UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
41st meeting
held on
Friday, 17 November 1989
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela)

CONTENTS

Consideration of and action on draft resolutions on disarmament items [49] to [69] and [151] (continued)

Statement by the Chairman

Organization of work

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 corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/44/PV.41
13 December 1989
ENGLISH

89-63255 5132V (E)

The meeting was called ta order at 3.55 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 69 AND 151 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): This afternoon, the Committee will take action, in the order indicated, an the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/44/L.55/Rev.1 in cluster 9; L.26/Rev.2 and L.56/Rev.2 in cluster 10; L. 38/Rev.1 and L.47/Rev.1 in cluster 15; L. 25/Rev.1 in cluster 8; L. 67 - which replaced A/C.1/44/L.54 - in cluster 12; and L.21 in cluster 7.

I call on the representative of Lesotho, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.55/Rev.1.

Mr. KOLANE (Leaotho): On behalf of the memher countries of the African Group, my delegation has the honour to speak on agenda item 63, "General and complete disarmament", and to introduce draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 55/Rev. 1, entitled Prohibition of the dumpinq of radioactive wastes".

By adoptinq this draft reaolution, the Committee would hear in mind resolution CM/RES.1153 (XLVIII) concerninq the dumping of nuclear and industrial wastes in Africa, adopted by the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at its forty-eighth ordinary aesaion, and resolution CM/RES.1225 (L) on the control of the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes and on their disposal, wherein the OAU Council of Ministers expressed their concern with the problem of the dumpinq of nuclear and industrial wastes.

The Committee would also welcome resolution GC(XXXIII)/RES/509 on the dumping of nuclear wastes, adopted on 29 Septemher 1989 by the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) at its thirty-third regular session.

(Mr. Kolane, Lesotho)

The item before us was included in the agenda of the General Assembly laet year as a rsault of the African Council of Ministers' initiative with regard to the dumpinq of wastes in African countries hy certain countries and their tranenational corporations and enterpr ises.

(Mr. Kolane, Lesotho)

It will be recalled that last year two draft teaolutions were eubmitted on this agenda item, by Nigeria and the Group of African States respectively. Great attention was attracted hy this item, as it reflected the concern of African and other States on the issue. Many States addressed the matter, emphasizing that it was of general concern to all regions, not only Africa. They called on the international community to take strict measures to prohibit actions that could endanger the security of States and infringe their sovereignty.

The Committee will recall that two major problem6 faced the draft resolutions. First, there were two texts from Africa and there waa a need to reconcile the two. Secondly, a group of Staten constituting the industrialized countries, and the main producera of nuclear and industrial wastes, felt and expressed reservations about the draft reaolutiona.

Regarding the first problem, despite intensive negotiations agreement on merging the two draft resolutions eluded the African Group. The African-Group draft reaolution that emerged after a number of textual changes was appropriately retitled "Dumping of radioactive wastes" and war formulated in such a manner that it was global in nature; it did not address itself to dumping in Africa only, but in all other countries Members of the United Natione that are also affected hy such practices.

The draft resolutions of the African Group and of Nigeria were ultimately adopted separately at the forty-third session, much to Africa's regret. However, negotiation6 and efforts at merginq the two text8 did not atop there. The result of the subsequent negotiations and changes is the new draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.55/Rev.1, now before the Committee, which enjoys the rupport of the African Group as a whole. We put it before the international community since the question of dumping is global and infringer the security and sovereignty of all States.

(Mr. Kolane, Lesotho)

Durinq her address to the General Aouemhly at its forty-fourth session, on 8 Novemher 1989, the British Prime Minister said, with respect to the scope of international action, that

> The evidence is there. The damage is he inq done. What do we, the international community, do about it?" (A/44/PV.48, p. 9-10)

The draft resolution before us seeks to sensitize the international community with respect to the grave consequences of the dumping of hazardous wastes for the security and economic well-being of States. It appeals to the international community to prevent all nuclear-waete dumpinq practices which would infringe the sovereiqnty of all States.

Regardinq the second prohlem, we hope that now, with the changes made to the two draft resolutions adopted last year, the Member States that had prohlama with the draft resolutions as they were formulated then will now show political will and find the new all-encompassinq text more acceptable for adoption hy consensus.

Mr. OWOSENI (Nigeria) : As members are aware, the issue of the dumping of radioactive wastes was first included in the aqenda of the General Assembly at the Eorty-third session, last year, at the instance of my deleqation. The subsequent cnneideration of the item in the First Committee led to the adoption at that session of two resolutions on the subject, one introduced by Nigeria - resolution 43/75 Q of 7 December 1988, entitled Prohibition of the dumpinq of radioactive wastes for hostile purposes" - and the other by the African Group - resolution 43/75 T of the same date, entitled Dumping of radioactive wastes".

In its statement on 24 October 1989, durinq the qeneral debate in this Committee, my daleqation commended the Committee for its eupport on this question last year. We also expressed our satisfaction that the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva hau, since the adoption of the enabling resolution, initiated effective

(Mr. Owoseni, Nigeria)

consideration of the matter by its Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons. Furthermore, we are pleased to note that at the end of its thirty-third regular session, in Vienna, on 29 Septsmber 1989, the General Conference of IAEA adopted A resolution on the dumpinq of nuclear wastes, in which it expressed the hope that the IAEA technical workinq group of experts would complete its work next year and auhmit to the General Conference in 1990 a draft code or practice for transboundary movements of radioactive wastes.

Nigeria s concern at the dumping of radioactive wastes is informed hy the lethal nature of that dumpinq. The deliberate dissemination of radiation, whether by attacks against nuclear installations or through the dumping of radioactive wastes, would have catsatrophic consequences on both human health and the ecosystem. That makes the dumping of radioactive wastes for hostile purpose8 a very effective means of conducting radiological warfare since it would surely result in grievoue harm, injury and destruction - which is what warfare is all about. Nigeria's intention in exposing that danger is to exclude permanently the possibility of radioactive wastes being used as weapons of warfare, and further to ensure that such wastes are not dumped clandestinely in the territory of other States.

It is indeed mcst appropriate that this subject should be considerad by the Conference on Disarmament under its agenda item entitled "New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons , which weapons are viewed as futuristic.

From what we already know about the dendly effects of radiation, the effect of dumping radioactive wastes could bs more lethal than the effects from some weapons of mass destruction on which international conventions prohibiting their use have already been concluded, A cane in paint is biological weapons. We hope it will he

(Mr. Owoseni, Nigeria)

possible for the Conference on Disarmament to conclude action on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes early, in order to remove any temptation of the use of dumping for hostile purposes.

This year, Nigeria and other African countries have decided to pool their resources and preaent a common draft resolution on the subject. Not only does that conform with the wiah of the Committee on this item, hut it also will facilitate a concentrated approach to the subject in the appropriate forums in the United Nations, the Conference on Disarmament and IAEA.

