, and reducing, nuclear as well as other weapons.
It would be absurd to try to build the edifice of a more secure world while placing in its foundation more and more explosive material capable of destroying the building itself many times over.

The questions of arms limitation and disarmament, as demonstrated by the existing system of agreements, including those relating to the kinds of weapons that form the backbone of the military power of States, fully lend themselves to solution, if one is guided by the concerns common to all mankind, rather than by narrowly self-serving calculations, if the interests of one another are taken into account, and if the unilateral, bilateral and multilateral efforts of States in this area are joined in a common endeavour.

Today, more than ever before, there is a need for understanding the realities of the nuclear and space age and rising above ideological and political differences. It is necessary to act with an awareness of the responsibility for ensuring a safe and secure voyage of our spaceship Earth in its galaxy. Such planetary thinking, which implies new approaches and the abandonment of psychological stereotypes and outdated concepts, including those in the military and political area, is steadily gaining ground. It is evolving and gathering momentum in the United Nations and outside our Organization, in the mass movements for peace and disarmament. An increasing number of scholars and realistically-minded politicians are thinking in terms of this approach. It has also been reflected in modern art. This was convincingly demonstrated to us quite recently in Mexico City where we saw the March of Humanity Polyforum, a work of the outstanding artist Siqueiros. This talented painter forcefully argues that civilization, with its common past sufferings, is united in the creative efforts of today and in the progress towards tomorrow and that mankind's grandiose forward march must not be stopped by the forces of folly, the forces of war and militarism.
The great Einstein was in effect warning of the same danger when he said that "modern weapons required a new way of thinking if mankind were to survive and develop in the ascendant". He also said that while bullets killed people, the atomic bombs could destroy entire cities; while a tank could resist a hail of bullets, natural science knew of no protection against weapons capable of destroying the whole civilization. I think that those warnings not only have retained their relevance but have become even more relevant.

One can draw little comfort from what is happening in the world today. International tensions are on the rise. The threat of a nuclear-missile holocaust is not receding. According to the estimates recently made by the organization "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" - which has just been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize - more than 2 billion people would become victims of such a war if it were to break out. The direct consequences of nuclear explosions would be aggravated by long-term effects, including the advent of the so-called nuclear winter.

Nevertheless, the race in both nuclear and other weapons is continuing. Moreover, a qualitatively new element has been added to it in the last year or two. I refer to the attempt now being made to extend the arms race into outer space, as if there were not enough weapons on Earth.

The architects of the "star wars" programme assert that they are developing space strike-weapons for defence, while in reality they are preparing to acquire a potential for launching a first nuclear strike with impunity. They are speaking of some kind of "security shield", while at the same time forging a space sword. If the United States steps with weapons into outer space, such constraints as the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM), strategic arms limitation agreements and others will fall by the wayside. Allegations that the ABM Treaty, rather than
banning, encourages the development of large-scale defence systems, are attempts to prove the unprovable. This is not a pessimistic position but a sober assessment of the situation.
"Star wars" is incompatible with the curbing of the arms race, as is convincingly demonstrated by the fact that the United States is developing six new types of strategic arms at an accelerated rate. It intends to have new intercontinental ballistic missiles of the MX type by 1986, Midgetman missiles by the early 1990s, and the new sea-based Trident-2 strategic missiles by 1989. It is developing two new types of heavy bombers and planning to deploy over 12,000 long-range cruise missiles of all basing modes. All these weapons are being given a first strike capability. At the same time, new first-strike nuclear missiles are being deployed in Europe which sharply reduce the distance for a surprise attack.

Nuclear war in these conditions could result from a deliberate decision and from attempts at blackmail on the part of those who seek military superiority. It could break out as a consequence of miscalculation by one side as to the intentions or actions of the other, or of someone's reckless action prompted by a sudden aggravation of the situation. It could also be caused by malfunctions of computers, which are being increasingly relied upon in the operation of modern sophisticated weapons systems.

The increasing risk of nuclear conflict and the danger that the arms race might assume new, mortally dangerous dimensions leave no room or time for political indifference or procrastination, which may have fatal consequences.

There can be no winners in a nuclear war, as all responsible politicians would now seem to agree. In our view, the time has come to draw a practical conclusion from this and prevent an arms race in space, thus giving the green light to radical mutual reductions of nuclear arms until they are completely eliminated, and stopping the buildup and qualitative upgrading of arms in all other areas.
The Soviet Union has invariably preferred political agreements which constrain military preparations to military-technological solutions leading to the emergence of new types of arms. Not a single round in the arms race spiral has been initiated by the Soviet Union.

General and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control has always been and remains our ultimate objective. We note with gratification that this idea, put forward by the Soviet Union as long ago as in the late 1920s, has now gained universal recognition and, as can be seen from the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, has become an integral part of the programme of action in the field of disarmament.

In the present extremely complicated international situation, the Soviet Union is not only calling for its improvement and for the reduction and complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction and conventional arms and putting forward specific proposals to this effect, but is also taking practical steps in this direction. We have unilaterally renounced the first use of nuclear weapons and introduced a moratorium on any nuclear explosions. We have suspended the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and have recently gone even further: we have declared to the whole world that we will not be the first to step into outer space with weapons.

The major unilateral steps taken by the Soviet Union during the course of this year represent our positive reply to resolution 39/148 A, adopted by the General Assembly last year, which contains an appeal to this effect addressed to the Member States of the United Nations.
At the same time, it is obvious that, if progress is to be made along the path of limiting and stopping the arms race, unilateral efforts are not enough. Responsible decisions and responsible actions of other countries, too, are needed for this purpose.

The Soviet Union approached the new negotiations with the United States on nuclear and space arms guided by a feeling of great responsibility to its own people and to other peoples for peace on earth. We are pleased that the United States accepted our proposal to hold these negotiations. Our firm desire is to conduct them honestly and seriously, and we will strive to agree on significant and genuine results in the form of very substantial reductions of strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons. But these goals can be achieved only if the other side, too, strictly adheres to the understanding reached last January on the objectives and subject of the negotiations, namely, that the issues of ending the arms race on earth and of preventing it in space should be resolved as interrelated problems.

The key to success in the negotiations as a whole should be an agreement on banning the development, testing and deployment of space strike systems. Whatever the two sides might have at the moment in this class of weapons, namely, their anti-satellite systems, would be subject to destruction. Regrettably, the United States has so far been unwilling to consent to such an agreement.

In order to give an impetus to the negotiations, the Soviet Union has recently put forward a number of major proposals which were announced during the visit to Paris of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail S. Gorbachev.
First, we proposed to the Government of the United States that the two sides should agree to ban space strike weapons completely and to effect a truly radical, 50 per cent reduction in their nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory.

Secondly, in order to facilitate an accord on an early mutual reduction of medium-range nuclear systems in Europe, we proposed that an agreement to this effect should be concluded separately, with no direct link to the problem of space and strategic arms.

At the same time the USSR proposed that direct discussions on this subject should be initiated with France and the United Kingdom and that an acceptable solution should be found through joint efforts.
Thirdly, in addition to the Soviet Union's moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, the number of SS-20 missiles we have on operational duty in the European zone has been reduced to 243. This means that it now corresponds precisely to the level that existed in June 1984 when supplementary deployment of our missiles was started in response to the stationing in Europe of United States medium-range missiles. The SS-20 missiles additionally deployed since then have now been taken off operational duty and the fixed structures for those missiles will be dismantled in the next two months. This can be verified.

