



---

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 30th MEETING**

**Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)**

**CONTENTS**

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

**Statements were made by:**

Mr. von Stuelpnagel (Federal Republic of Germany)  
Mr. Tellalov (Bulgaria)  
Mr. Issraelyan (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)  
Mr. Afande (Kenya)  
Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat (Viet Nam)  
Mr. Fan Guoxiang (China)  
Mr. Mohi-Ud-Din (Pakistan)  
Mr. Sabushimike (Burundi)  
Mr. Tonwe (Nigeria)

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

STATEMENTS ON SPECIFIC DISARMAMENT ITEMS AND CONTINUATION OF THE GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. VON STUELPNAGEL (Federal Republic of Germany): The importance my Government attaches to the agenda item on the prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters, is well known to the members of this Committee. It has been the aim of our statements and of the draft resolutions we have submitted on this item in the past to make a contribution to an in-depth objective discussion of all aspects of this problem affecting the community of States as a whole. We have not advocated a broad approach because we underestimated the danger of a nuclear war, but rather in the conviction that the prevention of war has become a question of survival for all mankind. Narrowing the discussion down to problems of nuclear weapons would not do justice to the import of that question.

We are all fully conscious of the terrible truth that at this very moment in many parts of the world conflicts are being fought by force of arms, and human lives are being annihilated. No atomic bomb is being dropped, and yet year in and year out thousands of people lose their lives in conflicts and wars. In Europe, the memory of the horrors of the First and Second World Wars is still alive, and those were but conventional wars. The destructive force of modern weapons has been multiplied, which makes conventional war an intolerable conception.

In the joint communiqué issued at the end of their summit meeting at Geneva, President Reagan and General-Secretary Gorbachev recognized that

"any conflict between the USSR and the United States could have catastrophic consequences [;] they emphasized the importance of preventing any war between them, whether nuclear or conventional". (A/40/1070, p. 3)

(Mr. Von Stuelpnagel, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

They also declared that they would not strive for military supremacy. That essential commitment must not be permitted to apply only to the relationship between these two great military Powers, but must also be brought to bear upon relations among all States.

The paramount objective of our security policy, pursued jointly with our partners in an alliance of free and equal States, is a condition of durable stability, reliably excluding every kind of war, nuclear as well as conventional. That policy of the prevention of war is guided by the principles of the Charter of the United Nations requesting of the Members of the Organization the peaceful settlement of international disputes and committing them, while recognizing their natural right to individual or collective defence, to abstain from the threat or use of force in their international relations. Together with the other member States of the Western alliance, we therefore declared on 10 June 1982 that "none of our weapons will ever be used except in response to attack".

Our policy of actively safeguarding peace, a policy based on the renunciation of force, is the conclusion we drew from the catastrophe of the Second World War, with its more than 30 million victims in Europe alone. We believe that war cannot and must not be a policy option any longer.

The existence of nuclear weapons has not only brought about a qualitative change in the conditions of security policy and its environment. It has also resulted in a fundamental change in security policy thinking. Our awareness and conviction that reliable and durable security cannot be established by military means alone has led us further to recognize that in the nuclear age security and peace cannot rest exclusively on autonomous defence efforts but must be complemented by broad co-operation in all areas, in particular by co-operation in

(Mr. Von Stuelpnagel, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

the field of disarmament and arms control, if the aim of reliably securing peace is to be achieved in the long run. Just as it would be desirable and would meet the expectations of people in all parts of the world to undo the creation of atomic weapons with the help of arms control, so too it would be misleading to assume that it would be possible to create a state of permanent security through nuclear disarmament alone. Our efforts for disarmament and arms control cannot be confined to the nuclear sector. Stability and security are aims that lie beyond particular categories of weapons; they can be attained only in the course of a process of arms control which is embedded in the wider framework of a policy of co-operation, taking into consideration the overall ratio of military power. My delegation therefore very much regrets that the sponsors of this year's draft resolutions on the prevention of nuclear war have not found it worthwhile to consider our position.

Nuclear disarmament, which we endorse vigorously, must be oriented towards the overall goal of preventing war, founded on stability, and measured by the yardstick of how much it contributes to the strengthening of that stability. Nuclear disarmament must not have the consequence that conventional war will appear conceivable again.

For that reason we advocate an arms control process which encompasses all categories of weapons, nuclear as well as conventional and chemical, enhances stability in all its aspects, promotes confidence, and advances by individual steps, each one would itself have a stabilizing effect and would be verifiable.

In the perspective of a nuclear-weapon-free world - a perspective opened up, we think, through Reykjavik - and in a phase of increased efforts for nuclear disarmament, our endeavours must be directed towards achieving substantial progress in negotiations on the reduction of existing conventional imbalances, the building of confidence and security, and the world-wide elimination of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Von Stuelpnagel, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

Our concept of the prevention of war is not restricted to measures of arms control and disarmament. Further essential elements seem to us to be the following: the appeal for mutual restraint in relations among States; confidence-building through increased openness and a more liberal exchange of information in military matters, regional efforts for the maintenance of peace and the settlement of conflicts; endeavours to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons; measures and mechanisms to prevent the unintentional outbreak of war; and the demand that all States adapt their military potential, their strategy for using such potential and their practical attitude exclusively to their defence requirements.

It is with satisfaction that we note that our views concerning the prevention of war are meeting with growing approval not only in West-East relations but also on a world-wide scale. Six Heads of State or Government from four continents stated in the Mexico Declaration that

"Nuclear disarmament, and ultimately the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, is an absolute priority. However, in this context, the problem of a balanced reduction in conventional weapons must also be given appropriate attention". (A/41/518, p. 4)

Similarly, the Political Declaration adopted at the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in August/September this year at Harare, contains the idea of a comprehensive concept of the prevention of war addressing not only the danger posed by nuclear weapons but also the threat posed by conventional and chemical weapons.

(Mr. Von Stuelpnagel, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

Individual measures may enhance the level of confidence. They may be indicated or even indispensable at a certain point. The overall task, however, remains multidimensional. What is needed is a common approach to influence State behaviour in all its aspects which must be directed towards more peaceful solutions. This is not only a matter of and an obligation for the nuclear Powers and countries with the largest military potentials, it is a task for the community of States as a whole.