In recommending draft reuolution A/C.1/44/L.55/Rev.1, entitled Prohibition Of the dumping of radioactive wastes", for support by all delegations, the Nigerian delegation wishes to thank the delegations of Kenya, as Chairman of the African Group for October, and Egypt, as the representative of the Chairman of the Otqanization of African Unity, for facilitating this single text, which perfectly combines the essential ingredients of the two resolutions mentioned earlier, We wish to remark that draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.55/Rev.1 deliherately avoids other aspects of the issue that, while important, are nevertheless related to the work Of other committees outside this forum, thus focusing on the disarmament angle under radiologial warfare, as appropriate to the work of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.55/Rev.1, entitled Prohibition of the dumpinq of radioactive wastes" . The draft resolution was introduced by the representative Of Lesotho, on behalf of the Group of African States, at the present meetinq. The draft resolution is sponsored hy the delegations of Kenya, on behalf of the African Group, and Romania. The sponsors have asked that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. May I take it that the Committee adopts the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.55/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote on draft. resolution A/C.1/L.55/Rev.1.

I call on the representative of France on a point of order.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French) : It appears that due to an Unfortunate misunderstanding the request we made before this meeting that the draft resolution be put to a vote did not reach the Chairman.

I wish to stress that my delegation asked for a vote, I shall explain when France gives its explanation of vote.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : I shall call on the representative of France after we have completed the list of speakers in explanation of vote.

Mt. KENYON (United Kingdom) : I should 1 ike to explain the United Kingdom s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.55/Rev.1, on the prohibition of the dumping of radioactive waste.

The United Kingdom strongly supports the contents of the draft resolution. Indeed our delegation worked hard with the delegation of Kenya to try to ensure that the language of the text could command the same universal support as its content. We thank it warmly for its efforts. However, the United Kingdom would have liked to have seen one additional change to the text - to amend the title of the draft resolution and the agenda item as it appears in operative paragraph 9.

For the United Kingdom, there can be no question of the prohibition of the disposal of radioactive waste. Such a prohibition would logically entail a Prohibition of all uses of nuclear energy, particularly peaceful uses. We understand that this was not the intention of the authors in using the phrase dumping of radioactive waste . But unfortunately it did not prove possible to agree on an alternative term which would have removed the ambiguity surrounding the term dumping ,

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

I should like to note for the record that the United Kingdom, in supporting the draft resolution, interprets the phrase dumping of radioactive waste" in the sense of any use of nuclear waste which would constitute radiological warfare. That is the formulation found in the fifth preamhular paragraph and psraqraph 3 of the draft resolution.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): I should like to explain the vote of the Netherlands delegation on draft resolution L/55/Rev.1, on the prohibition of the dumpinq of radioactive waate.

Once aqain the First Committee is asked to express itself on an issue which we firmly believe is outside its scope of activities. We reqret that the efforts to transfer the subject to the Second Committee have not yet proved successful.

We qave our support to the present draft resolution in its revised form on the clear understanding that its title, Prohibition of the dumpinq of radioactive wastes", and consequently the title of the agenda item, refers to "any use of nuclear waete in a manner that would constitute radioloqical warfare".

The draft resolution points to the Conference on Disarmament as the forum to consider effective measures of control against the use of radiolocqical methods of warfare. The Conference on Disarmament is indeed the appropriate forum for treatinq the subject of radiological warfare. It is therefore all the more important to make a clear distinction between dumping of industrial wastes, which is an environmental problem, on the one hand, and the offensive and hostile use of radiological waste, on the other.

At the same time we believe that the issue of dumping of industrial wastes must he addressed, takinq into account the purely economic issues which play a role in this matter, But this should be done in the proper context and in the proper

(Mr ¨agenmakers, Netherlands)

forum. We strongly appeal to the delegations concerned to agree to transfer the subject to the Second Committee, where its proper treatment could well prove far more productive.

Mr. BIALEK (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to comment on draft resolution L/55/Rev.1, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive waste". Though we joined the consensus on the draft resolution, we still have some reservations.

We believe that radioactive wastes do not meet the resuirements of weapons for military use, but are an environmental problem. We welcome the improvements made in the text thus far and we look forward to further necessary adjustments during the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): Before turning to the uuestion of substance, I should like to recapitulate the difficulties we have encountered.

Before the meeting started, my delegation asked a member of the Secretariat for a vote to be taken. Unfortunately, due to some difficulty, that reauest does not appear to have been transmitted. when the time came for the announcement by you, Sir, that a reauest had been made not to have a vote, my delegation was taken by surprise. We had raised our hand at the very moment you called the meeting to order.

I do not wish to make matters worse, but in the light of reasons of substance I shall explain, I hope due note will he taken that the French delegation did not take part in the vote. I would add that when this draft resolution is presented to the General Assembly we shall ask for a vote.

I now turn to the substance which, if there had been a vote, would have prompted my delegation to abstain.

(Mr. Morel, France)

France would have had to abstain on draft resolution L/55/Rev.1 for the following reasons. First, the preambular part recalls resolution 43/75 T, adopted at the last session of the General Assembly. France abstained on that resolution and gave an explanation of vote on that subject. Secondly, France certainly voted in favour of resolution 43/75 Q, on the same subject, but we think that this subject would be better dealt with in the Second Committee, in which it is also being discussed.

(Mr. Morel, France)

Thirdly, and this is the major consideration, France has already had many opportunities, both in the General Assembly and in the Conference on Disarmament, to emphasize the fact that one cannot equate the dumping of radioactive wastes with radiological weapons. General Assembly resolution 43/75 Q waa based on an implicit equation. In draft reaolution A/C.1/44/L.55/Rev.1, however, that equation is made explicit. That is the more regrettable because the work of the Conference on Disarmament's Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons has still not enabled us to arrive at any aqreed definition of the concept of radiological weapons or radiological warfare. Draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 55/Rev.1 would therefore prejudge the work of the Conference on Disarmament on this point, and France cannot aqree to that.

Those are the points I wished to make in explanation of -vote after the voting on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee, who has asked to make a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) : We have taken note of the statement of the representative of France, and we do apoloqize if there was some misunderstanding or breakdown in communication. However, I would also like to reiterate that we in the Secretariat always do our utmost to ascertain, before proceeding to action on any draft resolution, whether or not a vote is required, or what particular action is to be taken.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French) : I would like to say that I fully appreciate the difficulties the Secretariat must face. I certainly did not wish to imply anything other than the fact of the present material circumstances, because we all appreciate the pressure on the Secretar iat. As I said , we do not wish to complicate matter.9 at this last meetinq on disarmament questions. I have stated the quest ion of principle and reserved our position. Of course we have every confidence in the excellent functioning of the Secretariat.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : The Committee will now turn to draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 26/Rev. 2, Confidence- and security-huildinq measures and conventional disarmament in Europe . Does any deleqation wish to make a statement other than in explanation of vote?

Mr. MOREL (France!) (interpretation from French) : Since we are now turninq to a quite different subject and are about to take a decision on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L, 26/Rev. 2, I should like to state my deleqation's position and stress, in particular, the spirit in which my country, alonq with Austria, Belqium, Cyprus, Finland, Greece, Hunqa ry , the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Luxembourq, Italy, Poland, Sweden, and Yuqoslavia, submitted the text of the draft resolution. The text in a familiar one, first because it makes explicit reference to General Assembly resolution 43/75 P adopted by consensus last year unde r the same ti tle, and, secondly, because th is year our Committee has made progress in its consideration of this draft resolution, leadinq to the present version in document A/C, 1/44/L. 26/Rev.2, which is the result of the broad consultations that were carried out, primarily amonq the States enqaged in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE).