It should be added that the old and very powerful SS-5 missiles have been totally removed from our inventory and that the removal of the SS-4 missiles continues. This means that the overall number of medium-range delivery missiles in the Soviet Union's European zone is now substantially less than 10 or even 15 years ago. All those who are interested in reducing the level of military confrontation have a right to expect the United States to respond by stopping further deployment of its medium-range missiles in the European continent.

As for Asia, the Soviet Union has as many missiles there as is necessary to counterbalance the existing United States potential in the region, neither more nor less. If the United States refrains from building up its potential, we shall do likewise. If the situation should change for the better, we shall respond in an adequate manner.

Combined with our previous actions, our latest proposals form a set of constructive measures whose realization would genuinely change the course of international relations, and result in the cessation of the arms race on earth and its prevention in outer space.

It is now up to the other side to cover its part of the road and to show by its deeds a readiness to reach an agreement.
But should this mean, as some people think, that one should wait on the sidelines for the Soviet Union and the United States to reach agreement on nuclear and space weapons?

This is not our view. The present level of military danger calls for implementation of a number of urgent measures capable of reducing the threat of nuclear war, building confidence and slowing down the dangerous trends in the development of the situation.

Above all, it is necessary to stop nuclear-weapon tests, which serve as a kind of catalyst for the nuclear-arms race. In view of the particular urgency of this question, the Soviet delegation intends to discuss it in detail in one of our forthcoming statements. Today I would like to stress only that the moratorium on any nuclear explosions introduced by the USSR last August offers a good and timely opportunity to break the deadlock on this problem. Once again, from this room, we call upon the other nuclear Powers, and primarily upon the United States, to consider our initiative in a most serious manner, to make use of this opportunity and do everything possible to work out a treaty banning all nuclear-weapon tests. The need for an early conclusion of such a treaty has been once again brilliantly emphasized by our dean of disarmament experts, Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles.

We are convinced that a complete freeze on nuclear weapons, primarily those of the USSR and the United States of America, would be a good starting point on the road to nuclear disarmament. As we all know, this idea was put forward in the United Nations by many countries and public figures, and it has our full support. We share these views. The nuclear freeze would contribute to strengthening strategic stability, since it would preserve the existing military and strategic balance, in particular between the USSR and the United States. As a result of this the threat of outbreak of nuclear conflict would be greatly reduced. Accordingly,
the degree of trust between nuclear-weapon States would substantially increase and a decisive turn would be made towards an improvement in the international situation. Contrary to what the opponents of a nuclear freeze keep repeating, this measure can be verified by national technical means. But we are ready to go even further and to agree on certain additional co-operative measures of verification, taking into account the previous negotiations on the limitation of nuclear arms.

We welcome the initiatives of the Heads of State or Government of six countries - Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden - which have been recorded in their declarations of 1984 and 1985. The ideas expressed in these documents and the Soviet initiatives pursue the same goals.

Renouncing first use of nuclear weapons is another important measure that could be rapidly implemented. The obligation to this effect, assumed by the Soviet Union, is not just a declaration but a step of great practical significance from the standpoint of military activity and development of the armed forces. It means that greater emphasis is being placed on the tasks related to preventing the transformation of hostilities involving conventional arms into a nuclear conflict. Accordingly, even stricter standards are enforced in the training of troops and headquarters personnel, in determining the composition of armaments, and in ensuring even more rigorous control to preclude the possibility of unauthorized use of any type of nuclear weapons, from tactical to strategic.

The obligation of the Chinese People's Republic not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is also in effect. Now it is up to the other nuclear Powers to act. The Soviet Union is flexible about the ways in which this should be done; it could be either through unilateral declarations or a single international legal instrument. What is important is to resolve this issue in substance, and the sooner this is done the better.
The Soviet Union supports the proposal of India and other non-aligned countries on the conclusion of a convention completely banning the use of nuclear weapons, in which all nuclear-weapon States would participate.

The implementation of the entire complex of material and contractual guarantees against the threat of nuclear war, that we have mentioned, is of primary and increasing importance. But we are ready to consider other, what could be called collateral measures, such as preventing accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons, preventing the possibility of a surprise attack, and so on.
The Soviet Union proposes that the entire body of practical measures aimed at preventing nuclear war should be given the most serious consideration. We call upon the United States and its allies to abandon their obstructionist policy in this matter, and reaffirm our position in favour of putting into practice the decisions of the General Assembly on the holding of business-like negotiations on this subject at the Conference on Disarmament.

The Soviet Union is prepared not only to set in motion various mechanisms which could help to halt the build-up of nuclear arms and prevent their use, but also to solve the problem as a whole. We are in favour of starting without delay negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament aimed at working out a programme of nuclear disarmament. Appropriate methods and forms of verification, satisfactory to all concerned and conducive to the effective implementation of the agreements concluded, could also be agreed upon in the process of drawing up measures of nuclear disarmament. It is our view that the experience accumulated by the International Atomic Energy Agency in its verification activities could well be used in the context of nuclear disarmament. We have in mind above all cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes, which is one of the first steps in the programme we propose.

We believe that it is important that the General Assembly should once again reaffirm its appeal in favour of starting negotiations without delay on this matter in the Conference on Disarmament and setting up a special committee for this purpose.

The reasons why the Soviet Union, like most other States, attaches priority to the nuclear and space aspect of the problem of disarmament are obvious. At the same time, we consider it necessary to intensify, rather than slacken, our efforts in other directions aimed at curbing the arms race, particularly in view of the development of new and increasingly destructive types and systems of weapons.
I would refer to the statement made yesterday by the representative of Sweden, Mrs. Theorin, and in this context I should like to point to the importance of bringing to a successful conclusion the negotiations on the complete prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons that are now being conducted in the Conference on Disarmament. The Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons has intensified its work this year. A great deal of credit for this is due to the Committee's Chairman, the representative of Poland, Ambassador Turbanski. At the same time, we have to state once again that the main difficulties in the negotiations still remain, and that some participants are not prepared to look for reasonable ways out of the deadlock which, incidentally, they created themselves. One such deadlock, although not the only one, has been brought about and continues to exist because of the insistence by the United States on total verification, which goes far beyond the framework of a convention on chemical weapons.

The Soviet Union is convinced, as Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized at his meeting with members of the French Parliament on 3 October, that agreement on reliable verification of a chemical weapon ban can certainly be achieved.

We have placed on the negotiating table our proposals for a system of control over the destruction of chemical weapon stockpiles, including the permanent presence of international inspectors at specialized facilities, and for working out rigorous restrictive and verification measures to prevent the illegal manufacture of chemical weapons or their components by civilian enterprises.

However, it should be noted specifically that the search for agreements on verification, as well as on other aspects of the problem, implies a willingness to take into account the legitimate interests of the other party and abandonment of discriminatory approaches. There is as yet no reason to conclude that the United States is acting in this spirit. Moreover, it is our impression, and one which is
shared by others, that the United States, by putting forward proposals that are
clearly unacceptable, evidently intends to bring about a deadlock in the
negotiations and then to embark upon the implementation of the United States Army's
$10 billion chemical rearmament programme.