My delegation expects this session of the First Committee to continue the dialogue on the topic of war prevention intensively, and hopes that the common ground among all delegations which has already become visible in the overall approach, but even more apparent in the fact that concrete measures have been endorsed, and will be enlarged. Our contribution will, in the future, as in the past, be marked by a constructive spirit of co-operation.

Mr. TELLALOV (Bulgaria): Today I should like to introduce two draft resolutions.

The first one entitled "World Disarmament Campaign: actions and activities" has been submitted under agenda item 61 (c) and is contained in A/C.1/41/L.16. The sponsors, namely, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam and Bulgaria, have submitted this draft resolution convinced that it will contribute to the more effective implementation of the goals of the World Disarmament Campaign. They attach great importance to the role and activities of the United Nations in mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of peace and real disarmament.

(Mr. Tellalov, Bulgaria)

The draft resolution in general follows the basic provisions of General Assembly resolution 40/151 D.

In drafting the new paragraph 3, the sponsors proceeded from the generally-recognized fact that mass peace and disarmament movements have become an important factor in international affairs which can no longer be disregarded. These movements have shown that the broadest strata of the world public are fully aware of the realities of the nuclear and space age and can contribute to promoting a new political approach necessitated by these realities.

Paragraph 4 stems logically from the provisions of paragraph 3. The sponsors share the understanding of the need for Governments of all States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, in formulating their policies in the field of disarmament, to take into consideration the main demands of the mass peace and disarmament movements. This paragraph is also a direct reflexion of the democratic principles of society. The invitation which this paragraph extends to Governments to inform the Secretary-General on the actions taken to that end is, in our view, both purposeful and justified.

Another new element in the draft resolution is the necessity, underlined in paragraph 6, of more active involvement of children and youth in the activities of the World Disarmament Campaign. This, in our view, would help to enhance the impact and effectiveness of the Campaign.

The second draft resolution I should like to introduce today on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Angola, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Mongolia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and my own delegation is entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

(Mr. Tellalov, Bulgaria)

This draft resolution, submitted under agenda item 54, is contained in A/C.1/41/L.15.

The draft in general follows the provisions of General Assembly resolution 40/85; the sponsors have somewhat simplified the contents of that resolution while preserving its main thrust. The draft reflects the most important elements of their approach which are regarded as particularly important at the present stage in the consideration of this issue. The sponsors reaffirm their conviction that, until nuclear disarmament is achieved on a global basis, it is imperative for the international community to elaborate effective measures to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

The draft resolution also outlines the work of the Conference on Disarmament on that item in 1986 and expresses disappointment at the lack of progress in its consideration. As can be seen from the report of the Conference, in document A/41/27, at its 1986 session it was once again not possible to establish an ad hoc committee on that agenda item owing to the Conference's preoccupation with other matters. Following the conclusions of the report, the draft resolution notes, however, that the consideration of this problem revealed the existence of a general readiness to continue a substantive dialogue on the issue.

The sponsors express their confidence that the non-nuclear-weapon States, having no nuclear weapons on their territories, have every right to receive reliable international legal guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

The urgent need to reach agreement on effective arrangements for such guarantees and to find a common approach, which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character, has been reflected in the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution. The sponsors still consider



(Mr. Tellalov, Bulgaria)

that the Conference on Disarmament should continue to explore ways and means of overcoming the difficulties encountered in the negotiations on this question. Accordingly, they propose that the General Assembly request the Conference on Disarmament to continue active consideration on this subject, including through the establishment of an ad hoc committee as soon as practicable, at its 1987 session.

In conclusion, I should like to express the conviction of the sponsors that draft resolutions A/41/L.15 and A/41/L.16 will be carefully considered and will receive the approval and support of delegations.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In its statement today the Soviet delegation would like to address the question of banning chemical weapons.

There is no need to repeat that chemical weapons represent a real threat, since along with nuclear weapons, they are the only weapons of mass destruction currently in the arsenals of States. The Soviet Union has consistently advocated the prohibition and complete elimination of these weapons and regards this objective as entirely realistic. For many years now, the Conference on Disarmament has been negotiating a ban on chemical weapons. These negotiations have dragged on far too long and we see it as our task to ensure that they are successfully completed in 1987.

Have the necessary pre-conditions for doing so been met? I sincerely believe that they have. Negotiations have already gone beyond the stage of identifying and comparing positions. The time has come to take decisions. The work that was done during the 1986 session at the Conference on Disarmament to produce a relevant international convention has, in our view, been useful.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

We managed to make some headway in working towards agreement on key provisions of a convention, and the positions of States have been brought closer together on some issues that only a short time ago seemed insoluble. A not inconsiderable contribution to those positive results was made by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

In amplifying the fundamental provisions of the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev on 15 January 1986, the Soviet Union last April submitted at the Conference a broad proposal for the elimination of the production base for the manufacture of chemical weapons. We expressed our willingness to notify in good time the location of chemical-weapons production facilities and the halting of production of such weapons, as well as our readiness to embark, shortly after the relevant convention enters into force, upon the elimination of stockpiles of chemical weapons. All this would be carried out under strict control, including international on-site inspection. In putting forward those proposals, the Soviet Union took into account the views and concern of many States and accommodated their wishes.

Many of the participants in the negotiations have pointed out that the progress achieved at the Conference on Disarmament this year was made possible, in no small measure, by the introduction of those proposals. That does not, however, mean that all the problems relating to work on a future convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons have now been solved. One of the most difficult of the problems still to be resolved is the question of the non-production of chemical weapons in the commercial, namely, civilian, chemical industry. Although that problem has long been under consideration at the negotiations, and although a useful seminar was held in the Netherlands this summer on that subject, no sign of a solution has yet been glimpsed. In the circumstances, and having analysed the situation in the negotiations, the Soviet Union has decided to make the following proposal.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

In our view, a compromise solution to the problem of the non-production of chemical weapons would be facilitated if all chemicals were to be divided into four categories, each having a different régime governing limitation and verification. There would also be special categories for super-toxic lethal chemicals possessing properties characteristic of agents for chemical warfare, as well as chemicals that are key components of binary chemical systems and super-toxic lethal chemicals produced for permitted purposes - for example, for medical, pharmaceutical and other purposes. Depending on the degree of danger posed by various chemicals and their possible diversion to weapons purposes, and depending too on the volume of production of such chemicals, international inspections could take various forms: the permanent presence of international inspectors, systematic inspections or individual, on-site challenge inspections. In light of the particular danger posed by multipurpose production facilities that can be used for manufacturing chemical warfare agents, particularly the key components of binary chemical systems, those facilities should be subject to a special régime.

