



General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/40/PV.17 1 October 1985

ENGLISH

EXEMPLAIRES D'ARCHIVES FILE COPY

A relourner / Return to Distribution C. 111

Fortieth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 1 October 1985, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. DE PINIÉS

(Spain)

later:

Mr. MOUSHOUTAS (Vice-President)

(Cyprus)

- Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations [122] (continued)
- General debate [9] (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Jackson (Guyana)

Mr. Hayden (Australia)

Mr. Mahabir (Trinidad and Tobago)

Mr. Saldivar (Paraguay)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 122 (continued)

SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (A/40/645/Add.4)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to document A/40/645/Add.4, which contains a letter addressed to me by the Secretary-General informing me that, since the issuance of his communication dated 17 September 1985, Guinea-Bissau has made the necessary payment to reduce its arrears below the amount specified in Article 19 of the Charter.

May I take it that the General Assembly duly takes note of this information? It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 9 (continued)

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. JACKSON (Guyama): My first duty - which is a pleasant one - is to extend felicitations and congratulations to you, Sir, a distinguished son of Spain, upon your unanimous election to the presidency of this session of the General Assembly. I pleage the full co-operation of my delegation in your effort to make this important fortieth session of the General Assembly a distinctive and successful one.

Let me pay a special tribute also to your illustrious predecessor, Ambassador Paul Lusaka of Zambia, for his responsible and devoted service and for the impartial manner and serene dignity with which he discharged his duties as President.

May I also reaffirm our abiding support for our Secretary-General, whose qualities as an astute diplomat and an untiring devotee of the cause of internationalism are well known and widely respected. Once again, the

Secretary-General has given us in his annual report a penetrating analysis of the present international situation and eminently constructive ideas as regards the need for co-operative global action.

The Opening of this general debate has coincided with a tragedy of unspeakable proportions which has befallen our sister Latin American and Caribbean Republic of Mexico in the series of earthquakes which that country has suffered. I wish to utilize the opportunity offered by this public forum to reiterate the sentiments of regret and solidarity which were conveyed by my President, His Excellency Comrade Hugh Desmond Hoyte, to the President of the Republic of Mexico, His Excellency Miguel de la Madrid and to the Government and people of Mexico. Guyana is confident that the strength and courage which the Mexican people have demonstrated throughout their history will enable them soon to overcome the effects of this cruel disaster, with the help of the international community, and to resume without undue delay their task of nation-building.

We are now at the mid-point of the decade of the 1980s, which I suggest is an appropriate point at which to examine how we have fared during the first half of this decade, to do so against the background of our performance in the previous decade and to make a prognosis for the remainder of this decade and beyond.

In looking back at the 1970s, we should recall that it was the period when détente between the super-Powers was initiated. The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries welcomed that development and called for measures to sustain it and to make it global. It was the period when the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament was held and much hope was engendered that, through a series of interlocking activities, the survival of the peoples of the world would not be in jeopardy and tomorrow would be a better day.

The 1970s also witnessed a dramatic reduction of formal colonialism, for the intolerably long suffering of countries in Africa, the Caribbean and elsewhere came to an end and their peoples were once again free.

The hopes which the 1970s created were also reflected in the field of international economic relations. The adoption by the General Assembly of the Declaration on the Establishment of the New International Economic Order and of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States was an acknowledgement by the international community that global economic expansion could be secured only if economic relations among States were conducted on a just and equitable basis and the structural problems of developing countries were eliminated.

In the same vein, recognition must be given to the significant role which this Organization has played in fostering international co-operation in other fields. I think of the areas of human settlements, the role of women, the law of the sea and the protection of the environment as prime examples.

I suggest that it would be apposite to recall also the new relationships which were forged at the interregional, regional and subregional levels. The African, Caribbean and Pacific Countries and the European Economic Community engaged in intensive negotiations and the agreements reached, despite their imperfections, ushered in a different relationship. In my own region, the establishment of the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM) was a bold attempt to advance regional economic co-operation.

Finally, the period of the 1970s was a time when there was a growing appreciation of the nature of interdependence and that that interdependence should be based on symmetric relations between States and between peoples. In accordance with that acknowledgement of interdependence, Member States recognized that some problems required global solutions because of their very scope. This Organization

was therefore increasingly utilized in the service of all mankind in finding such solutions.

Unhappily, in the first five years of this decade the promise of the 1970s has not been fulfilled. Generally, in inter-State relations there is a certain primitiveness which stands in marked contrast to the spirit and accomplishments of the 1970s. It mocks the efforts expended over the years to establish a democratic international system, including a body of laws and rules carefully elaborated for the conduct of international relations. The major pillars of such a system are respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of States; the self-determination of peoples; the non-use or threat of use of force; non-interference in the internal affairs of States; collective security; and multilateral co-operation on an equitable basis.

Sadly, so far in this decade we have seen those principles observed too often in the breach. The independence of small States has not been respected and the fabric of international co-operation has been subjected to a sustained assault. And there are increasing indications of ideological intolerance in international relations.

In the field of disarmament the second special session yielded even more meagre results than its precursor. Meanwhile the arms race continues apace with the preparation for war consuming more financial resources than does any activity directed at strengthening peace or promoting development. The prospect of nuclear annihilation is now a major international concern. Yet in some Kafkaesque manner the existence of this common threat has not yet produced the unity of response that such a process demands. The sad reality is not only that the arms race continues on earth but also that concrete actions have begun which, if pursued to finality, will invite the result of making outer space an arena of military competition and confrontation.

The prime requirement of our time is the curbing of the arms race. In this respect a heavy responsibility devolves on the nuclear Powers, especially the United States and the Soviet Union. We have noted the stated positions of these two Powers, including their desire to engage seriously in arms negotiations and their awareness of the consequences of failure not only to themselves but to all of us.

Guyana has views on their past behaviour, but this not my concern on this occasion. Instead, today my desire is to add Guyana's voice, small but clear and sincere, to the many others heard from this rostrum to urge that the forthcoming Geneva summit talks be more than an exercise in establishing contact between the two leaders. These talks must be purposeful and constructive. The opportunity for them to usher in new and more structured relations between the two Powers should not be allowed to slip away.

To turn to the question of decolonization, the prolonged frustration of the independence of Namibia exemplifies the resistance of some States to the

decisions which truly represent the will of the international community. We should not be deflected by linkage or any other irrelevant consideration in our determination to secure implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978). Additionally, pressure should be brought to bear on South Africa to ensure its compliance with that resolution. In this regard let us commend the masses, led by the liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia, for exerting decisive pressure on the Pretoria régime to dismantle apartheid and to respect the rights of all the peoples of South Africa and Namibia. The duty of this Organization is to support them. Mandatory economic sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations should be applied during this session.

In other areas of the world, situations of tension and crisis with which this Organization was preoccupied in the 1970s are still on the international agenda. Since then, new problems have emerged.

In the Middle East the essential elements for a comprehensive and lasting settlement are well known. The key to peace remains the satisfaction of the legitimate Palestinian aspirations, including their right to a homeland. And let us here condemn the brutal attacks by the criminal Israeli forces on Tunisia and on the Palestinian headquarters. Further opposition to the convening of an international peace conference called for by this Assemby and involving the participation of all interested parties, including the Palestinian people, led by the Palestine Liberation Organization, only serves to prolong suffering and delay a settlement.

Similarly with Cyprus, whose independence and territorial integrity continue to be violated, a viable framework for a solution already exists in the relevant United Nations resolutions. The Secretary-General has been patient in carrying out

the mandate assigned to him. We commend his efforts and urge all Member States and the representatives of the two communities in Cyprus to give their fullest co-operation to him in his renewed endeavours.

It in Central America and the Caribbean that we see the most poignant manifestation of ideological intolerance. The social and economic situations of the peoples of this subregion have been exploited and manipulated by powerful external forces in the name of protecting them against the intrusion of an alien ideology. The result is tension, instability and a situation where peace and security are gravely imperilled.