The United States Administration's plans to begin mass production of binary
chemical weapons, to be deployed at what the United States regards as potential
theatres of military hostilities, are fraught with the danger of setting off a new
round in the arms race and of seriously increasing the threat of chemical warfare.
Such a step is clearly contrary to the efforts of many States aimed at an effective
international prohibition of chemical weapons and also makes the negotiations
considerably more complicated.

It would be appropriate for the General Assembly to speak out resolutely in
favour of speeding up the preparation of a convention on the prohibition and
elimination of chemical weapons and to call upon all States to refrain from any
actions which might make the negotiations on a chemical weapons ban more difficult
and, in particular, to refrain from the production and deployment of binary and
other new types of chemical weapons.

The task of saving mankind from weapons of mass destruction requires not only
the elimination of the existing types of such weapons but also the prohibition of
new kinds of such weapons before they appear. This is the purpose of our new
initiative, submitted to the Conference on Disarmament last July, which in many
respects takes into account the suggestions of our negotiating partners. The
substance of our initiative is that all States should assume an obligation,
immediately after any new kind of weapon of mass destruction has been identified,
to start negotiations on its prohibition and simultaneously to declare a moratorium
on its practical development. Prior to this the Conference on Disarmament, through
periodic meetings of a group of experts, could continuously monitor these questions and, whenever necessary, make recommendations for specific negotiations to be held on the kinds of weapons that have been identified.

We believe that agreement should be reached more speedily on such questions as banning radiological weapons and preventing attacks against nuclear facilities. Last July the socialist countries, including the USSR, submitted to the Conference on Disarmament a working paper on the subject which, taking into account the proposals of many States, expresses their willingness to resolve these two issues by concluding either separate agreements on each one or a single international legal instrument.

Our proposals on the urgent issues of disarmament have never been, and are not now, confined to nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet Union continues to be a firm supporter of the limitation and reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces. It is our continuing belief that it is not only senseless but also dangerous to raise higher and higher the level of approximate parity that exists in the field of conventional armaments and armed forces between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Treaty countries and those of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).
The correctness of our approach is especially evident in the present circumstances, when the United States and NATO, anxious to secure military superiority, are launching a new round in the arms race in both the nuclear and conventional fields. In effect, NATO is now carrying out a long-term programme of developing highly sophisticated conventional weapons whose destructive power is close to that of nuclear arms and has adopted an aggressive doctrine concerning their use. In this field just like in the field of nuclear weapons, reliance on force clearly prevails over a readiness for mutually acceptable agreements. At the same time, as demonstrated by the Vienna negotiations on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, objective prerequisites for such agreements do exist. At the Vienna talks we propose to begin the reduction of the armed forces and armaments of both sides in Central Europe and are ready to make larger reductions of troops than the United States. In the broader context, too, the Soviet Union is in favour of urgently taking steps to end the build-up and qualitative upgrading of conventional weapons, primarily by nuclear-weapon States and the military alliances to which they belong.

To this end we are prepared to reach agreement on a programme of practical measures that would include freezing the level of conventional weapons and armed forces, banning the development of new types of conventional weapons whose destructive power is comparable to that of mass destruction weapons and, subsequently, substantial reductions of armed forces and conventional weapons.

The goal of limiting and ending the arms race also calls for a practical approach to curbing the arms race in the seas and oceans, and specifically for starting negotiations on this subject with the participation of all major naval Powers and other interested States. Serious consideration of this question in the United Nations Disarmament Commission could contribute to this. Now, after the publication of a study of this problem by a group of experts on naval armaments, any
further delay in starting talks on this issue would be even less justified.

I should like to stress at this session that we continue to regard as extremely important the goal of eliminating foreign military presence and, above all, foreign military bases on foreign territories. We consider that establishing some form of contacts between the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Alliance as organizations should not forever be taboo, which is true also, and even more so, of overcoming in the more or less foreseeable future the division of Europe into two opposing groupings. It is well known that this is exactly what we and our allies are proposing. But even with the existence of the two blocs it is possible to find a modus vivendi that would take the edge off the present confrontation.

We are in favour of limiting or prohibiting on a reciprocal basis any type of weapons, nuclear or conventional, without prejudice to anyone's security. Our proposals to this effect have been submitted at bilateral and multilateral negotiations or submitted to the United Nations and other international forums. These proposals vividly demonstrate that there is no disarmament problem that our country would not be ready to tackle on the basis of reciprocity.

The same fully applies to confidence-building measures, which constitute an important factor in easing international tensions. We believe, however, that it is impossible to attain the necessary degree of trust in relations among States without first removing the causes and material roots of mistrust. We are convinced that "transparency" of military activities in and of itself, not linked to disarmament measures, far from being capable of limiting the arms race could, on the contrary, only accelerate it. It is also unproductive to try to develop a model of confidence-building measures that would be applicable at all times and in all circumstances.
One should work seriously on building confidence, and this is precisely what we are doing at different forums, including the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

It is important that the outlines of future agreements have now begun to emerge at the Conference, among them some giving concrete expression and maximum effectiveness to the principle of the non-use of force and a certain set of confidence-building measures in the military field which would play the role of safety fuses guarding against misinterpretation of actions by the other side in the event of a sharp deterioration in the military confrontation. A number of States, first of all the neutral States, propose that agreement should be reached on exchanging annual plans of military activities subject to notification. The Soviet Union is ready for such an agreement, hoping that it can help to overcome suspicion and will make it more difficult to conduct secret preparations for war.

Our approach to the issue of verification or controls is equally consistent and constructive. The Soviet Union was the first to express readiness to implement strict and effective control in conditions of general and complete disarmament, and proposals were made for the creation of an international control organization. Measures of control that ensure confidence in compliance by States with their commitments form a fundamental part of all our disarmament proposals, being fully in agreement with the central principle of control which calls for measures of control to be commensurate with arms limitation measures and it has been recorded in a number of universally recognized international instruments, including the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The USSR is no less interested in reliable and effective verification than any other State. The least that can be said about those who claim the contrary and try to put this in doubt is that they have the wrong address. The practice of
negotiations, including the Soviet-United States talks, has shown that when there is a genuine will to come to an agreement the issue of control is not an obstacle. When there is interest in concluding agreements and a political will to do so, the demand for "super-reliable", "150 per cent proof" of verification is not made.

Conversely, behind the efforts deliberately to complicate the issues of control and reference to the difficulties related to its implementation there is an obvious reluctance on the part of certain States to commit themselves to any limitations that would prevent them from building up and perfecting their armaments.
It is noteworthy that those States, while advocating control in words, are intensifying work on weapon systems and methods of their deployment which are less and less verifiable. If they were seriously concerned about the issue of control they would not drag out arms limitation talks but would try by actual deeds to reach early agreements on that score. For as a result of the arms race - and this must be borne in mind - the development of military technology undergoes rapid and profound changes, with qualitatively new types of weapons being developed which could make control over them and consequently their agreed limitation increasingly difficult, if not impossible.

We consider measures to limit and reduce arms in close interrelationship with the solution of problems of economic development. Such measures would permit the release of enormous resources now wasted on the arms race and their use for the benefit of mankind's peaceful development and channel them to the solution of urgent social and economic problems in the developing countries.