We express the hope that these new Soviet proposals will make it possible in the very near future to reach agreement upon the relevant provisions of a convention, taking into account as they do the views of other States as well as the extent to which the problem has already been explored at the negotiations. However, the Soviet Union makes no claim to a monopoly in introducing compromise proposals at the talks. We are prepared to listen carefully to the opinions of all States and to consider proposals strictly on their merits, regardless of who the sponsors may be. In this connection I should like to refer to the fact that for many years, the problem at the negotiations of developing the procedures for on-site challenge inspections acceptable to all States has constituted the stumbling block. On the one hand, the United States and its allies have been

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

unwilling to agree to our position that such inspections should be conducted on a voluntary basis. On the other hand, many States, including the Soviet Union, could not accept the United States proposal for a so-called open invitation because it was unrealistic.

A whole series of attempts have been made to work out a compromise approach but, unfortunately, they have been of no avail. Now, it appears that such an approach has been found. We suggest that the proposal submitted last summer at the Conference on Disarmament by the United Kingdom delegation be used as a basis for reaching mutually acceptable procedures for on-site challenge inspections. Since we are most desirous to reach agreement as soon as possible on one of the most important questions of any future convention, we believe that the United Kingdom proposal could form the basis for a compromise solution, provided, of course, that it is properly elaborated. If that approach is acceptable to the United States and other parties to the negotiations, a way would thus have been found to reach agreement. With regard to the work of elaboration to which I just referred, we believe that consideration should be given the question of how to formulate, in as clear a manner as possible and based on the United Kingdom proposal, the criteria that would determine the exceptional circumstances that would, on the one hand, allow us the initiation of a challenge for inspection and, on the other, would allow a rejection of such a challenge.

It is our belief that, with respect to challenge inspection, the decision should be made by the Executive Council by a two-thirds majority. That approach would be the most democratic. We believe that no one should make any claims to exclusive rights here, because chemical weapons are a threat to all.

Our efforts in the field of chemical disarmament are not, however, confined to these proposals. We would like to see concrete measures taken now to facilitate the earliest possible conclusion of a convention. In this connection the Soviet

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

delegation has been instructed to state that, as a step towards the elimination of chemical weapons, the Soviet Union would be prepared to agree to declare, together with the United States, a mutual moratorium on the production and deployment of chemical weapons, on the understanding, of course, that such a moratorium would be comprehensive and would cover binary chemical weapons as well. We hope that that proposal will not be found unacceptable by the United States, since, according to statements by United States officials, the United States does not at the present time produce chemical weapons. The Soviet Union sees an alternative to the manufacture of the means of chemical warfare in an expansion of international co-operation to develop a peaceful chemical industry. It is our conviction that as many States as possible should participate in such co-operation regardless of their social and economic systems or their level of development. Of course, the broadest possibilities for such co-operation would be opened up as a result of banning chemical weapons and freeing the resources devoted to them for peaceful and creative purposes.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

We are convinced that the establishment of chemical-weapon-free zones in Central Europe and the Balkans - which is the objective of the well-known initiatives of the Governments of the German Democratic Republic, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Socialist Republic of Romania - would also help to rid our planet of chemical weapons more quickly.

However, we should not overlook what is hampering negotiations by creating particular barriers to the development of an effective system for verifying full compliance with a future convention. I am referring to the dangerous United States plans to start manufacturing a new generation of chemical weapons, namely, binary weapons, and deploying them in Western Europe. In the light of the efforts of the Soviet Union to achieve the earliest possible agreement on an international convention prohibiting all types of chemical weapons and providing for their total elimination, those United States plans seem particularly unjustified.

We call upon the United States, instead of preparing for the production of new sophisticated types of chemical weapon, to engage responsibly in the work of achieving an international convention which would once and for all remove the chemical threat. Unfortunately, the United States has not as yet demonstrated such a responsible approach at the negotiations. The United States position has been frozen at the 1984 level. Since that time the United States has not made a single concrete proposal and has not budged an inch to accommodate the positions of other participants in the talks. One cannot help wondering whether the United States is not deliberately acting in this way so as to prevent any convention from seeing the light and to start up binary weapons assembly lines regardless of any other considerations.

The Soviet delegation calls on the General Assembly to speak out resolutely in favour of the earliest possible conclusion of the convention on the prohibition of

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

chemical weapons - we would hope as early as 1987 - and to call for the prevention of a new round of a chemical arms race. We are confident that by taking such a decision the General Assembly would be living up to the hopes that have been placed in it by the peace-loving peoples of the world.

Today we would like to touch upon one more issue. Recently the United Socialist Party of Germany and the Social Democratic Party of Germany took a new important initiative in the field of disarmament. They drafted and presented principles for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free corridor in Central Europe. This initiative is based on the recommendations of the Palme Commission and provides for the establishment in Central Europe, on the territories of the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, of a nuclear-weapon-free corridor 150 kilometres wide on each side of the border between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Warsaw Treaty countries. We wholeheartedly support that new joint initiative of the United Socialist Party of Germany and the Social Democratic Party of Germany and believe that its constructive substance convincingly demonstrates the ability to achieve concrete disarmament agreements when new, realistic approaches to the problem of security prevail despite differences in political philosophy.