Guyana believes that the struggles of the peoples of Central America are against centuric of neglect and disadvantage and that the problems in the relations between States in that region should be solved through dialogue and negotiation and not through the use of military force, whether directly or by proxies. That is why Guyana believes that the Contadora process deserves real and practical, as opposed to rhetorical, support by all members of the international community. For our part, we have given our wholehearted and consistent support to that process and to talks of a bilateral nature involving States within the region and between those States and interested parties outside it. Guyana also urges this Assembly to stand ready to facilitate the initiatives for peace in Central America which emerge from and have the blessing of the peoples of that subregion. Among other things this Assembly should give its endorsement to and encourage the work of the Contadora support group.

The prospects for securing progress in establishing a new international economic order and achieving sustained growth in the world economy are diminished by the current retreat from multilateralism and by the reluctance to engage in

discussion about global negotiations which, if launched on a mutually agreed basis, could constitute a comprehensive means by which the international community can restructure international economic relations while simultaneously strengthening multilateral economic co-operation.

At the same time, some developed States are willing to do no more than tinker with the international trade and payments system in spite of its many defects and inability to respond with any degree of accuracy or consistency to the needs of the majority of the international community. Though the reality of interdependence has become more obvious with the lingering economic crisis, its requirements are being ignored by some rich and powerful States as they seek to exert greater control over international economic relations.

A critical factor in the troubled international monetary and financial system is the problem of debt facing the developing countries. It is a problem that has already been forcefully and eloquently addressed at this Assembly.

Let us hope that we can at this session reach conclusions that will reflect the spirit of international co-operation that was evident in the 1970s.

Linked to the capacity to repay debts is the fact that the commodities traded by developing countries have been afflicted by low prices, weak demand and the managed contraction of markets in the developed world. This problem has had an adverse impact on the quality of life in many developing countries. What is required of the international community is increased co-operation in the formulation of international commodity policy, including the improvement of stabilization schemes.

Unfortunately, these negative postures on the part of some developed countries extend to this Organization and its specialized agencies in their articulation of programmes of economic co-operation among developing countries. We of the developing world, however, have not relaxed our efforts, and the record will show that co-operation among countries of the South at various levels continues to increase and to be intensified.

Guyana will not retreat from its commitment to internationalism. That is why we again urge those developed countries which have stood aside in the past or takensteps to frustrate international action in this respect to alter their positions and join those of us promoting genuine all-round development.

In addition to these situations, there are at least two issues which are causing increasing international concern. I refer to the abuse of and trafficking in drugs, and terrorism. As regards the latter, the Secretary-General has reminded us in his annual report on the work of the Organization that "some of the necessary international legal instruments are in place" (A/40/1, p. 15). We must not only resolve to implement these instruments fully but also decide whether additional measures for international co-operation are required and can be agreed upon. Last year this Assembly adopted a far-reaching resolution against State terrorism, which helped in clarifying the issues. As we continue to address this subject, we have to ensure that action is not proposed as part of an ideological crusade, for this is bound to complicate the search for agreed solutions.

On the question of drugs, Guyana supports the Secretary-General's proposal that a global conference should be convened to deal with all aspects of drug abuse and illicit trafficking. While we welcome and look forward to the holding of such a conference, we must nevertheless emphasize that the problem of drugs cannot be approached in an isolated manner.

For many States and peoples the intensification of drug abuse is not unrelated to social and economic conditions. This connection must certainly be taken into consideration in any meaningful international approach to the question. It is therefore our hope that the nature and extent of the drug problem will encourage an appreciation of the urgency of the need for dialogue leading to international co-operation over a much wider field, as developing countries have been calling for over the years.

As we look forward in our search for peace and international co-operation, I wish to leave this Assembly with two thoughts.

The first relates to sports. The Olympic Games were in this decade infected by some most distressing attitudes which deepened divisions between peoples and

between States. Of course there can be no compromise with <u>apartheid</u> in this regard. There are already existing instruments and, hopefully, during this session we can adopt the draft International Convention against <u>Apartheid</u> in Sports, which has been so carefully and elaborately prepared. However, I ask the question: can the Olympic Games not be used in the future to promote reconciliation and understanding between peoples and States, and thus serve the cause of peace? In view of the holding of the forthcoming Olympics in Korea, can they not be employed in a positive and constructive way to foster a climate which will facilitate the search for a solution to the problem of the divided Korean peninsula?

The second thought relates to decolonization. This Organization has been correctly applauded for its contribution to decolonization. But in rightly focusing our attention on the need to bring a formal end to political colonialism, a few vestiges of which remain, may we not have underplayed or even overlooked some consequences of colonizatism which persist to this very day and which have a negative impact on inter-state relations and on the capacity of the United Nations adequately to fulfil its purposes? For colonialism affected both the colonizer and the colonized. One obvious legacy is the pervasiveness of underdevelopment and the instability which it causes. The other, which is no less disturbing, is the continuing manifestation, oft times insidious, of attitudes, postures and policies akin to those of the colonizer. Action at both the national and international levels to alter permanently these adverse conditions will enhance international co-operation, peace and security.

From its inception the Non-Aligned Movement had as its overriding objective a world of free and equal sovereign States conducting their relations, among themselves and through institutions which they had created, in a democratic manner. That is why the Non-Aligned Movement has never wavered in its stand

against imperialism, colonialism, racism and alien domination, and has always been a vigorous advocate of the democratization of international relations.

During the 1970s our Movement strengthened its internal mechanisms for seeking the acceptance of its recommendations and decisions in this Assembly and elsewhere; and we have maintained that activism to this very day.

The Non-Aligned Movement has been and will always be an inveterate campaigner for peace and for equitable development based on mutual benefit. When our Heads of State or Government last met in New Delhi in 1983, they articulated a multifaceted programme of action affecting not only co-operation among non-aligned countries but many of the burning issues, the solutions of which require open and meaningful international co-operation. The response by the international community to several of these initiatives, however, has not always been positive. That notwithstanding, the Movement sought to carry forward the work of the summit meeting at the Conference of Foreign Ministers held recently in Luanda, Angola.

The members of the Non-Aligned Movement believe that the Luanda Declaration provides an adequate framework and concrete proposals for action at this Assembly.

The Movement will judge the attitudes of the rest of the membership of this Organization by their reaction to our efforts to get accepted at this Assembly the Movement's proposals for international co-operation and for action on specific issues.

We are not inflexible and we will remain ready, as always, for negotiations which are honestly and sincerely embraced. Such negotiations should have as a primary objective the harmonization of the manifold interests of all our States, a fundamental purpose of the Charter. What we cannot negotiate are the principles which are the bedrock of our Movement's solidarity - principles which I dare say are universal in character.

Let us demonstrate during the period of this, the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, that we, as a collectivity, are equal to the task.

Mr. HAYDEN (Australia): I extend my congratulations to you,

Mr. President, on your election to the presidency of this fortieth session of the

General Assembly. Your long service in this body and your extensive diplomatic

experience will stand us all in good stead. I would also like to express our

sincere congratulations to your predecessor, Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, on his

exemplary work throughout the thirty-ninth session.

I would additionally like to express the profound concern and sympathy of the Australian Government and the Australian people to the Government of the Republic of Mexico on the great national and personal tragedy which has beset Mexico City. We trust that the indefatigable energies of the Mexican people and their Government and the commitment and understanding of the rest of the world allow Mexico to rebuild and progress with confidence.

There were plenty of people in 1945, and especially in the dark days in the five or six years following, who would hever have believed that we would survive to celebrate the fortieth birthday of this Organization. Even if only for that fact, we should not begrudge the tone of relief and congratulation in the statements made in this Assembly this year. Over the past 40 years significant progress has been made towards putting into concrete form the decisions of 1945: that we were indeed a global community, that no place could any longer be insulated against the currents of change let loose by a second world war, that in a novel world of independent sovereign nations a coherent system of international authority and solidarity was needed.

This being a special occasion, I intend the Australian statement to be not the usual survey of world developments but more an examination of the condition in which the United Nations finds itself after 40 years.