This, as we see it, should be the aim of the Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development which will take place next year. It is important for that forum to deal constructively with the question of how to release additional resources for purposes of development by means of practical arms limitation measures which are or could be the subject of any particular negotiations.

We know that the road to a radical solution of the problems of ensuring universal security and disarmament is long and arduous. But there is no other road. It is important to realize that now is the time for practical action. If calls for peace and disarmament are not backed by concrete, practical deeds, we say
that they are nothing but political demagogy and deception of the peoples. As the
General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet
Union, Mikhail S. Gorbachev, has emphasized:

"The general demand, as we in the Soviet Union see and feel it, is that the
time has come to stop, finally to use our heads, think of where we find
ourselves, and begin to act, to take concrete steps. Here is a simple
formula, a simple idea, which, in our view, reflects a sense of responsibility
for the fate of one's own people and of other peoples. It contains a
proposal, a search for something constructive. We are prepared for that."
It is our conviction that in such a search all the existing mechanisms must be
set in motion, including of course the United Nations, which was created 40 years
ago with the aim of preserving and strengthening peace. It is important that its
decisions on the key questions of arms limitation and disarmament should not remain
on paper and that all States, regardless of their political and social systems,
should be guided by the recommendations of the United Nations to bring the
developments back onto the right track and solve one problem after another in the
field of arms limitation and reduction, as well as build mutual trust. Only such a
road, rather than any method of pure arithmetic, can help us enhance the
effectiveness of the United Nations and reduce the number of its decisions.

We believe that the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations
and the International Year of Peace, which we shall observe in 1986, must serve as
additional stimuli for undertaking concrete joint efforts by States in order to
avert the nuclear threat, curb the arms race, stabilize international relations,
return to détente, and build confidence.

We are happy to note that similar appeals have been made by you, Mr. Chairman,
to the First Committee and we are ready through concrete deeds to respond to them.
Mr. McDOWELL (New Zealand): Mr. Chairman, you have asked representatives not to preface statements with tributes to the Committee's officers. I will obey that injunction out of respect for you personally - a respect that has been built up over many years of close co-operation between our two countries in this and other forums.

Next week we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations and its Charter. It is a time for reflection, reassessment and rededication to the principles on which this Organization was founded. Throughout the different committees of the Assembly during this fortieth session we will have cause to celebrate the many achievements that have been made over the past 40 years - achievements which must not be underrated - in areas like the eradication of disease, famine relief, promotion and protection of human rights, codification and progressive development of international law and, above all, in the success of the decolonization process. In this Committee of the Assembly, however, we have to deal with the consequences of one of the less successful aspects of the Organization - its inability to prevent war or to head off the threat of war.

The fact that the United Nations has not lived up to the expectations of 1945 with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security is not because the system devised by the framers of the Charter in San Francisco was fundamentally flawed. It is because of the breakdown of the consensus among the major Powers that was to be the basis of the collective security system envisaged in the Charter. Inside the United Nations the breakdown of that consensus has led to the virtual paralysis of the Security Council on many major issues. Outside, it has led to a relentless drive by the major Powers to safeguard their security by the accumulation of more and even more technically advanced weapons - especially nuclear weapons.
Nuclear weapons may have helped to sustain an uneasy global peace for the past 40 years, but the numbers of those weapons and their level of sophistication have reached the point where ordinary people everywhere increasingly question whether any deterrent value they may have is not outweighed by the threat they represent to the whole of mankind. They also threaten to place an intolerable strain on the international order established by this Organization. As my Deputy Prime Minister said in the General Assembly three weeks ago:

"... the continued development of this weapon over the lifetime of our Organization has in fact succeeded in distorting the fabric of international life. In our own experience it conditions the sovereign freedoms we had thought in 1945 were once and for all assured to us. At the very least as policies of power are pursued it has impinged on standards of international morality and behaviour." (A/40/PV.7, p. 59-60)
MR. McDOwELl, NEW ZEALAND

From the first days of the United Nations efforts have been made to reduce the threat posed by the existence of nuclear weapons. Some important agreements have been concluded relating to these weapons. But the hard fact is that there has been little progress in the direction of nuclear disarmament. On the contrary, although some weapon system have been scrapped - and not through any agreements worked out under international machinery - these have been replaced by newer and more sophisticated weapons. And today the international community is faced with the possibility that the military competition between the two major Powers may move into the new environment of outer space.

The power to reverse the process of escalation and the responsibility for making progress to that end rest with the nuclear-weapon States and especially the two major nuclear Powers. Nevertheless, all countries, including small States like New Zealand, have a right and a duty to respond to the demands of their peoples to do all they can to bring the nuclear-arms race to a peaceful conclusion. The weight of collective opinion against nuclear proliferation - both vertical and horizontal - must not be dismissed.

New Zealanders have always known that however removed their country might be in distance from the most strategically vulnerable parts of this world, they cannot expect to escape the horrible consequences if nuclear weapons are ever used. If they had ever hoped otherwise that hope has been dashed by the increasing number of studies about the effects of a possible global nuclear winter resulting from a major nuclear war. My Prime Minister put it this way when he addressed the Conference on Disarmament earlier this year:

"New Zealand is a small country and remote. But if there should be a nuclear war then New Zealand will join the company of those who have destroyed themselves".
(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

Faced with this reality and mounting public concern the New Zealand Government decided to demonstrate the strength of opposition to nuclear weapons in our country by implementing its own limited measure of arms control; the exclusion from our ports of vessels carrying nuclear weapons. This decision reflects New Zealand's particular strategic circumstances. We are not part of any nuclear strategy. As a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty we have foregone the possession of nuclear weapons. We have never accepted that nuclear weapons can be stationed or stored on our territory. The decision to exclude all nuclear ships from all countries from our ports reflects our determination not to have any country defend us with nuclear weapons. We do not seek to be a part of any calculation that involves the accumulation of these weapons.

The Government's stand is fully consistent with New Zealand's active membership of the Western community - in the defence of which we have a proud and long-standing record. It is not a step towards isolationism or a retreat from our responsibility to provide for the defence of the region in which we live. The Government has, in fact, expanded New Zealand's political, economic and defence activity in the region and is committed to playing an increasingly active role there. As Deputy Prime Minister Palmer told the General Assembly:

"This new and strengthened regional approach should provide the basis for a continued, sound and stable relationship with Australia and the United States based on a clear definition of New Zealand's interests and a policy of self-reliance". (A/40/PV.7, p. 67)

The Government also firmly believes that regional measures can play a part in the search for disarmament and arms control. Accordingly, we have given our support to the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. The Treaty establishing this zone was opened for signature on 6 August this year. I had the privilege of being present at that ceremony in Rarotonga. The symbolism of
the timing will not be lost on people for it was the anniversary of Hiroshima Day. The Treaty has so far been signed by nine South Pacific countries including New Zealand. It recently received its first ratification.