Mr. AFANDE (Kenya): Allow me at the outset to extend to you, Sir, on behalf of my delegation sincere congratulations on your election as the Chairman of the First Committee. I fully endorse the compliments that previous speakers have paid you; they are more than well-deserved owing to your outstanding professional and personal qualities. I assure you of the full co-operation of my delegation. May I also take this opportunity of congratulating the other officers of the Committee as well as your predecessor, Ambassador Alatas of Indonesia, for the

(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

exemplary way in which he presided over our work at the fortieth session of the General Assembly.

This year, as in many previous years, the international climate and developments in the field of security cannot be characterized in optimistic terms. Recurring crises and periods of increased regional military conflicts are still evident today. Such a situation has not only produced a virtual stalemate in the process of disarmament negotiations but has also heightened a sense of insecurity and raised suspicions of hostile intentions among States. Consequently, instead of a resort to the process of the peaceful settlement of disputes we have witnessed a persistent, sustained and increasing catalogue of tension and use of force besetting our world.

Against that background increasing demands are being made to put an end to the arms race, and particularly the nuclear arms race, through the process of negotiation. It should be recalled that last year the international community welcomed enthusiastically the United States-Soviet agreement to commence negotiations on issues related to space and nuclear weapons with a view to concluding effective agreements aimed at preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on Earth. Indeed, the United States-Soviet summits in Geneva, and recently in Reykjavik, as well as elsewhere should be welcomed as a positive sign that the two major Powers have seriously embraced the idea of reducing offensive nuclear-weapon systems.

Because of the precarious international situation that obtains today we are fully convinced that genuine and general disarmament is a moral imperative in this nuclear age if the most important objective of the United Nations Charter, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security, is to be achieved. It should be self-evident by now that the continued massive acquisition and accumulation of



(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

sophisticated lethal weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, does not provide additional security to any country. On the contrary, arms build-ups have further jeopardized international peace and even brought mankind close to the precipice of self-destruction.

Added to the threat of the total annihilation of the human race, we feel acutely that the colossal financial resources wasted each year on manufacturing and research aimed at the improvement of arms should be more fruitfully utilized for the improvement of the well-being of mankind, particularly the poor and underprivileged. At a time when the world is reeling under severe economic strains, and the level of poverty in developing nations staggers the imagination, military budgets are increasing. Kenya strongly shares the view that gradual reductions of military budgets on a mutually agreed basis, particularly by the major military spenders, would be a step forward that would help to curb the arms race while enhancing possibilities of releasing badly needed resources spent for military purposes in both developed and developing nations for national needs and development assistance. Inspired by that thinking we feel that, during this session of the General Assembly, an appropriate decision should be taken on the holding of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development in 1987 through which a plan of action could be formulated and agreed upon.

While recognizing the real and potential obstacles standing in the way of the conclusion of a verifiable treaty completely banning nuclear tests, I wish to reaffirm the importance that the Kenyan Government attaches to that objective. The trend of recent efforts to negotiate the question of a nuclear-test ban by the Conference on Disarmament is regrettable. It has undermined and frustrated any

(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

possibility of the early conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Kenya shares the view that a comprehensive test-ban treaty is the springboard for the achievement of an international nuclear weapon non-proliferation régime. Enforced with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the wide-ranging safeguards administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), it promises the only guarantee of the peaceful intent of nuclear activities which are essential for the establishment of a climate of confidence.

(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

With regard to the question of verifying compliance through a future agreement, we are convinced that there are no insurmountable difficulties in that area if the achievements of seismology are fully applied. Recently, in Geneva, it was demonstrated that the work done by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to consider International Co-operation Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events could serve as a basis for the international seismic verification of a nuclear test ban.

Since the adoption of resolution 1962 (XVIII) of 13 December 1963, the United Nations has endeavoured to ensure that no arms race of any sort would be introduced into space. At the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (UNISPACE-2) the overwhelming majority of States agreed that meaningful steps should be taken to stop the trend towards the militarization of outer space. With the recent testing and development of anti-satellite weapons, it has become quite apparent that there is an overriding urgency and necessity to prevent the process of militarization of outer space from assuming irreversible proportions. It is true that some significant measures to curb the risks of an arms race in outer space have been taken. However, existing treaties in this field contain too many loopholes and cannot effectively prevent the militarization of outer space. The Conference on Disarmament, coupled with the bilateral negotiations, offers the only hope in this direction. It is vitally necessary to conclude a comprehensive international treaty on the non-militarization of outer space which all States Members of the United Nations should be obliged to observe and respect. It is the view of my delegation that, although it has been mentioned that the major space Powers bear a special responsibility with regard to the demilitarization of outer space, the subject

(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

remains a collective and multilateral one on which all States share the responsibility for taking appropriate measures.

Kenya continues to attach particular importance to the establishment of zones of peace in various parts of the world. Such zones could strengthen the fabric of regional peace and stability and prevent extra-regional interference, thereby creating conditions conducive to regional co-operation in the field of economic and social development. In the light of this fact, the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace reflects the hopes and aspirations of littoral and hinterland States to enhance the prospects of peace, stability, security and to promote the economic well-being of the respective States. We feel that the first step towards the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean region is the convening of the long-overdue United Nations Conference on the Indian Ocean. The Conference would harmonize the interests and viewpoints of the countries of the region, the major naval Powers and maritime users. We deeply regret that the Ad Hoc Committee entrusted with the attainment of this objective has not yet been able to achieve any meaningful progress in either the substantive or the organizational fields. The political and security climate in the region has increased the urgency of convening the Conference at an early date.

Though the Conference on Disarmament has been negotiating issues related to chemical weapons for the last six years, it is regrettable that we have not been able to conclude a convention banning the development, production, stockpiling, transfer, acquisition and use of chemical weapons. Notwithstanding the sensitivity of the issues involved, we are encouraged to note that considerable progress has been made at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. This year's report clearly indicates that the process of the elaboration of the convention's non-controversial

(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

parts has reached a qualitatively new phase. Negotiations have been taking place on those parts and compromise formulations in treaty language are being worked out where a convergence of views has emerged. However, major difficulties of a highly political nature - such as compliance, verification and international on-site inspection - still remain to be overcome before the convention can be completed. It is difficult to force any conclusive solutions in the absence of trust between the United States, the USSR and the other chemical Powers.