In draw in9 up our draft. resolution we have opted for sfmpl ici ty and concision. Indeed, we have preferred not to 90 into details with reqard to the negotiat ions in progress. We have also felt it naceasary to consider the

(Mr. Moral., France)

wishes of countries outside Europe that do not participate in the onqoinq process at Vienna. It is easy to understand that at the present juncture, when the pace af those negotiations has been vastly accelerated, with many new and complex developments, a certain caution should he exercised, especially this year.

On the other hand, we have deemed it essential that the draft resolution contain A clear approva1 of the Vienna process by the United Nations General Assembly. I would recall that the negotiations are designed to achieve a proqressive, concrete and mul tiform reduction in the various forms of military confrontation that have dominated the h istory of the European continent for more than 40 years anc to lead to an over-all re-evaluation of East-West relations. That, indeed, is what in at stake in the Vienna negotia t ions, The language we have used to express that approval is, as I said, simple, concise and uncontroversial. I would therefore hope that draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 26/Rev. 2 might be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation From Span ish): No deleqation has expressed the wish to make a statement. in explanation of vote before the votinq, and the Committee will therefore take action on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 26/Rev. 2, "Confidence- and securi ty-bu ilding measures and convent ional disarmament in Europe," The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of France. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee to read out the liat of sponsors.

MrKHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) : Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 26/Rev. 2 has 14 sponsors, as follows: Austria, Belqium, Cyprus, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, Italy , Luxembourq, Pol and, Sweden and Yuqos lav ia.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 26/Rev. 2. The sponsors of the draft resolution have

(The Chairman)

asked that it be adopted by the First Committee without a vote. If I hear no oh jection. it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 26/Rev. 2 was sdopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. GRANGER (United States of America), The United States is pleased that the First Committee, by adopting draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.26/Rev. 2 without a vote, has joined in welcoming the two distinct negotiations aimed at enhancing stability and security in Europe that. are taking place in Vienna within the framework of the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE). The United States attaches qreat importance to both of those negotiations.

The negotiation amonq the 35 participants in the CSCE, which is taking place in accordance with the manda te agreed upon in the 1983 Madrid meeting of the CSCE, is seeking to elaborate a new set of mutually complementary confidence- and security-bu ilding measures that would build upon and expand the result of the Stockholm Conference with the aim of reducing the risk of military confrontation in Europe.

The other nego tia t ton, on conventtonal armed forces in Europe, is conducted by the 23 States members of the North Atlantic alliance and the Warsaw Treaty as a resul t and on the basis of a manda ta they agreed upon las t January. That manda ta commits them to contributing to the ob jective of strengthening stability and secur ity in Europe through the establishment of a stable and secure balance of conven t ional armed forces a t lower levels, the elimination of dispari ties prejudicial to stability and security, and the elimination, as a matter of priority, of the capability for launching surprise attacks and for initiating large-scale of fens ive act ions. Having received a major impetus Prom the significant initiative advanced by the North Atlantic alliance last May, that negotiation is engaged in intensive and hard work with a view to achieving its objective as rapidly as possible.

(Mr. Granqer, United States)

In joining consensus on draft reeolution A/C.1/44/L.26/Rev.2, the United States gave a further expression of its hope for an early and positive conclusion of both of those negotiations. It is gratifying that all members of the Committee share that hope,

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): Czechoelovak ia is in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.26/Rev.2. In our view, the positions are very close together and agreement should be possible in the near future. It is essential to have control on the basis of mutual agreement. Many questions are still outstanding, but we are optimistic that work done within the framework of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe has taken place in an atmosphere of harmony.

The priorities of the three qroups of countries participating in the neqotiat ions should be taken in to account. The coming-together of positions will enable us to find speedy solutions to the complex problems that still exist. In our view, the most important problem is that of naval armamerts among the confidence-building measures, which should encompass all of the armed forces.

The progress achieved in the course of the negotiations in Vienna will be an important factor in increasing confidence in Europe. Czechoslovakia s position takes into account the establishment of a zone of confidence, co-operation and good-neighbour liness among the States members of the Warsaw Treaty and of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That proposal, if it were to be implemented, would contribute to improving the pol itical dialogue and mutually advantageous relations of co-operation among all interested countries.

We have always been in favour of the process of rapprochement in Europe. For thoee reasons, Czechoelovak ia joined in the conaensue on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.26/Rev.2.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now turn to draft resolu t ion A/C. 1/44/L. 56/Rev. 2.

I call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. SOOD (India) : My delegation wishes to put on record its views on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.56/Rev.2, entitled Conventional. disarmament on a regional scale .

The priorities in disarmament were established by the General Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament, held in 1978, and are reflected in paragraph 45 of its Final Document. They are: nuclear weapons; other weapon8 of mass destruction, including chemical weapons; conventional weapons, including any which may he deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects; and reduction of armed forces. Those priorities are as valid today au they were a decade ago, in view of the onqoinq nuclear arms face on Earth and the threat of its extension into outer space.

Nuclear war is aualitativaly different from other forms of war, as it threatens the very survival of mankind. Therefore, conventional disarmament has to be pursued, within the framework of progress towards general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Approximately three-auartara of the world s military expenditure, currently entimated at $1 trillion a year, is accounted for hy nuclear-weapon States and States belonqinq to the two military alliances. Those nuclear-weapon States and members of the two military alliances account for more than 93 per cent of international. arms transfers. A linkaqe therefore exists between nuclear weapons and conventional weapons, as the nuclear-weapon Powers and the two military alliances account for the largest arsenals of both nuclear and conventional. weapons. It is clear that it is those countries that must take the lead in ending the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, hy halting the qualitative escalation and by significantly reducing stockpiles to lower levels.

(Mr. Sood, India)

Isolated measures in the field of conventional disarmament offer little hope of meaninqful progress. A qlobal approach is a prerequisite if our efforts are to lead to significant results.

Due attention also needs to he given to regions which possess ths highest concentration of both nuclear and conventional forces. A 1 imi tinq approach would not only dilute the priorities but would also divert attention to secondary or peripheral areas.

Accordingly, my delegation is constrained to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish) : My delegation wishes to state its position on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.2, introduced by the delaqation of Peru and sponsored by a number of countries, It deals with conventional disarmament on a regional scale.

We note that the text reflects some of the principles which in the Cuban delegation s view are basic elements of any consideration of conventional dinarmament on a regional scale, It reiterates the primary reaponeibility of nuclear-weapon States and militarily aiqnificant States. It also reaffirms that effective nuclear-disarmament measures and the prevention of nuclear war have the hiqhent priority, which in our view reflects the essence of paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the 1978 special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That paragraph states priorities in diaarmament neqotiatione - mentioning f irst of all., nuclear weapons.

The concern expressed in the draft resolution that conventional weapons have become increasinqly more lethal and destructive, because of the continuing military application of technology and scientific advancea, is justified, heceure in our view It reflects a reality which is becoming increasingly clear and which is a reason for alarm and indignation on the part of international public opinion. The

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

draft resolution says that especially in militarily aiqnificant States canvantional weapons consume large amounts of resources which could be utilized for the social and economic development of the people of all countries, particularly the developing countries.