The South Pacific Nuclear-Free-Zone Treaty shows the determination of South Pacific countries that their region should not be or become an arena for nuclear confrontation. They firmly believe that there should be no use, testing or stationing of nuclear weapons in the South Pacific and that the countries of the region should fully respect and fulfil the aims of applicable international measures such as those contained in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Under the Treaty endorsed by the South Pacific Forum all parties undertake not to possess, manufacture or acquire nuclear explosive devices anywhere, nor allow them to be stationed anywhere on their territory. They also undertake to prevent the diversion of fissionable material to non-peaceful purposes and not to dump radioactive waste at sea in the zone. The Treaty leaves it to each party to determine for itself its security concerns and such questions as access to its ports and airfields by vessels and aircraft from other countries.

The zone covers a vast area, stretching from the Equator in the north to Antarctica in the south. It borders the two other nuclear-weapon-free zones that have been established - to the east the area covered by the Treaty of Tlatelolco, to the south that covered by the Antarctic Treaty. We fully acknowledge the inspiration provided to South Pacific countries by the Latin American example. We also reaffirm New Zealand's strong and continuing support for the Antarctic Treaty. We will vigorously defend that Treaty not only because of the nuclear-free and demilitarized zone it established but also because for 25 years it has guaranteed the stability of the region to our south. It is a system which is in place. It is a system which works.
When endorsing the South Pacific Nuclear-Free-Zone Treaty, the countries of the South Pacific Forum also considered the three draft protocols to the Treaty and agreed that consultations should be held on them with the nuclear-weapon States. We hope that after these consultations these States will become party to the protocols and thereby agree not to use or threaten to use nuclear explosive devices against any territory or country in the zone. They would also undertake not to test nuclear explosive devices in the zone. It is expected that these consultations will be initiated shortly.

We believe that the achievement of a nuclear-free zone in our region will strengthen existing measures to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. We are only too well aware, however, that the nuclear-arms race can only be stopped by global measures and that the nuclear-weapon States must play the major role in their negotiation. In this regard the summit meeting next month between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev is an occasion for hope for all countries. In the past few years, the absence of political dialogue and the chequered and so far unsuccessful history of arms control talks has caused enormous anxiety throughout the whole world. My country urges the two leaders when they meet in Geneva to set a framework for increased co-operation that will assist the bilateral arms control negotiations being held in that city.

New Zealand greatly welcomed the announcement in January this year of the resumption of these bilateral talks between the United States and the Soviet Union and the agreement reached on their objectives. Particularly welcome to my Government was the statement in the Joint Communiqué of 8 January that the negotiations "should lead to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere". The third round of these talks is now underway. We are encouraged that the negotiators have before them a comprehensive outline from the United States for achieving the agreed objectives of the talks. Recently the Soviet Union
has suggested some proposals for consideration. We hope that these talks will soon bear fruit in the form of balanced, equitable and verifiable agreements to eliminate large numbers of nuclear weapons.

The negotiators' task is not an easy one. It requires a determined and sustained effort. Both sides must pursue their task with vigour and good faith. They must eschew proposals that seek unilateral advantage and would thereby impede the search for an agreement. They must avoid another stalemate that would almost inevitably lead to a further and even more terrifying escalation in what is already an utterly unnecessary arms race.

The talks are aimed not only at achieving a reduction in strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons but also at preventing an arms race in space. We share the anxiety of many other countries about the possibility of the arms race extending into what has until now been a peaceful environment. At a minimum the negotiations must protect the agreements that have already been reached on the uses of outer space, notably the limited test ban treaty, the outer space treaty and the anti-ballistic missile treaty between the two negotiating parties. At the same time progress on the immediate imperative of reducing nuclear weapons on Earth should not be held hostage to the achievement of new agreements on outer space.
A successful summit meeting and progress in the bilateral talks in Geneva will, we hope, be paralleled by progress in the multilateral disarmament process. So far the Conference on Disarmament has failed to negotiate a single significant disarmament or arms control agreement since it was reconstituted following the General Assembly's first special session on Disarmament. In recent years, it has not even taken up some of the most important items on its agenda because of continuing procedural wrangles. New Zealand has been particularly concerned by the lack of progress on the first item on the agenda of the Conference - the nuclear test ban. New Zealand has long been a firm advocate of the early negotiation and conclusion of a treaty to ban all nuclear tests. We share the widely held view that a comprehensive test-ban treaty is the most practical and immediate way of halting the development and further spread of nuclear weapons. Without a comprehensive test ban treaty any agreement reached on reducing the numbers of nuclear weapons could be nullified by the pace of technological change leading to the development of new and unregulated classes of these weapons. It is a disarmament objective of the greatest importance.

It is well known that nuclear testing is of particular concern to New Zealand and other countries of the South Pacific because France insists on testing its nuclear weapons in our region. South Pacific countries have repeatedly reaffirmed their total opposition to these tests. In defiance of the view of all independent and self-governing countries of the South Pacific, France continues to turn its back on this strongly held regional opinion. We deeply regret this. We call on France to show its respect for South Pacific opinion by stopping the tests at Mururoa Atoll. Such a step would do much to contribute to regional harmony. It would enhance France's image in the South Pacific. It would enhance France's standing in the South Pacific.
I wish to make it clear that the importance we attach to the achievement of a comprehensive test ban is not motivated only by the testing that takes place in our region. As the Secretary-General said in his report to the Assembly this year, agreement on a comprehensive test ban would send:

"a clear and vital signal of humanity's willingness to confront the nuclear challenge". (A/40/1, p. 8)

Every year since 1972 we have, with Australia, taken the lead in putting forward a resolution calling for the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty. Those resolutions have enjoyed the support of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations. Further evidence of that support can be found in the call made by all non-nuclear States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty in the Final Document of the Third Review Conference, for the urgent negotiation and conclusion of a comprehensive multilateral treaty banning all nuclear tests by all States in all environments for all time as a matter of the highest priority in the Conference on Disarmament. New Zealand supported that call wholeheartedly. We welcome the consensus that was achieved at the Review Conference on the adoption of this language. Nevertheless, we are forced to recognize that the call was not unanimous and that there continue to be differences of approach on a test ban.

It has been in an effort to bridge those differences that New Zealand has suggested in its resolutions of recent years practical ways by which the Conference on Disarmament can approach the test ban issue. We are deeply disappointed that for the second year in a row the Conference has failed to respond to the injunctions in those resolutions. New Zealand believes that only by addressing directly the issues of concern to countries that have reservations about a comprehensive test ban will we ever achieve the goal desired by the vast majority of the international community. One of these issues is the scope of the test ban.
Another is verification. Until they have been adequately resolved there will be no comprehensive test-ban treaty.

We acknowledge the various proposals that have been made this year for a moratorium on testing. We want all tests stopped. But we do not think a moratorium is an adequate substitute for an appropriately verifiable and legally binding treaty. Past history shows that however useful a moratorium might be, it can provide no lasting guarantees.

At this Assembly, New Zealand will be working with Australia and other countries in putting forward another resolution calling for the urgent conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We hope that the Assembly will send a clear signal to the Conference on Disarmament to do much better next year on this item than it has done over the past two years. In this connection, we welcome China's decision to participate in the work of the Conference on this issue.

The nuclear test ban item was not the only one on which the Conference on Disarmament was unable to undertake any substantive work. We regret that the Conference was again prevented for another year from making progress on the subject of the prevention of nuclear war. That subject is of great importance to the work of the Conference and to the United Nations. It should be possible for the Conference to take up that issue without compromising any country's basic position.