For many years, the African States have demonstrated their peaceful intentions through their commitment to the denuclearization of the continent, as espoused by the 1964 OAU Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. Kenya, like other countries, is gravely disturbed by the growing nuclear threat posed by the racist régime of South Africa. South Africa's nuclear capability, as reported in findings from conservative sources, including the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), underscores the dangerous threat it poses to regional and international security and especially to the security of African States. South Africa could have designs of holding Africa hostage to its nuclear superiority and, in doing so, of torpedoing the process of the decolonization of Namibia and the democratization of South Africa itself. South Africa's nuclear programme is aimed at subjugating the African continent to its repugnant racial policies and unprovoked wars of aggression in defence of its obnoxious system of apartheid. To the dismay of many African States, certain Western countries have been identified as collaborating with racist South Africa in the development of technology, facilities and other related equipment. This has contributed to the enhancement and consolidation of the abhorrent policies of apartheid. My delegation requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to continue to render all the necessary

(Mr. Afande, Kenya)

assistance which the OAU may seek with a view to the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and to dissuade those collaborators from assisting South Africa in the nuclear weapons industry. We would also like UNIDIR to update its report on South Africa's nuclear capability for consideration by the General Assembly.

My delegation would like to associate itself with those delegations which commented on the need to rationalize the work of the First Committee. Over the past decade or so, an alarming tendency has crept into the procedures of this Committee: each year we have been overwhelmed by a steadily growing avalanche of draft resolutions presented for decision at the end of the general debate on disarmament items, particularly on nuclear disarmament. Concurrently, additional agenda items on disarmament, or on its various aspects, keep piling up, at a conservative average of at least two a year. Kenya is concerned by this trend of events, and, from the perspective of efficiency, we are of the opinion that there is a need to streamline and consolidate these draft resolutions and agenda items in order to arrive at practical decisions and resolutions. In this regard, my delegation welcomes the efforts of the former Chairman of this Committee in presenting specific proposals for rationalizing the work of the First Committee. We are quite optimistic that the wide-ranging consultations he is at present carrying out will be fruitful.

Finally, my delegation would at this stage wish to appeal, once again, to all Member States to adhere faithfully to the United Nations Charter and to the obligations they have freely contracted thereunder. It is our firm belief that, given the extent of our social, political, economic and technological development, the faithful observance of these principles and the peaceful settlement of any international disputes that may arise is the only sure way to avoid tensions and conflicts.

Mr. BUI XUAN NHAT (Viet Nam): The debate over the last three weeks in our Committee has strongly emphasized, inter alia, the objective need for a fresh and comprehensive approach to issues relating to peace and security in the present nuclear and space age.

We share the overwhelming view that the removal of the threat of a world war, a nuclear war, is the most acute and urgent task of the present day and that effective measures to prevent nuclear war and to achieve nuclear disarmament have the highest priority. As we dwelt at some length on this subject in our earlier statement, on 17 October 1986, today I wish to discuss some other specific items on the agenda of the Committee.

Viet Nam attaches great importance to the prohibition of chemical and biological weapons. Not only the present generation but also many generations to come in Viet Nam will suffer greatly from the grave human and ecological consequences of the brutal chemical warfare carried out against the Vietnamese people for more than a decade, from 1960 to 1971.

While noting the further progress achieved this year in the Conference on Disarmament, in Geneva, in the course of negotiations on a convention prohibiting chemical weapons, we are deeply concerned about the plans to produce binary weapons and to deploy chemical weapons on the territories of other countries. To exclude completely the possibility of the use of chemical weapons, it is essential that all States conduct serious negotiations aimed at the early conclusion of a convention entirely prohibiting chemical weapons and refrain from any action that could impede those negotiations. We hope that during the 1987 session of the Conference on Disarmament negotiations will be intensified to finalize the draft convention on this issue.

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

Over the past two years the Soviet Union has advanced further concrete proposals to help resolve existing differences of view, such as those on the elimination of chemical weapons and the industrial base for their production, and on the question of verification. Pending the conclusion of the convention, plans to establish chemical-weapon-free zones, such as those proposed by Czechoslovakia, Romania and the German Democratic Republic, would greatly contribute to the non-proliferation of chemical weapons.

Given the current rapid pace of the development of military technologies, adequate attention should be given to the possibility of the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction. Viet Nam therefore supports the proposals to set up in the Conference on Disarmament a group of experts with a view to identifying any new types of such weapons and making recommendations on undertaking specific negotiations on the weapons thus identified.

The threat to international peace and security posed by the escalating naval arms race has become increasingly clear. A large number of the nuclear weapons that exist today are sea-based. The deployment of naval forces far from one's own shores for a long period would lead to greater confrontation on the sea and hinder the international joint exploration of the natural resources of the oceans and the use of international sea lanes.

We all know the destabilizing effects of naval activities undertaken by the major imperialist naval Powers in the context of certain situations in various regions of the world. Past and present examples of gunboat diplomacy can be found in the Eastern Sea in South-East Asia, the Caribbean Sea, the South Atlantic, the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, and so on. We recognize the interests of countries having particular geographical positions, but all the seas and oceans are



(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

the common heritage of mankind, and no country can pursue its interests at the expense of those of the others. Thus all countries, especially the major naval Powers, should enter into negotiations to curb the naval arms race, limit naval activities and proceed to reduce naval armaments. The major naval Powers should refrain from and subsequently reduce their naval activities in regions of tension or conflict.

Much to our regret, one more year has passed without the Conference on the Indian Ocean being convened. We note with deep concern the increased collaboration between major naval and at the same time nuclear Powers against the interests of the peoples of the Pacific. We welcome the willingness of the Soviet Union, one of the two greatest naval Powers, to commence negotiations with a view to the reduction of naval forces and activities in various seas and oceans, including the Pacific Ocean.

This year discussion on the questions of curbing the naval arms race and naval disarmament has been renewed in the Disarmament Commission. There was a useful exchange of views in the consultation group established by the Commission. Regrettably the initial findings, which were arrived at through sustained efforts and adopted by consensus by the participants in the group, were not allowed proper reflection in the final report of the Commission due to the opposition of one delegation. We look forward to further discussion on this issue during the next session of the Disarmament Commission.