The development of the United Nations has led us to accept a code of international behaviour. Great and successful work has been carried out on codifying international laws on matters such as sovereignty over the sea and the sea-bed which used to be a cause of war. The process of post-War decolonization, which could have been so painful in so many areas, has been eased and enabled. I might say in parenthesis that Australia regrets that the decolonization process in New Caledonia has not gone ahead at the pace which the world community might have expected. We regret it particularly because of the unsettling effect it is having on our region.

Humanity everywhere has benefited from such developments as the recognition that human rights are the rightful concern of the world community. Collective effort has brought about economic and social advance for millions of people who would otherwise have remained mere objects of historical accident or coincidence. It is all but impossible to put a value on the outcome of the activities born in

this collective spirit: the literacy programme of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; the United Nations Children's Fund; the United Nations Development Programme; the Food and Agriculture Organization; the World Food Programme and other forms of material assistance; the lives saved by the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; the social profit from such programmes as the "ecent women's Conference in Nairobi; and the International Years of the disabled, of youth and of peace.

For the past 40 years no world war has broken out, though we have been close at times, and an important factor in this success has been the authority and sense of community which has been won by this Organization. I make this last point in the list of blessings which the United Nations has helped bestow on the international community not because it is a cause for congratulations between us here but because it is also a matter which should cause us to think carefully about what we mean by such concepts as peace and progress and community independence. It is a matter which should cause us to reflect on whether or not we can make this Organization serve these concepts more effectively and justly, especially in the context of peace and freedom.

In his report on the work of the Organization the Secretary-General refers to a remark by the late President Franklin Roosevelt which was a guiding signal to the Australian Government at the time. The United Nations, the President said,

"spells - and it ought to spell - the end of the system of unilateral action, exclusive alliances, and spheres of influence, and balances of power, and all the other expedients which have been tried for centuries and have always failed". (A/40/1, p. 2)

If that standard is applied to this Organization, it has to be said that we still have a lot to do.

Let me emphasize a point about our record of there having been no world wars for 40 years. There are people on every continent who would disagree strongly. There are people on every continent who would hold that when we talk about the absence of world war we have a very limited world in mind. There are people on every continent whose world would have been shattered or even destroyed by events that many of us here would call little local difficulties. These people discern from the international structures that we have created, such as the United Nations, that our world is a place in which political, economic and military power is restricted. They observe the great paradox of the United Nations, that, as the international community of independent States has grown, power in it has been given into fewer hands.*

The Secretary-General has drawn our attention to an example of this: the impact on many countries of indebtedness and methods of debt-servicing - a complex and sensitive issue. If the rich could hire other people to die for them, as the old saying goes, the poor could make a wonderful living. Measures such as adjustment programmes and debt rescheduling are important elements of a strategy which may be successful. I say "may be" because we cannot yet assume that the problem is solved. Moreover, we have to be careful that the cure will not kill the patient. We have to take care that, while adjustment measures may restore credit-worthiness and stability to debtor countries, they do not undermine the often fragile democracy existing in those countries. And those debtor countries which are going through the adjustment process have every right to expect support from the international community, in policies leading to reasonable exchange rates, for example, in credible exchange rates and in better access to the markets of industrialized countries.

^{*} Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Vice-President, took the Chair.

This is an example not only of the concentration of power but also of concentrated power being exercised outside the influence of this Organization. This process began, in fact, when the founding nations gathered to organize the United Nations. In Australia we noted that the topic of discussion was not paths to peace so much as the distribution of power, who should have it, who could share it. This was the grain of sand that was put into the machinery of world government. The machinery works; there is no argument about that: As I have said, it provides world order, world authority and the foundation of a true world community. But the machinery could work better for those who were not present at the power-sharing ceremonies 40 years ago.

At the United Nations we weave complex webs of theology and rhetoric about such developments as <u>apartheid</u>, for example, or disarmament. We have learned to live with these problems. Some of us employ experts who spend their entire careers working at them. Somehow, the problems remain and even grow. This is in spite of the fact that they create concern and sometimes even terror among many people who rely on us for representation. The Australian Government contends that at this fortieth session of the General Assembly we should start the process by which the Organization will become more effective in dealing with such problems for the greater good. I have deliberately nominated <u>apartheid</u> and disarmament because of both their potential for disaster and the better capacity of the United Nations to deal with them.

I do not intend to dwell on the evil nature of <u>apartheid</u>, which is obvious to all here. It is a moral abomination. The South African Government has carried out some cosmetic pruning of it, but its trunk, its main branches and its roots remain, in the main, untouched. The question is, will its inevitable downfall be even more violent than what we have already witnessed or can we help remove it relatively peacefully? Each day of bloodshed in South Africa makes the prospect

of moderation more remote. The Australian Government still maintains, however, that it should try peaceful pressure while it can to persuade the South African Government to abandon a barbaric system which is inevitably heading for massive violence and join a world which has more civilized standards.

Australia has suspended new official investment in South Africa and has prohibited South African Government investment in Australia. Australian banks and other financial institutions have been asked to suspend new loans to borrowers in South Africa. We have taken steps to withdraw our Trade Commissioner from South Africa and to withdraw Government assistance to Australians trading with South Africa. Australia will no longer export to South Africa petroleum products, computers and equipment known to be of use to South African security forces. We have prohibited the import of krugerrands, all other coins minted in South Africa and military supplies. We have introduced a code of conduct for Australian companies operating in South Africa which ensures that they do not profit from the use of racist labour laws and practices.

We are preparing a strategy for the meeting next month of the Commonwealth Heads of Government to continue this policy. We have in mind setting up a group of international authorities to work out proposals for peaceful transition in South Africa as well as a group which will study ways in which new investment in South Africa can be suspended.

The Austra'ian Government, furthermore, is working in this Organization for a worldwide, mandatory system of economic sanctions. We appreciate the concern that some governments have that sanctions will hurt black South Africans. They should note, however, that black South Africans themselves are calling for such sanctions, even though they could be put to death for doing so. The South Africans who will suffer most from sanctions will be the privileged white elite who are benefiting most from the apartheid system. Recent overtures by white businessmen to black leaders indicate that business has a clearer vision of reality than the zealots in the South African Government. Australia believes that it is especially important that those countries who are major investors in South Africa should take up an active role in the campaign for sanctions for which Australia will be working.

The case of Namibia is a closely-related problem. As a member of the Council for Namibia and a nation with a close interest in decolonization, Australia is especially concerned at South Africa's flagrant defiance of the United Nations in this matter. The United Nations terminated South Africa's mandate over Namibia nearly 20 years ago. It established the Council as the legal Administering Authority. United Nations resolutions set out a simple and workable plan for the handover of Namibia to its people through free elections. The South African Government's refusal to do this has led to South Africa's forces rampaging in their neighbours' territory and murdering their neighbours' citizens. We condemn South Africa's behaviour in this matter, which adds another reason for the Security

Council imposing mandatory economic sanctions on a government which is rapidly running out of friends.

Nuclear disarmament is an example of an issue on which significant advance has been aghieved; but not so significant as to dispel the fear that many people have about it. By progress, I mean such fundamentally important arrangements as the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the SALT I and II agreements. I have especially in mind the non-proliferation Treaty where the Review Conference ended its deliberations only 10 days ago. The non-proliferation Treaty has made an extraordinary contribution to stability in the nuclear age, providing security for all of us - signatories or not. The Review Conference itself was an encouraging example of international co-operation. Treaty partners reaffirmed its validity and strength. But they also argued that it needs to be more effectively implemented in such key areas as the development of the safequards régime. They drew attention to the urgent need for article VI of the Treaty to be fully implemented and to the particular responsibilities of the nuclear-weapon States. The agreement on a treaty for a South Pacific nuclear-free zone, reached by member States of the South Pacific forum last month, was welcomed at the conference. Nuclear-weapon States are invited to adhere to the relevant protocols of this Treaty. Of course, I repeat the invitation today. The Antarctic is exempted from the international arms race by specific provisions against its militarization. As an Antarctic Treaty party we applaud this and the general manner in which the Antarctic is managed.