However, in our view some ideas did not receive the attention that their importance merits. For example, there is no mention of the inherent riqht of self-defence, embodied in the United Nations Charter, a matter which must not be ignored when referring to the idea of holding neqotiationa on a balanced reduction of armed forces and on conventional disarmament. The fifth preambular paragraph omits that matter, although it is specifically referred to in the final document of the 1978 special session, in paragraph 83.

In considering disarmament on a regional scale, we should not only take account of the characteristics of each region and the views of all. interested parties, hut must also establish, given the danger to international peace and security, that negotiations leading to conventional disarmament measures on a reqional scale must begin in those regions where there is a high concentration of nuclear and conventional weapons.

In the final documents of the ninth summit meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement, held in Belgrade, the non-aligned countries expressed their readiness to contribute fully to the initiation and realisation of the process of conventional disarmament on the global, reqional and sub-regional levels. They also pointed out that the cessation of all acts of aggression against non-aligned countries, the strict observance of the principles of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, non-uee or threat of une of force in international relations, peaceful. settlement of disputes, Pelf-determination, self-defence, and the removal of all economic and political pressures against non-aligned countries

(Mr. Rivero, Cuba)

will make it possible for all of them to contribute effectively to the process of disarmament.

The draft resolution appeals to all States to facilitate the progress of regional disarmament, refraining from any action, that might hinder the achievement of that objective. It mentions only the use or threat of use of force and intervention or interference, omittinq a whole set of principles contained in the Belgrade summit documents, reflecting the sad reality which many of our countries face, almost on a daily basis, as a result of the policies of hostility and aggression applied by some States. In our view, the omission of those ideas makes the text inadeauate, because it is therefore limited.

There is another important omission from the text, important because it has a neqative influence on possible future negotiations leading to conventional disarmament at the regional level. I refer to the continued existence of foreign military bases, belonging to nuclear Powers outside a region, against the will of the Governments of the countries where they are situated, and the carrying out of military manoeuvres and exercises which are intimidating and infringe the sovereignty and territorial inteqrity of independent countries. Those matters were also considered at the ninth summit Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and are referred to in paragraph 24 of the section of the Final Documents of that Conference dealinq with international security and disarmament.

In general., we acknowledge the efforts made by the sponsors to try to take into account the various suggestions made by delegations. However, for the reasons I have qiven the Cuban delegation will have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now invite the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.56/Rev.2, entitled "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale". This draft resolution has 15 sponsors and was introduced by the delegation of Peru at the 31st meeting of the First Committee on 8 November 1989.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.56/Rev.2 has the following sponsors: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Romania and Uruguay.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, lceiand, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swazil rd, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist &publics, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Bahrain, Belgium, Canada, Cuba, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, India, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Mozambique, Netherlands, Portugal, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.56/Rev.2 was adopted by 98 votes to 1, with 31 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on those delegations who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. BIALEK (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to explain my delegation's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.56/Rev.2, "Conventional disarmament on a regional scale". Since this initiative began in 1985 my delegation has taken a special interest in the item and has welcomed actively the growing awareness and acceptance of the importance of conventional disarmament and related confidence-building measures - particularly on a regional basis. It has welcomed and supported the corresponding draft resolutions as a necessary complement.

My delegation continues to subscribe fully to the ideas underlying conventional diearmament on a regional scale as set forth in the previous resolutions. We regret that this year's draft resolution departs from the appropriate concentration on the matter of conventional. disarmament by introducing positions on, and linkages to, other disarmament measures. Those are positions which, in this context, we can hardly share. We should like to encourage the sponsors to maintain their previous balanced argumentation, and we should be glad to vote in favour of a corresponding draft resolution at the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

Mt. ALPMAN (Turkey): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.56/Rev. 2. As in the case of corresponding draft

(Mr. Alpman, Turkey)

resolution because we agree with its main thrust. However, we are not fully satisfied with the text of this year's draft, and we feel it contains extraneous elements that should have been left out. Furthermore, had the second preambular paragraph been voted on separately, my delegation would have abstained in that vote.

Mr. AL MOSAWI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Conventional disarmament on a regional scale should be part of the general process Of disarmament, in accordance with the priorities established in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, held in 1978. However, the comment, in the fifth preambular paragraph of this draft resolution - that negotiations on nuclear-disarmament measures should go hand in hand with negotiations on the balanced reduction of armed forces and with negotiations on conventional disarmament - is not in keeping with the priority that has been given to nuclear disarmament, which is mentioned in the fourth preambular paragraph.

Mr. IBAÑEZ (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Spain voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.56/Rev.2. Nevertheless, we should like to express reservations about some of the ideas that it contains. First, we do not believe that the adoption of effective measures on nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war should be given higher priority than other measures in the field of disarmament. In our view, all measures for the prevention of all kinds of war - leading to general and complete disarmament - should be given the same priority. The disarmament process must be a coherent whole.

In addition, we are not convinced that the implementation of scientific and technological advances results in the development of more destructive conventional weapons. Indeed, at times the opposite happens.

Finally, the delegation of Spain believes that its position On the

(Mr. Ibañez, Spain)

relationship between disarmament and development was defined clearly in its statements at the United Nations Confarenca on that subject in 1987. That position differs from the one that two paragraphs - one praambular paragraph and one operative paragraph - of tha draft resolution that the Committee has juet adopted could be interpreted am indicating.

MR. MASON (Canada): For reasons similar to those outlined by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, Canada, very regretfully, had to abstain in the vote on th is draft resolution, despite the fact that it contains many positive elements, and despite our support in previous yaara for similar draft resolutions.

Mr. GRANGER (United States of America) : Our delegation supports the principle of conventional dimarmament on a reqional scale, but we find that draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.56/Rev.2 unduly emphasizes nuclear disarmament and not the subject denoted in its title. For that reason, we were unable to ruppott the draft resolution.

Mr. HUNG (Viet Nam): My delegation wishes to explain why it abrtrined in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.56/Rev.2, entitled Conventional dinarmament on a regional scale". While favouring conventional disarmament on a regional scale an an integral part of global disarmament efforts, we hold that regional or subregional disputes rhould he nettled exclusively by peaceful means on the basis of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the States concerned. My deleqation would also like to stress that any measures of disarmament, including confidence-huildinq measures, to he taken at the reqional or subregional level must take into account tha characterioticn and situation of each region and the views of the parties concerned. The measures adopted rhould he directed at preventinq and reducing tensions, at creating a batter climate, and at assuring the security of all States involved.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We turn next to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.38/Rev.1. I call first on deleqationn wishing to make a atatement other than in explanation of vote.

Mr. TUN (Myanmar): I have asked to speak to express my delegation's wish to join Canada and 35 other States from various regions of the world in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.38/Rev.1, on chemical and bacteriological weapons. In our view it is one of the most important rnd timely draft resolutions to be submitted to the Committee at the present session. As my delegation har otated on previous occasions, chemical weapons represent a class of weapons of mass

(Mr. Tun, Myanmar)

destruction whore total and comprehensive prohibition cannot and must not he delayed any further.