Thankfully, there were items before the Conference on which some progress, though modest at best, was registered. We welcome the agreement that was reached on the establishment of a committee to deal with the prevention of an arms race in outer space. This agreement should provide a solid basis for more work next year within that forum, which is properly constituted for the task.

We appreciate the serious efforts that were made on the radiological weapons item and on the urgent question of the conclusion of a convention to ban chemical weapons entirely. Like the representative of Canada earlier this morning, we feel,
however, that progress is minimal. The pace of the chemical weapons negotiations is quite unequal to the evident dangers of the increasing use of these weapons. New Zealand condemns all chemical weapons use. We deeply regret that it was confirmed earlier this year that chemical weapons had again been used in the Iran/Iraq conflict. We commend the Secretary-General's efforts to investigate that situation and to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol that outlaws the use of these weapons in war time. In the unfortunate event of renewed allegations of chemical weapons use, we expect that recourse will be had to the procedures that were established under resolution 37/98D and that were fully elaborated in the report of the Group of Experts prepared pursuant to that resolution and considered by the Assembly last year.

Given the disappointing results of this year's session of the Conference on Disarmament, it is heartening to recall the outcome of the Third Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty held in September. It provides welcome reassurance on the viability of multilateral disarmament discussions and negotiations. It also augurs well for the conferences that are to be held next year, including the Review Conference of the biological weapons Convention to be held in Geneva, and the Conference on disarmament and development to be held in Paris.

That consensus at the NPT Review Conference was achieved because all parties - nuclear and non-nuclear alike - were prepared to conduct an honest and realistic assessment of the implementation of the Treaty and, notwithstanding their differences on some issues, to pledge themselves to preserving and sustaining the non-proliferation regime. Of the many important features of the Final Document, we would like to draw particular attention to the urgent call for a comprehensive test-ban treaty to which I have already referred and to the agreement to strengthen safeguards arrangements governing trade in nuclear materials. Above all, we would
underline the declaration contained in the Final Document by which all parties reaffirmed their commitment to the purposes of the preamble of the Treaty, to the Treaty's provisions and to work to achieve the cessation of the nuclear arms race. We appeal to those countries that have not yet done so to join the majority of United Nations Members in participating in the Treaty.
At the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty the United States and the Soviet Union demonstrated that they have a common interest in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries. We hope they will come to recognize that they share a common interest with the rest of humanity in reducing the numbers of nuclear weapons in their arsenals and in halting the future development of such weapons. If next month's summit meeting is approached in a spirit of co-operation and with the necessary determination, it will mark the turning point in the arms race that people everywhere are looking for.

There are moments in the affairs of men and in the affairs of nations which must be recognized and acted upon. In my own country the Maori have a saying:

"I hea koe i tangihanga o te riroriro?"

The literal translation is:

"Where were you when the riroriro - the grey warbler - sang?"

The grey warbler sings in the springtime, the time when the hard work of turning and breaking the soil and planting the seed has to be done. The question is a rhetorical one. It implies that people must recognize critical passages in time and make their contribution. Let us hope and pray that there is a recognition next month in Geneva of the critical passage in time through which we are now passing. There could be no more dramatic way of marking the fortieth anniversary of this Organization than to take a decisive step now away from the prospect of destruction.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I should like first of all to congratulate you most sincerely on behalf of the Romanian delegation on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. The active role played in international relations by Indonesia, a country with which Romania enjoys bonds of friendship, your widely recognized diplomatic skills, and
your experience in multilateral diplomacy, all offer the best assurances that, under your guidance, the results of this Committee's work will be positive.

I should also like to congratulate the other officers of the Committee and to wish them every success in the performance of their tasks.

This year the debate on disarmament-related items is of particular importance. This is because the enormous magnitude of the arms race, and above all the nuclear arms race, makes it more urgent than ever before to put an end to the present course of events, and to embark resolutely on the path of disarmament.

Furthermore, the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations prompts us to take stock of the disarmament activities undertaken thus far in the United Nations and to reflect on ways and means of contributing in a better and more concrete manner to the cessation of the arms race and to the initiation of a real disarmament process.

As regards the role played by our Organization, a positive element that should be stressed is the fact that the work of and the resolutions adopted over the years by the United Nations on disarmament problems have contributed to a great extent to an awareness of the growing threat that the arms race, and in particular the nuclear arms race, poses to the well-being and very survival of mankind. In 1978, for the first time in the history of disarmament negotiations, the international community reached a consensus on an international disarmament strategy, the immediate objective of which was to eliminate the danger of nuclear war and to implement measures aimed at putting an end to the arms race and at reversing the trend.

I am referring to the first special session devoted to disarmament which, in its Final Document, established the objectives, the priorities and the principles for disarmament negotiations, as well as a programme of action, the ultimate goal of
which was to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Despite obvious progress at the conceptual level, the results have been meagre in practical terms. It must be noted that, in the 40 years since the establishment of the United Nations, no weapon has been destroyed by virtue of a disarmament agreement; the arms race and in particular the nuclear arms race has continued unabated, and world military expenditures have increased considerably.

After 1978, the situation evolved in a way contrary to the conclusions and documents adopted at the first special session devoted to disarmament and contrary to the legitimate aspirations of peoples.

The arms race continues at an ever more frenetic pace, military expenditures have reached unbelievable levels, efforts to develop and produce new types and systems of weapons, including nuclear weapons with an increasingly destructive capacity, have been redoubled, and attempts are being made to militarize outer space.

Moreover, the situation in Europe has deteriorated, particularly as a result of the deployment by the United States of America of medium-range missiles in certain Western countries and the Soviet Union's nuclear countermeasures.

In recent years the policy of the maintenance and further division of zones of influence and spheres of domination, as well as the policy of force and of the threat of the use of force have intensified. Old conflicts between States have become aggravated and new conflicts have emerged. These are all factors that reveal the seriousness of the arms race we are witnessing.

Even if recent developments constitute a glimmer of hope, the international situation remains particularly serious and complex. The danger of another world war which would inevitably become a nuclear catastrophe is always present.

Never in the long course of the history of mankind has a threat of this nature been posed to the survival of civilization, to the life and freedom of peoples.
That is why, in the view of Romania and of President Nicolae Ceausescu, the fundamental issue of our day is the cessation of the arms race and especially of the nuclear arms race, the transition to disarmament, the elimination of all nuclear weapons, the cessation of any action to militarize outer space, and the safeguarding and consolidation of peace.

In view of the seriousness of the present international situation, the President of the Socialist Republic of Romania recently appealed once again to political leaders and to the peoples of the entire world to join efforts and rise above all differences between social systems and political, philosophical or religious views and, before it is too late, to stop the present dangerous course of events towards confrontation and war, and completely to renounce force and the threat of the use of force in international relations in order to guarantee to peoples the right to develop freely, and to use scientific achievements exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Like many other countries, we believe that the Gordian knot, in any efforts made to achieve disarmament and guarantee the security of States, is undoubtedly nuclear disarmament, the high priority of which is almost unanimously recognized.