So progress has been made on this potentially most destructive problem facing us. But it must also be said that the progress has been slow, often limited and often grudging. The Australian Government says this, not as a bystander wringing its hands, but as an active and sometimes frustrated participant in the disarmament process. We have a right to express this frustration. We understand that the

major and primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war rests with the nuclear-weapon States, and particularly the super-Powers. In this sense, disarmament suffers from the same irony that afflicts the United Nations as a whole: though the effects of nuclear war would be felt by all, direct power to prevent it is restricted to a few. The few should reflect on this. Probably as many as 30 States, including Australia, have considered acquiring nuclear weapons at one time or other because of the security and status they were thought to provide. Those countries have decided not to do so because they accept the norm laid down in the non-proliferation Treaty that nuclear weapons are simply not acceptable in the progressive world order. In making this decision, those States earned the right to influence the disarmament process, rather than leave it to an exclusive coterie of nuclear Powers. They have earned the right to point out aspects of the process which give them cause for concern.

We in Australia, of course, appreciate the complexities of the process. Our view is that the foremost goal of disarmament negotiations is early and radical reductions in the number of nuclear weapons. If negotiations focus on this and if they take fair account of the valid interest of each party in the maintenance of stability, it should not be all that difficult to identify the numbers and types of weapon systems which could be reduced. Difficulties would arise if the negotiations are not conducted in the fair way I have just described. They would also arise if agreement on reductions is made conditional on other issues. We would be deeply concerned, for instance, if linkage with other, perhaps related, but clearly separate matters held up movement towards reduction of weapons.

Another of our concerns is the possibility of an arms race in space. The Australian Government has declined to endorse the United Staes strategic defence initiative. We prefer that maximum attention be given to eliminating existing

weapons systems, preserving the anti-ballistic missile régime and enhancing international efforts to ensure that activities in space remain exclusively for peaceful purposes. It is necessary to speak plainly in a situation in which there is inadequate clarity about the facts. There should be no weapons system in space, in our view. If there are such systems, and if those who propose the exclusively peaceful use of space have such systems already there, they should remove them. If there is an honest difference in interpreting what constitutes permissible research under the anti-ballistic missile Treaty, those who want to preserve the anti-ballistic missile régime should be able to work the differences out.

The Soviet Union has proposed to the Assembly that we should take a new step towards international co-operation in space. The Australian Government will study the proposal carefully and critically, bearing in mind all the ramifications of the extensive research on this matter which has already been conducted over many years by the Soviet Union.

Our most immediate concern on arms control and disarmament is the failure to agree on a treaty which would prohibit all nuclear tests by all States in all environments for all time. Such a comprehensive ban is essential to an end to an arms race. This is why it has been sought for the best part of 25 years. This is why commitments to negotiate such a treaty have been made in so many existing international agreements, including the non-proliferation Treaty. And this is why progress towards such a treaty has been so frustratingly slow. The concluding document of the non-proliferation Treaty Review Conference called on the nuclear-weapon States to resume negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a matter of urgency and before the end of this year.

I propose to take up this call at the Assembly. I direct it particularly at those members of the Conference on Disarmament who have withheld consensus on proposals which Australia, New Zealand and others have made so that practical work can be started without delay on the comprehensive test-ban treaty. Procedural wrangling about how that work should be described does a terrible disservice to the community that we represent here.

We all know that there are differences of view on the issues of scope, verification and compliance in such a comprehensive test-ban arrangement. But the only way these differences will be resolved is for us to sit down together and work on them. As the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference proposes, this should be done without more delay. If delay continues, the Australian Government intends to search for an alternative means of settling the problems of scope, verification and compliance. In other words, if there are nuclear-weapon States that have problems with the details of scope, verification and compliance, we intend to work with like-minded non-nuclear-weapon States to establish a working alternative.

Before I leave the disarmament issue, I wish to record the Australian Government's appreciation of the decision by the Government of China, earlier this year, that it would participate in work on a comprehensive test-ban treaty as soon as it is able to be started in the Committee on Disarmament. One nuclear-weapon State, France, chooses by contrast to take no part in discussing the test-ban issue. Moreover, it continues to conduct tests in the Pacific, far from metropolitan France, in what is now within the area of the South Pacific nuclear-free zone. It continues to do so over the vehement and consistent protest of the nations in the area. Australia takes no pleasure in disputes with France. But France insists on provoking dispute through its testing policy and activities in the region, which President Mitterrand himself has admitted are an absurd crime and sabotage. This makes us all the more bitter to be told by France that it will not conduct these so-called harmless nuclear tests in France, rather than where we and our friends live. That is why we resent so much acts of so described sabotage on the territory of a nation which considered France to be its friend.

Disarmament and the problems of southern Africa are but two of the major issues before the world community which have caused speculation about the capacity of the international system to resolve long-standing issues on its agenda. in mind those problems which threaten international or regional security, such as the tragic turmoil in Lebanon and the continuing occupation of Afghanistan, which we continue to condemn. I repeat Australia's condemnation of Viet Nam's continuing occupation of Cambodia, though we are encouraged by recent signs of progress towards political settlement brought about by the good offices of our friends Indonesia and Malaysia. We have also been heartened by some signs of forward movement towards a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. Despite the deplorable Israeli violation of the sovereignty of Tunisia, we still hope that all sides will work towards early and substantive negotiations. In these and other cases, the ability of this Organization to effect solutions has been limited in various ways. The veto has been used in the Security Council, not in the dispassionate, tutelary manner envisaged 40 years ago, but more to protect the interests of the veto Powers. Threats to the international system come from the effects of underdevelopment and trade inequity, as well as from war. But the Security Council, despite its peace-keeping obligations, shares little if any of the power wielded on these issues through such bodies as the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The question arises: Should wider potentially destabilizing issues, as well as military threats, be considered by the Security Council?

Hundreds of thousands of people are being destroyed by the war between Iraq and Iran. Twenty-five Members of this Organization - some of them with great influence - sell arms to one or other of the combatants. Nine Member nations sell arms to both. Should United Nations Members be allowed without penalty to turn the Iraq-Iran war into a gigantic arms bazaar as well as a charnel house? Practical

answers to these terrible problems are available and they can be forged by this Organization. It is my Government's hope that the Security Council will be able, impartially, to assist both countries in moving towards a resolution of this terrible conflict.

The record of the United Nations in easing the decolonization process is an interpolation, as I have pointed out. But colonization survives and even in its last moments it causes pain and tension. We see something of this especially in the Pacific region. The question perhaps might be asked: Should decolonization, its pace and its extent, be left to the colonizing Power or should it be a matter for involvement by this Organization?

Prevention of nuclear war is the most immediately pressing task facing us today. This demands nuclear disarmament. Negotiations on the issue are proceeding in Geneva, and we are all grateful for that. It has to be appreciated that the minutiae of arms control arrangements can practically be dealt with only by those immediately involved. But the ramifications of arms control arrangements, or lack of such arrangements, flow beyond the borders and responsibilities of those immediatly involved. Is there a case for the proposal by my colleague from Burkina Faso for the Security Council, the world's paramount peace-keeping organization, to meet especially to discuss peace and disarmament in the context of world economic and social development? Should the Council be reformed to reflect more accurately the world as it is today? The United Nations and its institutions have contributed to peace and progress on a scale and in ways that almost defy valuation. Could it do even better without structures which may be found, after careful evaluation, to be perhaps imperfect or outdated?

These questions, of course, have been heard before. They are heard more often as the United Nations advances into respectable maturity. They were raised at the Security Council last week, where a degree of consensus evolved in favour of the need for greater commitment and efficiency. Australia raises them here in an attempt to get the issues that they raise examined while we are of a mind to reflect on our achievements and our failures. We raise these questions in a spirit of active and profound loyalty to the United Nations and its ideals.

Australia is one of the founding and original Members of the United Nations. We are a member of the Security Council. We have provided moral, physical and financial support for a vast range of United Nations activities: from control over narcotics, keeping the peace, improving the status of women and the health of children to the survival of refugees. In all these activities, the Australian Government has had the benefit of the great goodwill of the Australian people. appreciate the complications of the system. We understand the drawbacks of the political process. We know that nations cannot be expected to ignore genuine national interests. But we also realize that the United Nations will get nowhere if we are not also fuelled by the idealism which created such concepts as the World Health Organization (WHO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Development Programme and the Conference on Disarmament. We should therefore take our fortieth anniversary as an opportunity to renew this idealism, committed to ensuring that the operations and structure of the United Nations are not vehicles for our own shortcomings or ambitions, but are relevant to a world whose complexity and needs could not have been even imagined 40 years ago.