Since the emergence of the first socialist State in the world after the First World War and the dramatic awakening of the colonial peoples after the Second World War, the imperialist forces have resorted to repeated wars, including wars by proxy, in an attempt to wreck the socialist system and repress national liberation

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

movements, causing heavy human as well as material losses. Still fresh in our memory are the wars in Korea, in the Middle East, in southern Africa, in Indochina, and so on. The war of aggression against the Vietnamese people in the 1960s and 1970s was the longest and bloodiest since the Second World War, and it was conducted with all kinds of weapons except nuclear weapons.

The need to eliminate conventional weapons is evident - the more so in the face of new and dangerous developments in conventional weapons. In our view what should be emphasized here is that the adoption of measures aimed at conventional disarmament should be based on full respect for the principles of non-intervention, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, and the peaceful resolution of disputes. Conventional disarmament should be pursued within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament, with effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war having the highest priority. States having the largest military arsenals, especially the nuclear-weapon States, should bear special responsibility for the limitation and gradual reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons.

Also evident is the fact that for the past 40 years, while the world has enjoyed the longest span of time without a world war, peoples in many regions have time and again been denied their right to peace and have been subject to wars of aggression by imperialist and reactionary forces. The struggles launched by many peoples for their independence have helped stay the hands of the warlike forces, thereby contributing to world peace. There is always a distinction between struggles for national independence and self-determination, on the one hand, and wars of aggression, on the other.

(Mr. Bui Xuan Nhat, Viet Nam)

At this session of the General Assembly, as in the past, our Committee must tackle a large number of important issues. Our work-load is heavy indeed, but my delegation sincerely hopes that our Committee, by not merely pointing out the dangers inherent in the continued arms race but also mapping out ways to eliminate those dangers, will make a significant contribution to the fulfilment of the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. PAN Guoxiang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): In my statement today I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.28, on nuclear disarmament, which has been proposed by China.

Nuclear disarmament has long been an issue of the utmost concern to people throughout the world, as well as a top-priority item in the field of disarmament. Over the years, as a result of the ever intensifying nuclear-arms race, the people of our planet have been living under the dark shadow of nuclear war. Faced with this grave nuclear threat, people of various regions of the world are calling in ever stronger terms for an end to the nuclear-arms race and for disarmament. Numerous countries have contributed to nuclear disarmament in one way or another. The Declaration adopted at the recent eighth summit Conference of non-aligned countries also contains a strong demand for prompt measures to prevent nuclear war and to carry out nuclear disarmament.

As is known to all, the complete removal of the danger of nuclear war necessitates the complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons. That requires both unswerving will and effective steps in keeping with the present reality. At present, the two big nuclear Powers possess over 90 per cent of the total number of nuclear weapons, with approximately 50,000 nuclear warheads. It goes without saying that if the nuclear threat is to be reduced those two Powers

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

should take the lead in cutting down their nuclear arsenals. The representatives of many countries have pointed out in their statements both in the General Assembly and in the First Committee that the two countries with the largest nuclear arsenals have the primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament and therefore should be the first to take action. That represents the common demand of the numerous small and medium-sized nations, made in the light of the objective reality today.

It is well known that both the Soviet Union and the United States, in their joint statement issued at their summit meeting in autumn 1985, acknowledged their special responsibility for maintaining peace and pursuing disarmament. They agreed that a nuclear war should never be fought and can never be won and affirmed the principle of a mutual 50 per cent reduction in their nuclear weapons. The world public welcomes this, and hopes that concrete action will follow.

Last month during the Reykjavik meeting the leaders of those two countries explored extensively the issue of large-scale reductions in nuclear weapons. People throughout the world fervently hope that they will move in that direction, so as to facilitate the process of nuclear disarmament.

While emphasizing the special responsibility of the two big nuclear Powers, we should not overlook that of the other nuclear States. We hope that the big nuclear Powers will take the lead in drastically reducing their nuclear arsenals and, thus, the threat those nuclear weapons pose to other countries. Following that, the other nuclear States should take corresponding measures of nuclear disarmament, thereby contributing to the total elimination of nuclear arsenals throughout the world.

As for China, on the very first day we became a nuclear-weapon State we unilaterally undertook not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and not to use those weapons against non-nuclear countries and nuclear-free zones at any time or

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

in any circumstances. That shows that China's nuclear forces are not being used as a means to threaten or commit aggression against other countries. The limited number of nuclear weapons China possesses only serve the purposes of self-defence. China is opposed to, and will never participate in, the nuclear-arms race.

In recent years we have not only voluntarily taken a series of important actions in favour of conventional disarmament, but have also exercised great restraint in nuclear armament. Our country is now engaged in peaceful economic and social reconstruction and does not wish to spend its limited resources for military purposes. All that indicates that China's policy is to seek peace and disarmament and not to engage in an arms build-up.

While attaching importance to bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States, the international community is also placing high hopes in multilateral disarmament negotiations. As nuclear disarmament involves the vital interests of all countries, the numerous small and medium-sized nations cannot be left aside as mere spectators in disarmament negotiations, passively waiting for the outcome of bilateral negotiations. They have the right to put forward their views and proposals on nuclear disarmament, particularly at a time when protracted bilateral negotiations have failed to produce practical results and when people urgently hope that multilateral negotiations will make headway and add to bilateral negotiations.

Many countries feel disappointed at the fact that the Conference on Disarmament has so far failed to play any role in nuclear disarmament, and are calling for a change in that unsatisfactory state of affairs. We share that opinion.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.28 was formulated according to a number of basic positions. In its preambular part this draft resolution gives due credit to the important commitment made after the summit meeting last autumn between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, and in its operative part urges those two countries to discharge their special responsibility for nuclear disarmament, to take the lead in halting the nuclear-arms race and to negotiate with a view to reaching early agreement on the drastic reduction of their nuclear weapons.