This is not empty rhetoric but a fact which, unfortunately, some at times attempt to call into question. Nuclear weapons have brought about a radical change in military doctrines, in concepts of security and in the balance of forces. An entire body of specialized literature as well as life itself emphasize the far-reaching effects of these weapons on the political, economic, social and moral levels. Nuclear weapons have, for the first time in the history of mankind, created the dreadful instrument by which man can destroy life on our planet.
When the immense quantity of nuclear weapons accumulated by the United States and by the Soviet Union can destroy all of mankind many times over, how can it be claimed that a few hundreds of missiles more or less could affect the balance of forces between the two parties? On what is nuclear superiority based when we know that the adversary, even from a position of inferiority, possesses arsenals that can destroy the world many times over? In the nuclear age it is no longer a problem of military balance, of inferiority or superiority, but a question of life and death. Since these are the alternatives, it seems to us that there is only one solution: the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. This is the most certain way to free mankind from the danger of nuclear cataclysm, maintain stability in the world and safeguard world peace and security.

We welcome the agreement reached between the Soviet Union and the United States of America to begin negotiations on nuclear and space weapons having as a final objective of their talks the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. It is clear that such a broad objective cannot be achieved overnight. Romania has always been in favour of persevering and sincere negotiations, both bilateral and multilateral, with a view to agreements on nuclear disarmament measures aimed at the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and their gradual reduction until their total elimination is achieved.

The fact that there will be a meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America in November is undoubtedly a positive event of extreme importance. As was recently stated by President Ceausescu:

"Romania believes that it is necessary to make every effort, in the framework of the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva, and to demonstrate the highest sense of responsibility for peace and the life of peoples, to put forward new initiatives which can lead the way towards appropriate agreements on the cessation of the arms race, of any action aimed at producing and
testing nuclear weapons or the militarization of outer space; such agreements should also lead to the elimination of missiles and all nuclear weapons from the European continent and from the world at large. Mere declarations do not suffice: The two parties must proceed to the adoption of concrete disarmament measures."

Romania also welcomed the initiatives taken by the Soviet Union and the measures proposed by the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, concerning a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of certain nuclear weapons and a cessation of nuclear tests, as well as the proposal for a 50 per cent reduction in strategic nuclear weapons and the cessation of any action towards the militarization of outer space.

In my country's view, the implementation of these proposals by both sides would represent a major step forward towards increased confidence and towards the attainment of agreements leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons from Europe and the entire world.

We wish to recall as well that Romania was among those which described as a very positive development the declarations by the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union to the effect that they would not make first use of nuclear weapons. It is clear that similar commitments by other nuclear Powers would constitute a historic step towards the elimination of the nuclear threat. By becoming a co-sponsor of draft resolutions submitted by Argentina, India, Mexico, Sweden and other non-aligned countries or neutral countries, my country has over the years supported the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, a freezing on the production of such weapons, and the prevention of nuclear war.

In general terms, we believe that in order to put an end to the arms race, and especially the nuclear-arms race, and proceed to disarmament, the other States
(Mr. Marinescu, Romania)

should not passively await the development of Soviet-American negotiations and the meeting of the leaders of the two countries. On the contrary, all States, and first and foremost the European States, and in particular those which are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and of the Warsaw Treaty, must assume more direct responsibility and heighten their own actions in order to induce the two major nuclear Powers to act concretely in order to arrive at a mutually acceptable stance on nuclear weapons and a cessation of the militarization of outer space, so that at the November meeting appropriate agreements in that direction can be reached.

More than ever before, we believe it is necessary that all Governments, all Heads of State and all political forces act before it is too late to save mankind from nuclear catastrophe.

The serious situation we have reached requires the adoption of measures to intensify activities in international organizations and conferences devoted to disarmament. The current impasse in the work of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva must be overcome so that agreements can be reached on questions such as the prevention of nuclear war, a ban on all nuclear weapons tests, the non-extension of the arms race into outer space, the prohibition of the production and development of chemical weapons and the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons.

Romania is acting resolutely for the success of the Stockholm Conference on Security and Confidence-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. In respect of the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and weapons in Central Europe, my country believes that the proposals made thus far provide a good basis for reaching, without delay, an initial agreement acceptable to all the parties.

Since we attach great importance to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world, we are promoting an active policy
to develop, both bilaterally and multilaterally, relations with all the States of
the Balkans in order to transform that region into a zone of good-neighbourliness,
of co-operation and of peace, free of nuclear weapons and foreign military bases.

The recently concluded general debate revealed the deep concern that exists at
the dangers of extending the arms race into outer space. In this respect Romania,
like other countries, considers it necessary to take concrete measures to to
prevent these dangers and arrive at strict respect, by all States, of the
obligations undertaken by virtue of existing international agreements in order to
ensure that outer space is used exclusively for peaceful purposes in the interest
of all mankind.

The question of the non-militarization of outer space should be resolved
appropriately in the framework of the process of intensifying global co-operation
in the use of outer space for peaceful purposes. It is in a spirit of that
position of principle that we support the proposals by the Soviet Union concerning
the peaceful uses of outer space, including the convening of an international
conference and the establishment of an international organization towards that end.

We hope that this year again the General Assembly will be able to adopt a
single resolution, this time unanimously, on this problem, which will make it
possible for the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to begin real negotiations to
arrive at concrete agreements for the prevention of the militarization of outer
space.
In order to put an end to the arms race it is necessary to take action towards the freezing and reduction of military budgets. We stress the need to freeze and reduce military budgets, not only because of the positive political results this would have but also because the practical results would have a very favourable effect as regards the settlement of other major problems now confronting mankind. Perhaps no other disarmament issue is so closely connected with the relationship between the two fundamental issues of the world of today, disarmament and development.

We are very pleased that more and more Governments are beginning to pay greater attention to the question of the reduction of military budgets. The views expressed and the proposals made, although based on different approaches, reflect in the final analysis a concern which seems to us to be normal and inevitable about the damaging effects of this phenomenon, for which sooner or later a remedy must be found.

We are convinced that the efforts of the United Nations Disarmament Commission to harmonize the positions of States in order to facilitate realistic negotiations on the freezing and reduction of military budgets are more important than ever before. We believe that, by virtue of the decision adopted by the Disarmament Commission in 1985, it will be possible, through joint efforts, to contribute to the speeding up and completion of the preparation of principles for the freezing and reduction of military expenditures, so as to begin specific negotiations capable of leading to international agreements in this field.

Since disarmament is a subject of universal concern, all Governments and all peoples must be provided with the information they need for a full awareness of the problems created by the arms race and the urgency of disarmament. It is undeniable that the United Nations must play a central role in that regard. By drawing
attention to the present highly disturbing situation, it must dispel any illusions to the effect that peoples can live in tranquillity while the arms race continues and while vast material and human resources are wasted for what are, to say the least, unproductive purposes.

We are convinced that the fourth report of the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security, a decision on, the preparation of which is to be made at this session, will, like the earlier reports, respond to a deeply felt need for a thorough study of the effects of the arms race on the life of peoples and a report on the subject to Governments and the world public.

No other problem confronting mankind today is of such direct concern to all the Member States of the United Nations as disarmament. As we commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, we wish to stress the need, which is now greater than ever before, for the United Nations to play its central role and fulfil its primary responsibility in the field of disarmament and to exercise its powers more effectively. As a universal organization the United Nations must direct its main efforts towards mobilizing the political will and resolve of all States, above all the nuclear-weapon States and other heavily armed States, to take action in connection with the prevention of war, the cessation of the arms race, the non-militarization of outer space and the achievement of nuclear disarmament.