Mr. MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago): It is a pleasure for me, on behalf of the Government and people of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, to offer our congratulations to the President on his election to preside over the General Assembly during this fortieth session of our Organization. His long association with the United Nations as a representative of Spain, and his vast experience in international affairs will, I am confident, ensure that this commemorative session contributes substantially towards the attainment of the goals, enshrined in our Charter, of world peace, justice and economic and social progress. I gladly avail myself of this opportunity also to pay a deserved tribute to Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, who presided so capably over the work of the General Assembly at its thirty-ninth session.

On behalf of the Government and people of Trinidad and Tobago, I convey to the Government and people of Mexico our heartfelt sympathy over the extensive destruction and loss of life resulting from the recent earthquakes.

It is a sobering commentary on the status of many countries 40 years ago, and on the enormous changes that have since taken place, that of the 159 Members of our Organization more than half were not independent when the United Nations Charter was signed in San Francisco in 1945. Indeed, nearly a quarter of the Member States represented here today, my own included, gained their independence as late as the decade of the 1960s, which saw an acceleration of the process of the dissolution of the world-wide system of colonialism. Thus do the resolve of people and the passage of time bring about changes which reshape the course of history.

Every anniversary provides an opportunity, if not for rejoicing, at least for reflection, and as we reflect upon the events of the 40 years since the inauguration of our Assembly, it may be useful to examine that period in terms of what it has meant to us, Member States of the Organization.

In doing so we may consider the period from several standpoints: as having been one of 40 years of strengthening the Organization; of 40 years of trying to resolve conflicts; of 40 years of searching for agreement on disarmament; of 40 years of furthering economic, social and cultural development. But some may ask "Have they been 40 years of advancement or of retrogression or stalemate? Has it been a period of continuing confidence and hope in the future of the world, or one of despair over a world seemingly still torn apart by its contradictions?"

When he addressed the commemorative meeting in San Francisco earlier this year, our Secretary-General boldly faced that question, and listed a number of areas in which the multilaterialism embodied in the United Nations provides the necessary structure within which nations can work together for progress that no nation acting alone can accomplish. He was not overstating the role of the United Nations when he declared that for 40 years the Organization had provided the catalyst, the framework and the machinery for the continued common engagement in the betterment of the human condition upon which the peace of the world has depended so much.

The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago recognizes and applauds the invaluable achievements of the United Nations, which have been articulated by the Secretary-General and several representatives who have addressed the Assembly. There is, in fact, clear evidence in many parts of the world that several of the objectives set out in the Charter have been, or are being, realized. We may take much satisfaction in those achievements. But this is not an occasion only, or even primarily, for self-congratulation. We must be equally candid in acknowledging that, despite our efforts, solutions to many contentious issues still seem to be elusive and that much more work remains to be done. Many of the objectives and purposes of the Charter have been only partially achieved, and the consequent disappointment has tended to engender frustration and disillusionment and to retard

progress. There is evident need for a renewal of our commitment to the objectives and purposes of our Charter.

In the area of economic and social development, the responsibilities of the United Nations must of necessity be more important and far-reaching today than in 1945. The United Nations now comprises 159 sovereign States, but some three quarters of the world's population dwell in States whose inherited social and economic structures still confine them to a peripheral position outside the mainstream of the international economic and financial system.

The Charter of the United Nations contains a pledge - that the people of the United Nations are determined to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic advancement of all peoples. Yet the quest, in which we in the developing world repose so much hope and faith, for the new international economic order that would establish a world economic system predicated on justice and equality, is still to be completed. Indeed, it is not even being seriously considered in some quarters. The developed States must surely have recognized by now that the proposed new international economic order does not constitute a threat to their economic well-being, but that it is a concept designed primarily to restructure economic interaction and promote the economic growth of all peoples.

Unhappily, indifference and inaction have confronted all the efforts to bring about global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development, the elaboration of a code of conduct on transnational corporations, the establishment of a long-term financing system for science and technology for development and the attainment of the targets and objectives mutually agreed in the International Development Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the critical, ever-worsening economic situation throughout the world continues to be a cause of serious concern and that

developing States, which once looked to multilateral financing institutions to assist them with their complex economic problems, are now, with good reason, losing faith in them. Their discouragement is aggravated by the fact that any demonstration of economic improvement by any of those countries tends to bring with it the application of concepts such as that of graduation, which alters their eligibility status and entails the loss of much-needed assistance from trading partners and international development organizations.

That is not all. One of the most serious problems facing developing States is that of massive and spiralling debt, and their inability not merely to repay the capital but even to meet the huge interest payments unilaterally prescribed. In fact, developing States have been forced to seek new loans to meet interest payments on previous loans. It is difficult to see where the spiral will end. A debt must always be honoured. There is, however, the concomitant responsibility on the part of the developed world to ensure that the terms are such that they do not defeat the objective for which the loan was contracted and do not cause economic strangulation. The flexibility necessary to keep payments attuned to the socio-economic perspective must be retained.

Sources of long-term financing are crucial to the economic programme of developing States, and it is clear that those States cannot afford, as they are now required, to borrow at commercial rather than at concessional rates. Yet, the cost of borrowing from the institutions engaged in international finance, which were supposedly designed as the machinery for the promotion of the economic development of all peoples, has become economically too high and politically too explosive for most developing countries. Why impose on today's developing countries conditions of financing so much more onerous than those experienced by the present developed countries in the early stages of their growth and development?

Another serious problem facing developing countries is the spread of trade protectionism. Those developing States which, by their sustained efforts towards development have managed to create manufacturing and industrial sectors that are able to compete with those of developed States, often find that methods are devised to bar the entry of their products into the markets of the developed economies. At the same time, forces beyond the control of developing countries, and unmindful of their particular circumstances, dictate the prices and the conditions of purchase of their traditional primary products. The terms of trade continue to move inexorably against those States, with inevitable adverse consequences for their balance-of-payment positions.

Since developing States are not being adequately remunerated for their primary products and are prevented from selling whatever else they produce and manufacture, they have been left in the invidious position of possessing insufficient funds to purchase the products of other States. As a result, the level of economic activity in the developing States has declined, unemployment is increasing and their capacity to maintain trade, even among themselves, is being considerably undermined.

Over the years, the United Nations has sought to address and resolve questions such as these through the establishment of a number of agencies and institutions. However, despite the activities of organizations such as the United Nations

Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and

Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the progress towards development in many countries of the world has generally been slow. These agencies have, none the less, played a positive role in seeking to give practical effect to the principles on which the United Nations system was founded. They have demonstrated a keen awareness of, and sensitivity to the problems and needs of developing States. But the financial difficulties which certain of these agencies have latterly encountered, in part because support from some Member States has tended to decline, have had the effect of impairing the ability of the United Nations system to function in accordance with the principles enunciated by its founders.

We should, perhaps, acknowledge that the mechanisms of collaboration and co-operation in the United Nations system are of value only to the extent that they assist in the attainment of the Organization's objectives. Over the years, we have elaborated and refined our perspective in this regard. But can the problem be that insufficient attention has been given to evaluating the mechanisms employed to attain these objectives? Perhaps this fortieth session might well give priority to addressing these issues.

The Charter sets out a number of objectives aimed at satisfying the unrelenting quest for justice, freedom, equality, peace and economic and social advancement. We have made much progress towards each of these goals, but none of us, after 40 years of effort, can feel fully satisfied with what we have

accomplished. Our disappointment is, perhaps, most acute in respect of the Charter's requirement that we promote and encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religious belief. Our attention is directed daily to more and more cases of violation of human rights and denial of fundamental freedoms. In no area of the world are the violation of human rights and the denial of freedoms more offensive to the spirit and the principles of the Charter of our Organization than in South Africa.