Our draft resolution is intended to urge the two big nuclear Powers to carry out negotiations on nuclear disarmament in earnest on the basis of their mutually agreed principles, and to start a process of nuclear disarmament as soon as possible, so as to create conditions in which other nuclear-weapon States can participate in the process towards the eventual total elimination of nuclear weapons. That constitutes a reasonable and practical measure of, and approach to, nuclear disarmament and the gradual achievement of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. The reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons are in keeping with the interests of the small and medium-sized nations, as well as with the fundamental interests of the Soviet Union and the United States.

(Mr. Fan Guoxiang, China)

In conclusion, I wish to point out that in the drafting process we have drawn upon the opinions of other delegations that are in line with the basic intent of the draft resolution. We deeply appreciate the contribution and assistance of these delegations. We hope that this draft resolution that reflects the common desire and interests of all countries will be evaluated positively and supported by all delegations.

Mr. MOHI-UD-DIN (Pakistan): My delegation has asked to speak to comment on the Final Declaration of the Second Review Conference on the biological weapons Convention which was held in Geneva last September.

We note with appreciation the consensus reached during this Conference, especially on the measures to strengthen and increase confidence in the Convention as described in article V. As the delegation of a developing country, we are also gratified by the emphasis placed in the Declaration on the need for a fuller implementation of article X of the Convention, relating to the peaceful uses of biotechnology. However, we feel it is necessary to emphasize that the positive achievements of the Review Conference should not lead to a sense of complacency about the continuing need for strengthening the effectiveness of the biological weapons Convention.

At the Second Review Conference, Pakistan, together with a large number of other States parties, expressed concern over the inadequacies of the Convention's verification and compliance procedures. While reaffirming our strong support for the Convention, we pointed out that recent developments in the area of biotechnology and genetic engineering have greatly increased the potential for the misuse of this branch of science. In our view, as a result of such advances it was now possible to develop new and more lethal forms of biological warfare agents

(Mr. Mohi-Ud-Din, Pakistan)

which would be easier to manufacture and store while also being resistant to preventive measures. At the same time, these new and more efficient techniques could be used to produce vaccines to protect the aggressor's forces, leading to a broadening of the military application of potential biological weapons. These considerations compelled the delegation of Pakistan to advocate a strengthening of the verification and compliance procedures of the Convention, in particular articles V and VI. A number of like-minded delegations also expressed similar concern and proposed a number of useful measures to that end.

The ideas submitted by our delegation to strengthen the verification and compliance procedures of the Convention in essence comprised two elements, namely, the establishment of effective fact-finding machinery to examine and report on complaints made under the Convention, and measures to strengthen the procedures laid down in article VI for consideration of complaints by the Security Council, so as to avoid the misuse of the veto power in a situation where one of the permanent members of the Security Council or its allies is the subject of a complaint.

With a view to codifying these and other appropriate additional measures designed to strengthen the Convention, the delegation of Pakistan advocated the adoption of a legally-binding instrument, in the form of an additional protocol to the Convention. We therefore supported the idea of convening a special conference of States parties to identify, examine and agree upon the contents of such an additional protocol.

At the same time, we expressed the belief that certain additional interim confidence-building measures could also be adopted within the existing framework of the Convention to reinforce articles V and VI. In our opinion, such confidence-building measures within the framework of the Convention and the more



(Mr. Mohi-Ud-Din, Pakistan)

comprehensive additional provisions could be viewed as being complementary and mutually reinforcing.

Regrettably, the Second Review Conference could not arrive at a consensus decision on these issues. None the less, my delegation hopes that the modest beginnings that have been agreed upon will now lead to more comprehensive measures in the near future.

With regard to implementation of article X, my delegation believes that existing co-operation between the developed and developing countries falls far short of the vast potential offered by recent scientific advances and technological developments in the peaceful uses of biotechnology. In our view, one of the major factors that has inhibited meaningful co-operation in this sphere has been the absence of appropriate institutionalized channels for such co-operation. Consequently, the developing countries favour the fullest possible implementation of article X through institutionalized direction and co-ordination within the existing means of the United Nations system.

In recognition of their concern the Second Review Conference called upon the Secretary-General of the United Nations to propose for inclusion in the agenda of a relevant United Nations body, the discussion and examination of the means for improving institutional mechanisms to facilitate the fullest implementation of article X. My delegation would also like to emphasize this consensus decision of the Second Review Conference and to express the hope that all States parties and specialized agencies concerned will take the necessary steps to ensure the implementation of this decision at the earliest possible time.

Mr. SABUSHIMIKE (Burundi) (interpretation from French): Sir, since this is the first time that I have spoken in this Committee, permit me first of all to congratulate you on behalf of my delegation on your election as Chairman of this Committee. Your diplomatic qualities, your great experience in international affairs and your determination in the quest for a better world augur well for the success of our deliberations. We are gratified that the choice has fallen upon you, a national of the German Democratic Republic, a country with which Burundi maintains excellent relations.

We also should like to congratulate the other officers of the Committee who will spare no effort, we are sure, to help you in carrying out the noble task entrusted you by this Assembly. I should, furthermore, like to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Ali Alatas, for the very important work he did as Chairman of this Committee.

The Republic of Burundi has always contributed to any thinking and action which involve our commitment to disarmament, justice and peace. In this International Year of Peace proclaimed by our universal Organization, every country, great or small, regardless of its economic, political or social system, must display the necessary political will to reach concrete solutions on crucial disarmament questions, because failure to take the necessary measures might bring the world to the brink of nuclear catastrophe.

The current international situation is a picture of a world in disarray, marked by tension and conflict, and we therefore appeal to States to give up war or the threat or use of force as a means of settling differences.

In South Africa an angry people are falling daily under the bullets of their oppressors simply because they are fighting against apartheid, an evil condemned by the entire international community.

(Mr. Sabushimike, Burundi)

The Pretoria régime is not only waging war inside its own borders but also committing acts of aggression against neighbouring countries, threatening their stability and security. The front-line States are forced to devote vast resources to their defence, to the detriment of their social and economic development programmes. Namibia should accede to independence, as South Africa's illegal armed occupation of that Territory and the plundering of its resources constitute a serious threat to international peace and security.