Representinq a country which is unequivocally committed to the achievement of such a han, we wish to see the conclusion, at the earliest possible opportunity, of 4 convention on chemical weapons that is global, comprehensive and verifiable. The Pat is Conference, held in January 1989, expressed the collective will of the international communi ty to achieve that goal, The Government-Industry Conference aqa inst Chemical Weapons, held at Canberra two months ago, and the memorandum of understandinq between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on chemical weapons, providing for verification and data exchanges, signed on 23 September 1989, represent further constructive ● tepm. It is incumbent on all of us to maintain the political momentum already generated and to translate the universal concern and interest into the achievement of a global han on chemical weapons.

My delegation notes with satisfaction that, in paraqraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would urge tho Conference on Disarmament, as a matter of high priority, to intensify in 1990 its neqotiations with a view to the final elaboration at the earliest date of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons and on their destruction, end would request the Conference to use the political momentum generated by the Paris Conference.

My delegation considers that the draft resolution, the result of broad consultations, is a canrtructiva text and merits consideration for adoption by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C, 1/44/L. 38/Rev.1, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological

(biological) weapons". The draft resolution was introduced by the delegation of Canada at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 8 November 1989. It has 37 sponsors.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.38/Rev.1 is sponsored by the following delegations: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Rapublic of Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Uruguay and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.38/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We turn next to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1. I call first on delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of vote.

Mr. REESE (Australia): After consultations with the sponsors of draft rawolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1 and other interested delegations, it has been agreed that the text on which action will ha taken today should have an additional footnote to an operative paragraph, the addition to be incorporated in the Rapporteur's report under thin agenda item, to be submitted to the General Assembly. With that technical addition, I now commend the text of the draft resolution to the First Committee for adoption without a vote,

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As no deleqation has asked to make a statement in axplana tion of its position before the voting, we shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1, taking into account the statement just made by the representative of Australia. The draft resolution has 32 sponsors. It wan introduced hy the representative of Australia at the 31st meetinq of the First Committee, on 15 November 1989.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1 has the fcl low inq sponsors: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulqaria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic Of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Pot tugal, Samoa, Spa in, Sweden, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Thailand, the United Kinqdom of Great Br itain and Northern Ireland and the United Staten of Amer icn.

I would like to make a statement, on behalf of the Secretariat, on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1. Under the terms of operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would r equest the Secretary-General to carry out promptly inves tigations in response to reports that may be brought to his attention by any Member State concerning the poss ible use of chemical and bacteriological, biological or toxin weapons that may constitu te a viola tion of the 192 4 Geneva Protocol or other relevant rules of customary in terna tional law in order to ascer ta in the facts of the matter and to report promptly the results of any such investigation to all Member States. It is not possible to foresee whether such invea tigations would be called for in

(Mr. Kheradi)

1990-1991. It would be the intention of the Secretary-General, therefore, to enter into possible commitments in thin respect under the provisions of the General Assembly reaolu tion on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses in the biennium 1990-1991 to be adopted by the General Assembly at its current session.

In addition, under the terms of operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, the Secretary-General would assess the actions needed to implement the guidelines and procedures proposed by the group of qualified experts, particularly with regard to the implementation of standing preparatory measures for investigations. Should that assessment indicate the need for actions involving additional expenditures, the Secretary-General would report further to the General Assembly on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The sponsors of this draft resolution have requested that it be adopted without a vote. If there are no objections, it will be so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1.

I call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of vote.

Mr. OWOSENI (Niger ia): The Niger ian &legation wishes to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, entitled: Amendment of the Treaty Bann ing Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water . The draft, which is sponsored by 57 States, including Niger ia, was introduced by the representative of Mexico. Niger la considers an urgent step towards a comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test ban to be an i tern deserving consideration of the highest priority, in order tc stem the tide of action towards both the qualitative sophistication of existing nuclear arsenals and the horizontal proliferation which would inevitably ensue without a ban,

(Mr. Owoseni, Niger ia)

Notwithstanding the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - and var ious super-Power bilateral strategic talks, as well as other regional negotiations in Europe, it is common knowledge that even if all those negotiations came to fruition, the remaining nuclear arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States would still present the world with an awesome overkill capacity with continued grave consequences for international peace and security. Fur thermore, the fact that scientific and technological improvements in weaponry have continued to be employed towards the innovation of a third generation of sophisticated nuclear weapons vividly demonstrates that the threat to global peace and security is not diminishing.

Thus the removal of the threat of nuclear war, the elimination of nuclear weapons, the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, and the prohibition of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes are all inseparable Links in the strengthening of global non-proliferation.

Th ta is why Niger ia is concerned that a few States could continue to rationalize their possession of, and reliance on, nuclear weapons for their narrow security interests while at the same time expecting others to accept the inherent and obvious infringement which this poses Eor the pace and security of the preponderant majority of States which do not have - and have refrained from aqu ir ing - nuclear weapons.

Niger ia does not and cannot accept the bizarre notion of the classification of the world into nuclear haves and have-nots, with all its consequences for the survival of human civil ization. If we must demonstrate the determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of another war, which could not be won in our nuclear age, the litmus test is a speedy agreement leading to a comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

(Mr. Owoseni, Niger ia)

The position of the three depositary Rowers with regard to the issue of the amendment oonferencs in 1990 will indicate whether or not they are capable of leading the rest of the world towards a safer, nuclear-free generation. It will be a great catastrophe for the future of the non-proliferation régime if this opportunity to utilize the provisions of the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty to achieve a comprehensive test-ban Treaty is lost, particularly in view of the prevailing efforts towards global co-operation and a relaxation of tension.

The Nigerian delegation therefore commends draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1 to the overwhelming support of delegations in view Of its balanced and objective nature as well as the legitimate aspirations of mankind which it seeks to achieve.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish)2 I now call upon delegations who wish to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1.

Mr. KENMN (United Kingdom): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1. The Government of the united Kingdom, as one of the three depositary Governments of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, has consulted over many months with the other depositaries in order to begin preparations for convening the conference requested by 41 parties to consider the amendment to the Treaty proposed last year.

Taking into account the varying views expressed by parties to the Treaty, the depositaries decided to convene the Conference in Geneva on 8 January 1991 for a period of up to two weeks. I announced this to the Committee on 2 November on behalf of the delegations of the three depositary Governments, and yesterday my Government issued formal notification of the decision to all parties signatory and acceding to the Treaty in London through diplomatic channels.

It is a matter for regret that the parties cannot reach consensus on what we believe is a fair and sensible resolution of the different opinions over the timing of an amendment conference or on the appropriate procedure for its preparation. We shall, however, remain open for further discussions through all available channels in search of such consensus.

There are a number of points on which my delegation as a party to the Treaty is unable to support the draft resolution before us. We have therefore decided to vote against it. A conference split into two parts is unnecessary, wasteful of resources and could be intended to establish a linkage with the non-proliferation

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

Treaty Review Conference, which we would regard as spurious and damaging. Finally, we do not believe that funding of the amendment conference is a subject that can be usefully addressed at this stage in this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water". The draft resolution has 57 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 26th meeting, on 2 November 1489.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Dr aft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1 has the following sponsors: Afghanistan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Cape Verde, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Egypt, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, Uruguay, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

I should also like to read out the follwing statement concerning the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, on behalf of the Secretariat:

"By the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, entitled 'Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water', the General Assembly would recommend that a preparatory committee be established to make arrangements for

(Mr. Kher adi)

a conference to be convened to consider an amendment to the Treaty . The General Assembly would also request the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance and provide such services, including eummary records, as may be required for the amendment conference and its preparation.