We are surely not alone in this Assembly in holding fast to the belief that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Representing, as I do, a country whose National Anthem proudly proclaims "...Every creed and race find an equal place..." I cannot find words expressive enough of my country's repugnance at that odious system of apartheid that discriminates against people on the basis of their race and colour.

Our Organization was founded 40 years ago in order that the world might never again be faced with the evils of nazism. But we meet today, conscious that an evil no less great continues to confront us. We are all aware of the similarities between nazism and apartheid, both founded on the spurious doctrine of racial superiority. Just as nazism was in the 1940s, apartheid is, equally today, a threat to international peace and security. Nazism was overcome by international effort, by a collective effort to which many of the then dependent countries contributed with their material and human resources. I need not elaborate on the number of young men and women, the flower of the populations of countries still under the yoke of colonialism, who volunteered and sacrificed their lives in the

fight against nazism. Is it too much to ask for a similar concerted international effort to overcome apartheid? Is it too much to ask today that all countries take those steps which will contribute effectively to the efforts to secure the total eradication from the face of the earth of this pernicious system? That is not too much to ask. We call upon all the Member States of the United Nations to implement fully the many resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council concerning South Africa and to apply immediately the measures provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter. We must move with dispatch and a sense of urgency. Unless we do, there will be no end to the spiralling violence which has claimed so many lives in South Africa.

A related source of disappointment to our Organization must be our continuing failure to secure compliance by South Africa with resolutions and decisions demanding that it end its illegal occupation of Namibia and allow the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination. In addition, South Africa has paid no heed to the repeated condemnation by this Organization of its acts of armed aggression against neighbouring States, in contemptuous defiance of world opinion and of the principles of the Charter to which it once purported to subscribe. No Member State should be allowed to arrogate unto itself the right to flout with impunity the just and legitimate decisions of this Organization. Yet, that is exactly what South Africa continues to do, daring the Organization to prevent it or to punish it. Against all reasoning, urging, and warning, it remains obdurate and unrepentant.

Trinidad and Tobago reitestates its concern over the number of areas of tension which remain volatile and of regional conflicts which continue to defy solution, thereby threatening international peace and security. The need to respect principles of territorial integrity and of non-interference, and to adhere to the principle of the peaceful resolution of conflicts, has never been greater. In this regard, we reaffirm our confidence that the situation in Central America can be resolved through regional negotiations, and we express our continuing support for the efforts of the Contadora group. We also welcome the recent creation of the support group, comprising Argentina, Brazil, Peru and Uruguay, to assist in the Contadora process. It is our earnest hope that those joint efforts, and the goodwill of the countries directly involved, will bring about an early end to the conflict in Central America.

Trinidad and Tobago notes with much satisfaction the resumption of dialogue between the two Koreas which has led to the recent exchange of visits by families. We urge that the dialogue be continued in a spirit of greater understanding and co-operation so as to ensure a peaceful solution to the Korean problem. We also note the situation in South-East Asia and propose that all the parties involved enter into or continue dialogue to resolve conflict in that area.

Our Secretary-General has been untiring in his efforts to find solutions to the many problems before the United Nations. Not least among them is the situation in Cyprus. It is not too much to hope that as we celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we shall see the resolution of this long-standing problem.

The conflicts in the Middle East continue to bring suffering, misery and deprivation to the peoples of that region. In the name of humanity, a way must be found to bring their anguish to an early end.

In our continuing efforts to defuse the arms race, it is significant to recall that the very first resolution of the General Assembly dealt with the question of disarmament. Yet, over the past 40 years, instead of a reduction we have witnessed a quantitative and qualitative increase in the arsenals of both nuclear and conventional weapons.

It is a reproach to the conscience of this Organization that while an increasing proportion of the world's population seems doomed to continue to live in conditions of penury, squalor, famine and ill health, some countries find it necessary to spend enormous sums of money each year on a never-ending quest for arms superiority. Since the acquisition of increasing quantities of arms implies a fear - or the fact - that the conditions for peace no longer exist, is our commitment to the peace provisions of our Charter to be considered no longer credible?

My delegation supports the call of the ministerial meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held recently in Luanda, for the convening of a third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We believe that Member States acting in concert could make a meaningful contribution at such a session to efforts at halting and reversing the arms race.

Trinidad and Tobago also supports the call for an international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development. Such a conference could establish the mechanisms through which the vast resources now devoted to the production of armaments could be channelled into peaceful and productive activities.

We believe that security for nations is more likely to be achieved through political, social and economic co-operation than through investment in and deployment of newer and even more awesome means of mass destruction. This celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations must therefore have as one of its primary objectives the attainment of a substantial reduction in the production and proliferation of weapons of all types and the redirection of the resources now used for those purposes to secure a significant improvement in the quality of life of all peoples.

When moved to compassion by harrowing televised scenes of hunger, squalor and disease afflicting countless millions throughout the world, Member States of our Organization have demonstrated that at the national level they are not lacking either in sympathy or in the capacity quickly and effectively to transform that sympathy into adequate material assistance in an emergency situation. But we evidently find it difficult to take the necessary steps to ensure that our Organization and its relevant agencies are adequately provided with the necessary requirements for averting such emergency situations.

If, because of the lack of appropriate means, our Organization is rendered

incapable of employing "international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples", as envisaged in our Charter, it will be unable to achieve the objective of promoting social progress and better standards of life.

The economic and social conditions of those Member States that would most benefit from the international assistance that our Organization was intended to provide have in recent years been aggravated by the deteriorating world economic climate. Although some of our Member States are clearly in a better position than others to contribute effectively to the solution of the world's economic problems, our Charter prescribes the need for co-operative action. Member States therefore have a solemn obligation to ensure the achievement of international co-operation so that these pressing problems may be resolved. My country fully accepts that obligation and will continue, in so far as is within its power, to play its part in the attainment of that objective.

As we mark this fortieth anniversary, let us remember with gratitude and sincere appreciation the invaluable contribution made by all those men and women who over the years have dedicated themselves to the growth, development and strengthening of our Organization. I particularly wish to pay tribute to our Secretary-General and to all those who preceded him in that office. Their untiring efforts have earned them an enduring place in the history of the United Nations.

In appending their signatures to the Charter on 26 June 1945, the founders of our Organization declared that they did so "in faith". Conceived in faith, our Organization has been nurtured in optimism. Let us, on this memorable occasion, reaffirm that faith and renew that optimism so that in the years that lie ahead we may fulfil the hopes and aspirations that inspired the founders and that must continue to inspire those of us to whom the torch has been passed.

Greater things than have thus far been accomplished are pressing upon us. Let us use this fortieth anniversary observance to rededicate ourselves to their achievement.

Mr. SALDIVAR (Paraguay) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like first of all to express on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Paraguay our most cordial best wishes to Ambassador Jaime de Piniés, representative of our motherland Spain, who is presiding over the fortieth session of the United Nations General Assembly. We are confident that under his leadership, the General Assembly will have positive results at this fortieth anniversary of the founding of the most universal forum in the world.

We also wish to convey our greetings to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, whose fruitful work enjoys my country's complete support because of his dedication and fairness in dealing with delicate issues involving world peace and the future of mankind.

The adversity that has afflicted Mexico has aroused our complete sympathy and solidarity. In this difficult time, we are convinced that Mexico's traditional strength will prevail and enable it to erase the traces of this misfortune. As a member of the Latin American community, we offer our help, considering it to be a freely assumed obligation to stand by the side of our brother country, Mexico, in its time of distress.

Paraguay is attending this gathering of nations in the same spirit as ever.

We hope that our Organization will grow in moral authority, that it will be able to play an effective role in the maintenance of international peace and security and that Governments will entrust the world's future to negotiation and dialogue, eliminating for ever military conflicts, which constitute a blot on mankind.

We reaffirm our conviction that the negotiating power of the United Nations should be strengthened, because Paraguay hopen that the Organization will be the mandatory channel for settling the disputes within its jurisdiction. So far conflicts have threatened and erupted, and all the negotiations concerning them have taken place outside the framework of the United Nations, without regard for the Charter and the promises made here by Governments when they became Members of the United Nations.