In the Middle East, so long as the Palestinian people have not regained their homeland there can be no lasting peace in that part of the world.

In Lebanon, that country's people long for peace and self-determination without outside interference in their internal affairs.

The war between Iran and Iraq, which has now been going on for six years, has taken a heavy toll in human lives and material goods. Once again we appeal to our Iranian and Iraqi brothers to renounce war as a means of settling their differences.

My country is firmly convinced that appropriate solutions to the crises in Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Central America can be found in keeping with the United Nations Charter and international law.

The Republic of Burundi, committed to the ideals of the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, has always supported and will continue to support all initiatives, whatever their source, that can lead to disarmament, to the strengthening of peace in the world and to increasing co-operation and confidence among States. My country advocates solidarity, friendship, co-operation, good-neighbourliness and peaceful coexistence. We believe that the States Members of our Organization must reduce armaments budgets and use the major portion of available financial resources for

(Mr. Sabushimike, Burundi)

the development of countries ravaged by hunger, poverty, ignorance and disease. On the eve of the twenty-first century, it is unthinkable that colossal sums are still being used to develop weapons of mass destruction when everyone knows that in any nuclear war there will be neither victors nor vanquished. We in Burundi oppose the geographical proliferation of nuclear weapons. In this connection we would like Africa to be declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone and the Indian Ocean to remain a zone of peace.

My delegation, which attaches great importance to problems of development, is convinced that scientific and technological progress should be at the service of man and not contribute to his extinction. We invite all States possessing advanced nuclear technology to exploit the atom solely for peaceful purposes. Outer space is part of the universal heritage of mankind and must therefore be used only in the interest and for the good of all mankind.

Mankind must not forget the atrocities of the Second World War. The memories of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki are still with us today. The international community has a moral obligation to save future generations from nuclear catastrophe, and we call upon the nuclear Powers to demonstrate political will and commitment in order to create conditions for peace and security that will enable the nations of the world to devote all their efforts to the task of development. To that end, the two super-Powers could agree to ban the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and embark upon negotiations leading to the conclusion of treaties on the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

The New Delhi Declaration, the Ixstapa Declaration by the eminent political leaders of five continents, namely, Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania, as well as the Political Declaration adopted by the eighth summit meeting of countries members of the Non-Aligned Movement, demonstrate the desire of all

(Mr. Sabushimike, Burundi)

peoples to live in peace in a world from which exploitation, oppression and dictat have been banished, a world in which respect for all nations and new relationships based on co-operation and mutual assistance will prevail.

I cannot fail to mention here the close link between disarmament and development. I referred to this question earlier. However, I should like to reaffirm our support for the convening next year of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development that was to have been held in June of this year at Paris.

We believe that civilized mankind can no longer tolerate the idea that the developing countries, with their 2 billion people, should remain areas of illiteracy, ignorance, chronic undernourishment, famine and epidemics that strike hundreds of thousands of people.

My delegation considers that there can be no lasting peace and security as long as the world economic system remains based on iniquity, and one in which the strongest States mercilessly pillage the natural resources of the developing countries.

The disastrous situation of those countries is, in our view, the true reason for the conflicts that often get out of control because they stem from external contradictions.

In conclusion, my delegation is convinced that the United Nations remains the ideal framework for negotiations and for the settlement of disputes between Member States. That is why we give our unreserved support to initiatives and actions that consolidate the Organization's mission to promote peace, stability and international co-operation.

We hope that the work of our Committee will lead to concrete decisions that will contribute to the efforts our world body is making to create conditions of peace and stability in the world.

(Mr. Sabuehimike, Burundi)

The panoply of weapons of mass destruction is a threat to the survival of mankind. That is why the peoples of the world must constantly bring pressure to bear to halt the development, production, stockpiling and deployment of nuclear and chemical weapons. We believe that this would be a first step in the process leading to the reduction and total destruction of stockpiles of such weapons.

In Burundi we are convinced that mankind, despite its diversity and conflicts of ideas, shares a common fate and it is in this context that my country will continue to make its humble contribution to the efforts being made by our world Organization to shape a world free of weapons in which the economic and social wellbeing of all mankind will become the highest of priorities.

Mr. TONWE (Nigeria): I gives me pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.60, entitled United Nations Programme of Fellowships on Disarmament.

The draft resolution does not seek to create new responsibilities, financial or otherwise, but to reaffirm the programme's intrinsic qualities and to reiterate the need to continue the good work.

(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria)

The draft resolution is sponsored by the following States: Algeria, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, the Dominican Republic, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia and, of course, Nigeria; others have indicated their intention to announce their sponsorship.

After recalling in the preambular paragraphs the genesis and various stages of the development of the Programme, the draft resolution acknowledges its achievements. By the end of the current session the Programme will have trained 175 government officials from 93 Member States. Many of those thus trained are today holding respectable and responsible positions concerned with disarmament affairs in their respective countries. Many representatives in this Committee today are former Fellows. Former fellows are actively involved in other forums where States are deliberating on or negotiating disarmament measures. If this happy development continues the time will come, we hope, when multilateral disarmament negotiations will be dominated by a strong body of former Fellows whose common experience, technical competence, deep understanding of the real issues and, above all, personal ties should make it easier for them to make progress in the field of disarmament. That is a remarkable development and we are all its architects.

In my delegation's statement on 15 October in this forum we expressed our appreciation for the co-operation of Member States which have made the Fellowship Programme a success story. Similarly, the sponsors would like to have the draft resolution express their gratitude to those Governments which so far have invited Fellows for study visits in their respective countries. They also hope that ever more Governments will extend similar invitations to Fellows in the years to come.

Finally, the draft resolution commends the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs and his staff for the highly competent manner in which they have operated the Fellowship Programme.

(Mr. Tonwe, Nigeria)

It is our sincere hope, considering the significance attached to the Programme by Member States, the wide support that it enjoys and the benefits derived from it by all, that draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.60 will be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to inform representatives that the following delegations are inscribed on the list of speakers for the meeting tomorrow morning: Albania, Colombia, China, Austria, Cuba, Romania, the German Democratic Republic, Canada, Denmark and Angola.

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.