Recognition of the vital interest of all peoples in the ending of the arms race and the achievement of disarmament calls for a steady development of the democratic nature of the existing deliberative and negotiating machinery on disarmament questions, the active participation of all States in the preparation of
disarmament agreements and the monitoring and collective assessment of their implementation.

One way in which we believe the United Nations could and should play a more active role is by intensifying its work in order to stimulate public interest in the problems of the arms race and disarmament through the provision of wider and more objective information. The mass movements in favour of disarmament and peace which have arisen in recent years in various parts of the world have revealed that world public opinion constitutes a considerable political force capable of compelling Governments to take a more positive attitude with regard to the problems of peace and disarmament.

Like other countries, we believe that the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the achievement of disarmament goes hand in hand with the efforts being made to resolve other major problems confronting mankind today, especially those relating to the economic and social development of peoples, the elimination of the phenomenon of underdevelopment, the maintenance of international peace and security, the cessation of existing conflicts and the peaceful settlement of all disputes and conflicts between States.

The human race is undeniably in danger. This is not mere speculation but a tragic reality. However, the threat to the survival of mankind was created by man, and man must have the means to ensure his own well-being; such means are not beyond his reach. What is needed is the determination to take a new direction, to use all human knowledge and material resources to preserve peace and improve the living conditions of peoples throughout the world. It is within the power of the United Nations, of all Member States, of all of us, to contribute, by means of the decisions that we take, to agreements to put an end to the present policy of tension and armament, to chart a course towards disarmament, primarily nuclear
disarmament, to preserve peace and ensure co-operation based on the principles of equality and independence.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): I congratulate you, Sir, on your well-deserved election to preside over this Committee. Your experience and skill, which have won you great prestige, guarantee the success of our work. I also congratulate the other officers of the Committee and the Secretariat.

The agenda of the First Committee reflects a situation of world-wide concern over the different ways in which the arms race is jeopardizing the peace process, economic development, international co-operation and, in the case of nuclear weapons, even the very existence of our world. This concern is a factor of high priority as we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, since the world is wondering what in fact has been achieved in the field of disarmament, even as regards partial measures, at least in regard to a weapons freeze, the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests in all environments or the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and their progressive elimination.

It is clear that what is lacking is the firm, collective, simultaneous political will to reach that goal, since we already have sufficient means of verification to guarantee the total prohibition without which it will be impossible to stop the present international rivalry for the possession of more, and more terrifying, instruments of death.
Ecuador, a country that has always been devoted to peace, recognized in General Assembly resolution 39/53 that a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty would be a decisive element in effecting a halt to the nuclear-arms race and to the further refinement of nuclear weapons; but we have affirmed that there is a need for immediate negotiations and not just an appeal to the Conference on Disarmament, with things then to continue as they are.

The Foreign Minister of Ecuador, Mr. Edgar Teran, pointed out to the General Assembly at this session the need to progress towards real disarmament, above all in the parts of our world most given to conflicts, and he said:

"In all international forums Ecuador has criticized the arms race, whatever its origin. Ecuador is a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco which is intended to preserve Latin America as a nuclear-free zone.

"Disarmament is the goal which mankind must pursue, but the least we can do is to seek arms limitation." (A/40/PV.11, p. 12)

At a time of world-wide crisis and uncontainable inflation when external debt has a backbreaking effect on the great majority of countries, further aggravated by terrifying natural disasters, it is more urgent than ever to deal with items on our agenda, such as the economic and social effects of the arms race and its deeply damaging effect on peace and security in the world, and the link between disarmament and development and the possible reallocation of resources from military ends to civilian uses through disarmament measures.

Ecuador advocates the prohibition of force in international relations, the strengthening of machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes and the achievement of nuclear disarmament as an initial step towards achieving at a later stage general and complete disarmament under international control.

For all these reasons it is essential that the two super-Powers should be determined and persistent in conducting the Geneva negotiations on strategic
and medium-range nuclear weapons, and outer space weapons. The planet does not belong exclusively to the great Powers. The developing world must be heard on this subject.

Since reference has been made to background documents concerning this fortieth anniversary, we should like to recall that even before the San Francisco Conference a commitment was made by the great Powers in the Moscow Pact of 30 October 1943 in which the four major allies recognized "the need to ensure a rapid and orderly transition from war to peace and to establish and maintain international peace and security with the minimum use of human and economic resources for weapons purposes". They also committed themselves "to hold conferences and have co-operation between themselves and other Members of the United Nations in order to make possible an overall viable agreement on the control of weaponry in the post-war period".

Over 60 of the General Assembly resolutions adopted last year, and this year's agenda of this Committee, demonstrate the vital importance that all mankind attaches to this field of international co-operation. At the same time the most recent annual publication of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) tells us that the volume of military expenditures has increased over the past five years at a faster pace than in the preceding five years, and gives some terrifying statistics of the nuclear warheads being stockpiled by the super-Powers: approximately 6,000 megatons on one side and 4,000 megatons on the other, capable of blowing up the world many times over in a war that can never be won and which must therefore never be started. SIPRI finds that present levels of military expenditures, adjusted for world inflation, exceed $900 billion for the year 1985.

Bearing in mind these considerations, and the fact that the transfer of military expenditures to development purposes can be a pragmatic measure that can
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restore spiritual health to the human race, Ecuador, together with the other
countries that sponsored by consensus resolution 39/160 last year, believes that
the time has come for a detailed consideration of the link between disarmament and
development and to convene for that purpose an international conference at a high
political level.

Thus development, a concept that has arisen from the operations of the United
Nations system over the past 40 years, with its implications of national and
international justice, takes on additional importance as a basic aim of human
co-operation, for which peace, disarmament and even collective security are
necessary and contributing factors.

In this way it would be possible to eliminate the danger of the absurd arms
race, which is one of the main causes of the international economic crisis, which
has a special effect on the poor countries, above all as far as conventional
weapons are concerned.

Both the aggressive nuclear-weapons escalation which threatens the survival of
mankind and the conventional arms race promoted by the merchants of death have a
continuing devastating effect, as can be seen in the persistence of international
conflicts. This is why our country hopes that the States which have not yet done
so will as soon as possible accede to the United Nations Convention on Prohibitions
or Restrictions of Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be
Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. Ecuador also urges the
international community to conclude a convention on chemical weapons.

What we hope to achieve as regards disarmament within the territories of
various countries must also be sought in the other dimensions of our universe:
this applies to the sea beyond the territorial seas, as well as to the new
dimension of outer space, which must be preserved for peaceful purposes. In this
connection Ecuador, in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, has
expressed its interest together with the other equatorial countries, in view of its special geographical location in relation to the geostationary orbit where satellites are placed, and of the interests of the developing countries, in the establishment of a body of rules on the rational and equitable use of the geostationary orbit, which is a limited natural resource, already saturated, which should be used solely for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all peoples.

My delegation reserves its right to speak in the debate on the different agenda items and will lend its support or its sponsorship, as appropriate, to the drafts submitted, as we have done on disarmament items at previous sessions of the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to remind members of the Committee that the list of speakers for the general debate will close today at 6 p.m. and I urge representatives who wish to speak and have not yet inscribed their names on the list to do so as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 1:10 p.m.