This year we are celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. Emerging as it did after the profound anguish of the Second World War, our Organization has played a guiding role in the international sphere.

Although there is need for improvement in its day-to-day work, a good opportunity is provided by this anniversary to point out the many achievements of the United Nations on the difficult path to peace and security.

Paraguay has always respected completely the individuality and independence of all States. On the basis of strict reciprocity in that steadfast course of conduct it has demanded of others the faithful observance of the same principles. For that reason, in no circumstances can it ever accept interference by other States in affairs that are exclusively the concern of Paraguay and that should be resolved by Paraguayans alone.

Paraguay maintains its constant position of principle. My country is a true democracy, based on a democratic multi-party and participative system with full enjoyment of civil liberties. Its Government has as its constant objective the development and progress of the country and the continuous improvement of the standard of living of its people. Whilst Paraguay experienced the pain and anguish of anarchy and of coups d'état for decades, today it looks to the future with faith, because its Government's work is based on the peace of the nation and the stability of its institutions. The functioning and independence of the three state powers are a reality, and the work of progress of development carried out by the Government has been uninterrupted, nor does it have insoluble problems that could delay the progress of the country for the benefit of all Paraguayans and those foreigners that live among us.

In my country there is full enjoyment of the civil and political rights enshrined in the most demanding international legal instruments. Likewise, aware of the importance of these rights for the well-being of man, my country is endeavouring, in all the international forums in which it participates, to ensure full respect for them and it offers its sincere co-operation to that end.

Paraguayan women have a most important role in our society. They are the ones holding together the family and fostering its development, and they have "pamically extended their role beyond the family. Being equal with men under the law, they contribute to the further development of our nation. The presence of Paraguayan women in all the areas of human life is increasingly felt in our society, especially in the administration of justice and in the field of education, a key activity for the future of all peoples, where their presence is even most influential in some areas. We are aware that our country can play a useful role in the promotion of womens' rights throughout the world, and therefore we are prepared to serve as an example and to support all legitimate aspirations that may be reflected in present or future international conventions on that subject.

My country has been the object of vast campaigns of vilification carried out abroad for unacceptable reasons. A short time ago one such campaign, which ran the gamut of international infamy, collapsed like a pack of cards, demonstrating that everything that had been said was merely the creation of distorted interests, designed to denigrate a country which is making constant progress and is living in peace and harmony with all others.

My country, with the solid support of foreign technical co-operation, as well as with the support of international and bilateral agencies, has in recent years benefited from the most modern technology in all fields, especially in agriculture. There is no area of human activity which is not being provided with the constant and unquestionable support of the latest technology, making the physical development of the country a most important reality and bringing constant economic and social progress to the nation.

We maintain a spirit of friendship and fraternity with all our neighbours. Instead of a philosophy of doubt and suspicion among friendly neighbouring nations, we have chosen harmonious coexistence and integration, desiring only the progress of our peoples. Thus it is possible for us to give the world the example of the Itaipu hydroelectric plant, the largest in the world, which represents the splendid result of co-operation and understanding between the Republic of Paraguay and the Federal Republic of Brazil.

This plant, which is producing energy for the development of our two countries and which will benefit the whole region, will this October set in operation the third great turbine, and on that occasion the President of the Republic of Paraguay, General Alfredo Stroessner, and the President of the Federative Republic of Brazil, Mr. José Sarney, will meet as a clear demonstration of the spirit of co-operation and friendship between our two peoples.

The shared use and development of the Parana River does not end with the ITAIPU dam. In the same spirit of co-operation and friendship, we are building, together with the Republic of Argentina, the YACYRETA Plant which, like the first plant I mentioned, will provide energy for a number of regions, cities and peoples in an electrification process that signifies progress and a vast socio-economic revolution.

This governmental work has had a far-reaching effect on private initiative.

There is a continuing increase in foreign investment in the establishment of major centres of agricultural production, and industry is becoming more flexible and seeking out the best technology. Meanwhile the State is making up for the lack of private initiative wherever the good of the country so dictates.

Many issues before us deserve the special attention of the representatives gathered here. To speak of disarmament at the present time may even seem superfluous. Everyone is aware that the priority problem confronting the United Nations and endangering international peace and security is the unending arms race. Billions of dollars are spent on weapons, while millions of human beings are dying or living a marginal and subhuman existence through lack of food. The most serious and pernicious aspect of this arms policy is that it involves not only the great Powers and the industrialized countries but also to the developing countries, to the detriment of other needs that are basic to the development of their peoples.

This crucial issue of the arms race is linked with another issue that endangers the very life of our planet. I am referring to the existence of nuclear weapons, to their increasing sophistication, and to the policy of many States which are trying in one way or another to join in a race which may lead us to a collective nuclear holocaust. It is essential that the nations which have no nuclear force and do not aspire to obtain it, but which undertake nuclear research solely for peaceful uses in development and in the health field, should have a guarantee of protection from the misuse of that scientific discovery that today threatens the very existence of the world in which we live.

There are agenda items that remain relevant because of their implications and the political philosophy behind them. I refer here to the questions of Afghanistan and Kampuchea. In the first case a super-Power, which feels free to use the most outright imperialism in any continent of the world, continues to subjugate by force the noble people of Afghanistan, in defiance of all the rules of international law and of the ethics that should govern relations among States. In the second case, a neighbouring country with military and all other types of support from that same super-Power has been subjugating the people of Kampuchea, denying it the exercise of its free will and self-determination.

The conflict in the Middle East remains a matter of concern to all mankind.

So many horrors have been committed and so much blood has been shed in that part of the world that it is essential for the United Nations, with the requisite support of the major Powers, to intervene and seek to establish peaceful coexistence among all the peoples in that part of the world, which deserves a better fate.

There is a principle which is fundamental in our Organization - universality. In this respect, Paraguay supports the just aspiration of the Republic of Korea to be admitted to the United Nations. The Republic of Korea is a peaceful and hard-working State which maintains cordial relations with all countries.

We should like to underscore the resolute efforts made by the Republic of Korea to seek unification of the two Koreas. In recent days these contacts have been fruitful and there seems every prospect that they will lead to a decrease in tension and promote a continuing dialogue in good faith between the two sides. It is appropriate that the countries represented in this Assembly should support those steps towards reunification, which hold out the promise of being beneficial to peace in that part of the world.

Just as it is the fundamental duty of the United Nations to respect the free and sovereign application of the principle of the self-determination of peoples, the principle of the integrity of countries is also part of the structure of international law and of ethical behaviour among countries.

Paraguay has always supported the process of decolonization. Our country, which was part of the Spanish Empire from which it obtained its independence on 14 and 15 May 1811, believes that at this stage in the life of mankind colonial possessions must disappear and yield to the self-determination of peoples and nations. However, sometimes, for political motives or for motives of world hegemony, decolonization is invoked in cases where the respective peoples, in free elections, have chosen a different course - as is the case of Puerto Rico, where the majority of its inhabitants have so decided.

The conflict in Central America is of concern to the Government of Paraguay. Our country takes an optimistic view as it follows the efforts of the Contadora Group to achieve a lasting and stable peace, as well as to eliminate the root of the problem, in that strategic region - that is, the intervention of a super-Power from outside the continent through a State in the region whose aims constitute a threat to the stability and freedom of the American continent.

We support a negotiated legal solution to the question of the Malvinas

Islands, which remains a source of concern to the world public and a matter of

considerable interest to the United Nations and the American continent. It is

essential that a solution be found that preserves peace. The Republic of Paraguay

with its pacific tradition and consistent solidarity supports any initiative

designed to bring about a friendly negotiated solution, based on the principles of

international law, to the sovereignty dispute 1 connection with those islands.

In this context, our country would welcome the resumption of bilateral talks between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom and the use of the Secretary-General's good offices.

The war in the Persian Gulf is another source of concern to peoples and nations. How is it possible that no solution has been found to this conflict? The issue is a challenge because of the political and economic interests involved, but for that very reason our Organization should intervene firmly in the quest for peace.

The same can be said of an age-old problem that has given our Organization much work: the question of Cyprus and its links with Turkey and Greece. Although this issue is not constantly in the headlines, it is a question that concerns all the citizens of our world who see the future of mankind in a constructive spirit of peace.