"It should be noted that the conference will be a conference of States parties to the Treaty. Other conferences of multilateral disarmament treaties, for example the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the sea-bed treaty and the biological weapons convention, included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the appropriate conference and any sessions of its preparatory committee. Under those arr angemen ta, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the Organization. Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under the draft raaoluticn to render the necessary assistance and provide such services, including summary records, as may be required for the amendment conference and its preparation would have no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations and that the associated costs would be met in accordance with the financial arrangements tc be made by the parties to the Treaty.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 25/Rev .1. A request has been made for separate votes on several portions of the draft resolution. First, a separate vote has been r equested on the third preambular paragraph. Secondly, a separate vote has been requested on the sentence in operative paragraph 1, the relevant part of which should read:

"... amendment conference to be convened at United Nations Headquarters for an initial two-to-three-week session , and so on,

(The Chairman)

Thirdly, the Committee will vote on operative paragraph 1 as a whole, The Committee will than take a separate vote an operative paragraph 2, and then the draft resolution as a whole will be voted upon.

The Committee will first vote on the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1. A separa te, recorded vote has been requested .

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austr ia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbador, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d 'Ivoire , Cuba, Cypr us, Czechoslovak ia, Democra tic Yemen, Djibouti , Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Leso tho, Liber ia, Libyan Ar ab Jamah ir i ya, Madagascar , Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger ia, Oman, Pakietan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republ ics, United Arab Emirates, United Rpublic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Japan, Turkey, United King&m of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Denmark, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Nether lands, Norway, Portugal, Spain

The third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 25/Rev.1 was retained by 116 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions,

Thr CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now put to the vote thr phrase at United Nations Headquarters", which appears in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1,

A separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote waa taken,

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Qabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singnpore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoalavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining: Australia, Auatrin, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Nether lands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

The phrase "at United Nations Headquarters" in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1 was retained by 105 votes to 1, with 22 abstentions.*

---

* Subsequently the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now put to thr vote operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, as a whole.

A separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darueralam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonrria, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Ku-it, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakirtan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yamrn, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, Canada, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Gr-sat Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining: Auatralin, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, as a whole, was retained by 100 votes to 10, with 13 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1.

A separate, r worded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barhadoa, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darusaalam, Bulgaria, Rurkina Faso, Burundi, Byslorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cypr us, Czechoelovak ia, Democratic Yemen, Dj ibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fij i, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic F&public, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bieeau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People s Democr atic Republic , Lesotho, Liber ia, Libyan Arab Jamah ir iya , Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar , Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger , Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines , Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, Ger many, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Ne ther lands, Por tugal, Spa in, united Kingdom of Great Br itain and Nor ther n I reland

Abstaining: Aua tr al ia, Aus tr ia, Canada, Denmar k , Finland, Greece , Iceland, Ireland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1 44/L. 25/Rev.1 was retained by 105 votes to 9, with 14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) I The Comni ttae will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote has barn requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghan is tan, Albania, Alger is, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbadoe, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Camrroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Corta Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Caechorlovak is, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji , Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic I&public, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liber is, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger ia, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syr ian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoalavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Br itain and Nor thern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Auatr ia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 25/Rev.1 was adopted by 108 votes to 2, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr, WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): We abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1 because convening a special conference with the aim of amending the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 to bring about a comprehensive ban is not an appropriate my of dealing with the issue, whether poli tlcslly or legally.

(Mr. Wagenmaker a, Nether lands)

That is not to say, of course, that we would contest the right of parties to the Treaty that so desire to call for an amendment conference. But is it a prudent, effective way of going about such things? We doubt it.

In the meantime, it deems likely that the amendment conference will take place after all. The depositary States have faithfully carried out their duties in that regard. The Netherlands will certainly not fail to act in conformity with its obligation8 under the Treaty, both during the preparation and during the conference itself. I doubt, however, whether adequate preparation can be made for a first substantial session to take place a8 early as June next year. Moreover, it is debatable whether the General Assembly is in a position to recommend such specific dates for preparatory conferences and sessions, thereby abrogating the rights of the depositary Sta toe. In substance, however, our position remains as I have just stated.

Mr. GRANGER (United States of America): As we have stated in the past, the United States does not believe that a conference to amend the limited test-ban Treaty is an appropriate or practical approach to the subject of a comprehensive teat ban. We are fundamentally opposed to that approach. We have expressed this view again today in our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 25/Rev.1.

Al though our na tional position is in opposition to the proposed conference, we are mindful of our duties as a depositary of the Treaty. In this regard, the United States, together with the other two deposi tar ies, has arranged for the requested conference to be convened in Geneva on 8 January 1991 for a period of up to two weeks. The United States ha8 transmitted its notification to that effect to all the par tie8 to the Treaty,

The United States did not participate in the votes on paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution, because we do not consider a draft resolution to be an appropriate vehicle for decision-making with regard to the matters they deal with.

Mr. RIDER (New Zealand) I I wish to explain New Zealand s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 25/Rev .1, on the subject of a partial test-ban treaty amendment conference.

As the New Zealand Minister for Disarmament and Arms Control stated in the Committee on 16 October, New Zealand welcomes the planned amendment conference. We believe it will provide a useful forum in which all the parties to the Treaty can exchange views on the need for a comprehensive test ban. We hope it will 8 trengthen the political commitment necessary if substantive work is to commence in the Conference on Disarmament, where an ad hoc committee on a nuclear-test ban is the appropr iate vehicle for dealing with the issue.

Taking into account the wishes of the majority of signator ies and practical constraints, New Zealand s view is that the amendment conference should convene in May-June 1990 for an initial session, followed by a final, substantive session in

(Mr. Rider, New Zealand)

January 1991. At the initial session next year the Conference will need to reach agreement on organisational matters, including cost-sharing. But we imagine there would also be time under an Other business" item for general statements that delegations might wiah to make.

Those are New Zealand's views. They accord to some degree with those of the sponsors of the draft resolution, as set out in paragraph 1, but they are not shared by all. Meetings of par ties to the partial test-ban Treaty over the past few days have demonstrated a continuing divergence of strongly and sincerely held views on the following important issues: the timing of the amendment conference, its venue and the cost-shar ing arr angemen ta. Those are matters upon which the par ties mus t themselves decide. It is not, in our view, appropr iate for this Committee to make pronouncements upon these ma tters in lieu of such a decision by the par ties themselves.

In welcoming the amendment conference, my Minister urged the sponsors Of the draft resolution to construct a draft text which would gain wide endorsement from across the political spectrum in the Committee. The prospects of a useful conference would be enhanced, she noted, if the draft resolution accommodated as far as possible the interests of key participants, it would, on the contrary, make for a more difficult conference if a draft resolution were introduced with the support of only one group. That, in fact, is what has happened.

New Zealand stands prepared to work with all other parties to reach the agreement necessary before the amendment conference can be convened, but, regrettably, we had to abstain on the draft resolution.