Economic issues command our attention and today constitute truly serious threats not only to the development of peoples but also to the very existence of nations and the preservation of social peace.

The most striking issue of the day is the foreign debt of the developing countries, which weighs on them like an unredeemable mortgage, since the amount of interest gorws day by day and there are no resources from which they can be pay it, much less the capital involved.

The problem of the foreign debt is no longer an purely economic question that can be resolved through normal banking channels or organizations linked to the development of our countries. It involves factors of a political and social nature that require the active participation of the United Nations in order that the rescheduling of the debt can be accomplished without infringing the rights of the developing countries or retarding their economic and social development process. We stress this, because the Government of Paraguay has taken steps to ensure that our foreign debt is controllable and does not become a burden on our national economy.

The tariff and non-tariff barriers set up by the industrialized countries to exports from countries producing raw materials remain an obstacle to the right of the less developed countries to grow economically and thus raise the standard of living of their peoples.

This applies to the Latin American countries which export agricultural products. Given the common interests of the highly industrialized and the developing countries in the face of world problems, greater understanding of this problem is needed to ensure normal, unimpeded trade based on a just distribution among nations and in the interest of the well-being of the peoples of the developing nations, which make up the immense majority of mankind.

I need not stress the dramatic deterioration in the terms of trade between the countries that produce raw materials and the industrialized countries. While the latter increase the prices of their finished goods which are essential to the developing countries, the value of raw materials decreases, creating a balance-of-payments deficit, which is a sign of injustice and poor economic distribution.

Experts on these issues have reaffirmed the justice of the cause of the countries that produce raw materials. Their conclusions are unassailable and irrefutable. Those countries have to send ever greater quantities of unprocessed

goods to the major purchasing countries in order to acquire the products they need, and to do so at an intolerable rate that affect the very existence of millions of human beings.

Paraguay expresses its appreciation to the United Nations Development
Programme for its co-operation in the various development programmes undertaken in
our country under its auspices. None the less, we regret that in each cycle the
indicative figures decrease and for that reason opportunities to carry out new
development programmes are blocked. The solution is for the industrialized
countries to contribute more generously to the funds of the United Nations
Development Programme.

Experts have estimated that horizontal co-operation among the developing countries is the best solution to the problem of technical assistance. This means that national experts or experts from relatively less developed countries can work in technical assistance programmes. However, this syste faces the same problem as we have just mentioned in connection with the United Nations Development Programme, namely, the lack of adequate financing to create fluidity. Logically, that financing should come from the highly industrialized countries. Financial support for that programme would help achieve the figures required by the United Nations Development Programme in present circumstances.

The Government of Paraguay welcomes the Convention on the Law of the Sea as a victory for all mankind. We are pleased that that Convention is being supported by more States and we hope and trust that its provisions will always benefit the less-developed land-locked countries.

In order to resolve the problem of its unjust land-locked situation, Paraguay has from the outset of its independent existence waged a struggle for the free navigation of international rivers on the basis of accepted principles of international law and norms and the need of the land-locked countries to communicate and carry on their trade free from undue obstacles.

The Government of the Republic of Paraguay is most pleased with the efficient work being done by the International Law Commission in expanding codification of all the practices and uses of international law. In this field anything that can serve to promote the codification of international law is an effective contribution to the free play of international relations in an orderly, just and egalitarian world.

There is a scourge afflicting mankind in all parts of the world. It endangers daily life and leaves no one exempt from fear. I am referring to terrorism and violence, which have written the most painful pages of the history of our day. The boldness and daring of those who perpetrate this violence know no limits or moral constraints. Nations have not reacted firmly to this negation of coexistence. It is urgent that an international convention on terrorism should be concluded to put an end to this scourge, so that those responsible may find no sanctuary anywhere. The time has come to speak clearly and to say that terrorism exists in present circumstances because there are governments that tolerate it, that provide training for terrorists and serve, when necessary, as places of asylum for them.

Paraguay repudiates violence and terrorism as inimical to religious and human values and to human rights, even though Paraguay has experienced no outbreaks of this criminal and murderous philosophy and is living in a climate of peace and work for the growing well-being of all its people.

The right to social and economic well-being of a society can never justify the sacrifice of the fundamental freedoms and rights of the individual. This is why we condemn totalitarian doctrines of any kind that repress those rights on the pretext of thus achieving alleged collective well-being.

We must sincerely say that the world panorama today is not very comforting,

nor do we foresee favourable solutions, at least in the near future, which would be to the satisfaction of the less powerful.

The Republic of Paraguay places its to the moral authority of the United Nations in finding early solutions so that we is the moral authority of the United that is more free, just, equitable, humane and pears.

The PRESIDENT: Three representatives wish exercise their right of reply. May I remind them that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second intervention, and should be made by representatives from their seats.

Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): We have followed attentively the statement made by the Foreign Minister of the Syrian Arab Republic this morning. We have heard the viewpoint of Syria and its appraisal of several important issues dealt with in that statement. Unfortunately, groundless charges have been directed against Egypt. We categorically reject such charges both in form and in substance. The least we can say is that the Arab people are tired of this repetition, which has no effect whatsoever on events. The Arab people are aware and know that they are duty bound to face reality, instead of hiding behind condemnations. Today the Arab people strongly believe that we must put forward realistic alternatives instead of exchanging condemnations.

Egypt will continue to discharge its historic responsibility towards solving the issues facing our Arab people. Nobody can insult Egypt or its positive stance or the efforts that Egypt has sincerely made to promote the cause of peace, which will ensure to the Palestinian people its full rights in its homeland. As has been the case in the past, Egypt will continue to call for Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, including the Golan Heights.

Mr. de KEMOULARIA (France) (interpretation from French): I would like to reply to statements made this morning by the Foreign Minister of Chile and this afternoon by the Foreign Minister of Australia in connection with the nuclear tests carried out by France in French territory in the southern Pacific. I shall not refer to the fact that the site of the tests is thousands of miles from those two countries. I note, however, the restrained character of their statements.

As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of France stated only a few days ago, an international scientific mission, headed by Professor Atkinson of New Zealand, went to the Mururoa testing centre in October 1983. Following its visit the mission published a detailed report concluding that the tests were harmless to both the population and the environment. My delegation had occasion to comment on this last year in the Assembly and in its relevant committees.

As is known, the President of the French Republic has invited the Heads of State or Government of the region to see for themselves the exceptionally stringent security measures being taken for these underground tests. In his statement on 26 September, Mr. Roland Dumas also explained why France must continue its tests: the technological progress made by the two major nuclear Powers compels it to maintain the credibility of its deterrent instrument, on which its national defence rests.

In accordance with its rights and in exercise of its sovereignty, my country is engaged in actions which are essential to its security, and which do not affect either peace in the region, the security of States, or the health of the population or the environment.

Mr. HAYDEN (Australia): I have listened to the carefully presented statement of the Ambassador of France defending French nuclear testing in the South Pacific. First let me recall that, as I said earlier this afternoon, it gives Australia no pleasure to have a disagreement with France. There are a number of reasons for this; many are historical and some are extremely important and arise from our fraternal affiliation as members of the Socialist International.

None the less, in spite of our commitment as democratic socialists, we have differences of substance on fundamental principles, on things like nuclear testing, nuclear arms escalation and related matters. We have these because the testing takes place in the region in which our country and its neighbours are situated. It is perfectly correct, as the Ambassador of France pointed out, that in October 1983 a mission which involved New Zealand and Australian scientists produced a report. It is also essentially correct that the report found no short-term problems. But the conclusions made it clear that quite definite longer-term problems would arise from leakage of toxic nuclear waste products. This will be a problem for future generations of people living in the region. In those circumstances we have a justifiable concern, which needs to be raised.

Finally, I would merely recall that, as I pointed out in my comments this afternoon, if the testing is harmless, if the security measures are stringent and if there are no problems, in the light of the fact that it has been incontestably established that there are areas of metropolitan France where this sort of testing can be conducted, it would be more appropriate for that testing to be conducted there.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.