Mr. KRASULIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian) t The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated its support in principle for proposals to extend the scope of the 1963 Moscow Treaty so that it would ban

(Mr. Krasulin, USSR)

nuclear-weapon tests in the three environments already covered and underground as one possible way to solve the problem of a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. In that light, we also support the idea of convening a conference of States parties to the Moscow Treaty in order to consider appropriate amendments to that Treaty.

However, as regards ths timing of the conference, we still believe that the best and most practical l&a is a period of two weeks beginning on 8 January 1991,

In our view, the principles for financing the conference should not be prejudged at this stage, They could be discussed and agreed upon in the course of the preparations for the conference itself .

We are also in favour of continuing to have a solution acceptable to all.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French) : I should like to explain my delegation s vote on draft resoiution A/C.1/44/L. 25/Rev.1.

Like most delegations represented in the Committee, we in no way challenge the Principle of holding an amendment conference on the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water. No one can deny that the procedure for convening the conference has been strictly observed. Having received requests from more than one third of the parties to the Treaty, the depositary Governments have fulfilled their responsibility in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty. My Government believes that the depositary Governments have fulfilled their duties in good faith and in accordance with the spirit of the Treaty.

However, we believe that it is not timely or appropriate to adopt any draft resolution on the convening of an amendment conference, whose holding is governed by the provisions of a sovereign text. with regard to the modalities of the conference, we, together with the depositary Governments and a large number Of other States parties, believe that one session should be enough to carry out a

(Mr. Houllez, Belgium)

thorough examination of the substance of the Treaty. However, that session could be preceded by preparatory work during 1990, when the parties should, by consensus, decide the administrative and budgetary aspects of the conference, observing the rules applicable to the matter.

Mr. WHELAN (Ireland): I should like to explain why the delegation of Ireland was compelled to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, which has just been adopted by the Committee.

The position of my Government on the question of a comprehensive-test-ban Treaty is clear and unequivocal. The first step in the process of halting the nuclear-arm? race must be to stop the development of new weapons of wholesale destruction. This requires an immediate end to nuclear tests. For my Government, a Treaty to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear-test explosions by all States in all environments and for all time is a matter of the utmost priority. Consistent with that position, my delegation, as in the case of similar draft resolutions in the past, was pleased to be a sponsor of the two draft resolutions on this subject that the Committee has already adopted - draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11 and draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.50/Rev.1. We were encouraged by the fact that these two important draft resolutions, like previous similar draft resolutions, were able to command substantial majorities when put to the vote.

In the case of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25 Rev.1, the Committee was asked to address a quite different proposal. We were asked to vote on a recommendation concerning arrangements to convene -a conference that would amend the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 by converting it into a comprehensive-test-ban Treaty. As a party to the partial test-ban Treaty, Ireland is ready to participate in any amendment conference convened in accordance with the amendment procedures prescribed by the Treaty. It is important to recall, however, that the obligation to convene an amendment conference rests solely with the three depositary Governments. In that regard, we note that the three depositaries have taken steps to convene an amendment conference, on foot of a correctly presented request to

(Mr . Whelan, Ireland)

them to do so. Ireland looks forward to participating actively and constructively in the preparatory process loading to the amendment conference and in the con Cer ence itself,

Since the obligation to convene an amendment conference can be discharged only by the depositaries, any recommendation of this Committee at variance with action already undertaken by the depcsitariea to implement their obligation would not servo any useful purpose, *and* since draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1 comprises such a recommendation my delegation had no choice hut to abstain in the vote on it.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist. Republic) (interpretation from Russian) : The delegation of the Byelorussinn Soviet Socialist Republic supported draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1 as a whole, as well as the various parts of it that were put to a separate vote. In doing so, we were guided by our belief that this draft resolution puts forward one of the possible ways of bringing about a complete prohibition af nuclear-weapon teats, wh ion we fully support. At the same time, we are somewhat alarmed by the fact that operative paragraphs 1 and 2, by a decision of the General Assembly, de fine speci fic elements for the preparation and convening of a conference to amend the Treaty - questions that fall within the exclusive competence of the States parties to the Treaty, The Byelorussian SSR believes that the situation that has arisen should not in the future be considered as a precedent.

Mr. STRESOV (Bu lqar ia) : I should like to explain the Bulgar ian delegation's vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25 Rev.1.

We have stated on many occasions that Bu lqar ia supports the convening of an amendment conference to transform the partial test-ban Treaty into a

(Mr. Stresov, Bulgaria)

comprehensive-test-ban Treaty. It is for that reason that we joined the countries that signed the formal letter requesting the convening of the conference. However, it is our conviction that, from a strictly legal point of view, the timing, venue and other arrangements for this conference should be co-ordinated in close consultation with the depositaries.

Mr. NOREEN (Sweden): On strictly procedural grounds the Swedish delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1. We abstained because we consider it to be of vital importance, if there is to be a constructive amendment conference, that, at the outset, the parties to the Treaty be in agreement, at least on the timing of the conference. That is not the case. The depositary Powers have proposed that the amendment conference be held in January 1991, whereas the sponsors of the draft resolution recommend an initial one-week session, to take place in May/June 1990.

In the hope that it will prove possible to achieve agreement on the question of dates, my delegation abstained in the vote on this draft resolution. We urge All parties now to demonstrate flexibility so that a compromise formula may be arrived at. Sweden will participate in the amendment conference with the aim of contributing constructively to its work.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The vote cast by the Ukrainian SSR on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1 was dictated by our position of principle in favour of agreement, at the earliest possible date, on a Treaty to prohibit all nuclear-weapon tests. On 25 October, during this Committee's general debate on all disarmament matters, the Ukrainin SSR's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Vladimir Kravets, stated:

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

"A comprehensive ban on nuclear testing is a ma jot priority for a secure world . . . A number of constructive proposals have been made by var ious States to bring about an early resolu tion of the problem. . . .

Like many other countries, the Ukrainian SSR believes that one way to achieve that goal quickly is to extend the 1963 Moscow Treaty banning nuclear tes tinq in three environments to include underground tes ting a8 well. We support the idea of convening an international conference on that subject." (A/C.1/44/PV.9, p.43)

From the vote on the various parts of this draft resolution it is clear that at present there is a discrepancy in the approaches to various aspects of the implementation of th is Convention ,

(Mr. Batiouk, Ukrainian SSR)

We believe the decision we have taken will mobilize action and enable all countries parties to the Moscow Treaty to use the remaining time actively to prepare for productive work at the conference, which would promote the achievement of good results.

On the basis of those views, the Ukrainian SSR, as a party to the Moscow Treaty Banninq Nuclear Weapon Tests in the three environments, and in the hope of mobilizing every possible effort with the objective of achieving a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon testing, voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1.

Mr. REESE (Australia): Australia would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, on which Australia abstained. Attempts were made by States parties interested in this amendment conference to find consensus language regarding the convening of the conference. We regret that consensus was not found and that the draft resolution was put forward in a form on which not all States could aqree.

With respect to the votes on separate paragraphs, Australia abstained on some of them not necessarily because of ob jsctiona to their substance but because we do not consider that a vote in the First Committee would be an appropriate way of resolving the issues in question.

We hope the draft resolution will not be regarded as an end to the matter, and we hope that the States parties interested in playing a constructive role in the amendment conference, of which Australia is one, will continue to work toqether to find common ground.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland) I My delegation has asked to rpeak in order to state the reasons for Finland's abstention in the vote on dtaft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water ,

(Mr. Patokall io , Finland)

We consider that the issues dealt with in paraqraph 1 are of such a nature that Stataa parties to the Treaty need to agree about them first. We regret that such agreement has so Car eluded the States parties. The views of my deleqation on the issue of the timinq of tha amendment conference are already on record, in our statement to the Committee on 19 October. I shall therefore not repeat them here.

As to paraqraph 2, we are not in principle oppoaed to the formula of financinq recommended therein. However, it is clearly a matter for the States parties themselves, and for them alone, to decide in the context of the actual preparations for the conference.

Finally, I wish to say that as a State party to the partial test-ban Treaty Finland will participate in the amendment conference and will do so in a construct ive spirit.

Mr. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia) : The Czechos lovak deleqa tion jo ined the majority of Member States in aupportinq draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 25/Rev.1 because it is etronqly committed to the achievement of nuclear disarmament. One of the basic ways to achieve that goal includea, in our view, tne complete cessation of nuclear -weapons explos ions. That is the reason my deleqation is prepared to take an active part in the work of the conference on amending the Moscow Treaty on a partial test-ban, as it has already stated several times.

From the leqal point of view, my deleqa t ion has reservat ions on the decis ion just taken. Organizational questions related to the timing, venue and financinq of the conference should have first been aqreed amonq the parties to the Treaty and the depositary Governments.

Ms. MASON (Canada) : I should like to explain Canada sabstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1. Canada aconcer ns reqarding the process of an amendment conference to seek to achieve a comprehensive teat-ban

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

treaty are well known and need not be repeated hers. In any event, as I made clear in my openinq statement to the First Committee, now that the conference in qoinq forward we wish to act in a constructive fashion. lb that and, Canada has participated in various informal consultations, and it is our belief that a way could and should have been found to allow a preparatory sess ion of the conference to proceed in 1990 and a substantive session in 1991. We reqret that in the end the States parties failed to reach agreement on means to move this process forward in a constructive and practical way and in a way that would take due account of the role of the depositary Sta tea in the conven ing of the conference, and of the Sta tes parties in the preparatory process.

Without that agreement among the States parties, Canada could not support this draft resolution.

Mr. TOTH (Hungary) : My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L.25/Rev.1. Our affirmative vote merely represents an acknowledgement of the riqht of Member States of the United Nations represented in this Committee to express their views in the form of recommendations on the issue of how best to proceed to a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Hunqary is neither a depositary of the partial test-ban Treaty nor a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, but as a State party to the Treaty we are vitally interested in seeing, on the one hand, that ohliqations to pursue the objectives set forth in the preamble to the Treaty be fulfilled in good faith and, on the other hand, that the integrity of the body of disarmament agreements be preserved.

Those aims, as we see it, are reconcilable only through concerted common efforts based on the search for mutual compromise. Such an approach is the only sound solution to difficult outstandinq issues, be they substantive or procedural. That is a task to be faced by no one but the Statee parties themselves as a whole.

(Mr. Toth, Hungary)

No proposal put forward by any group of States parties to the Treaty, be they depositaries or not, will promote any of those objectivee if it does not enjoy consensus. No recommendation of the First Committee or the General Assembly can replace agreement reached on the basis at! consensus amonq the States parties themselves,

In the event that there should be a discrepancy between the approach set out in draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1 and that of a qroup of States parties including the depositaries of the partial teat-ban Treaty, we can only hope that the life-cycle Of the preparations for the amendment conference will not end with the adoption of this draft resolution. We urqe States parties to the Treaty to resume their consultation8 on the modalities of an amendment conference and arrive at a mutually acceptable aqreement on the basis of the present recommendations of the First Committee and taking into account the proposal of the depositaries. We urqe that such consultations be resumed at the earliest possible time.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): I should like to explain Japan s vote on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1 and on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11, on which the Committee took action yesterday but which also relates to a nuclear-test ban.

Japan has consistently attached great importance to the early achievement Of a comprehensive nuclear-teat ban and has always been actively involved in efforts to achieve that goal at the Conference on Disarmament and in other international for urns. We are convinced that in order to achieve a comprehensive test ban we have to work out arrangements to ensure the effective and reliable verification of a teat ban. At the same time, we are convinced that such a test ban should be achieved without jeopardizing the security of States.

Working out such arrangements will require all-out efforts by all parties concerned. Therefore, it would not he realistic in our view to try to achieve a Comprehensive teat bon at once, simply by concluding an agreement or amending an existing treaty. We bel ieve that a s tey-by-step approach is the soundest, and in the final analysis the fastest, way to achieve a tee t ban.

It is for that reason that Japan welcomes the progress we are now witnessing in bilateral United States-Soviet nuclear-testing talks. Thin offers a very good opportunity to commence substantive deliberations on the issue in multilateral forums. My delegation believes that the Conference on Disarmament provides the best venue for reaching our shared goal of a comprehensive test ban. Japan strongly urges all thoee concerned to make great efforts and shw greater flexibility in order to establish an ad hoc committee within the Conference on Disarmament and initiate substantive work on all aspects of a comprehensive test ban on the basis of an objective assessment of the realities, which includes the important progress in United States-Soviet negotiations.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

As draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.11 did not seem to reflect such an approach, we abstained in the vote on that text, even though we share the goal of its aponsor ing coun tr ies.

As for draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 25/Rev.1, Japan is not certain whether an amendment conference could achieve the common goal without the understanding and m-operation of the depositary States of the partial test-ban Treaty. But since it has already been decided to convene an amendment conference, my delegation wishes to state that Japan will participate in the conference in a constructive manner in accordance with the position of Japan as I have just stated it.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): Bearing in mind our position on the substance of the question dealt with in draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.25/Rev.1, I would be grateful if the Secretariat could indicate in its report that my delegation did not participate in the vote on that text.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.67. As I informed the Committee earlier, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.54 have decided that the Committee should not take action on that text. My proposal on the same subject hao been circulated in document A/C. 1/44/L. 67. In line with today's agreement, may I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.67 without a vote?

Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.67 wao adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We turn now to draft r esolu tion A/C. 1/44/L. 21. I call first on delegations wishing to make statements other than statements in explana tion cf vote.

Mr. AL MOSAVI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.21, entitled Israeli nuclear armament ,is of especial importance this year for two reasons. First, increased international understanding and détente, along with many initiatives on arms limitation and disarmament at the national, regional and international level, have made any movement towards armament deserving of condemnation.

Secondly, Israel seems to be living in another world, and appears to see things differently from the way the international community sees them. It continues to devote its capacity and that given it by others to the acquisition of more weapons of all kinds. Israel has been flouting the wishes of the international community and has been using the high seas and international sea-lanes of the Mediterranean as a teeting-ground for its missiles and delivery vehicles.

(Mr. Al Mosavi, Iraq)

In an attempt to avert any replies, I would refer members to news broadcast by NBC on 25 October 1989: that, according to Pentagon and Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) sources, Israel has nuclear warheads and is developing launchers for them. The broadcast also stated that Israel has assisted South Afr ice in acquiring nuclear weapons and long-range-missile technology, I would request that representatives bear those facts in mind during the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 21.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.21, entitled Israeli nuclear armament . The draft tesolutlon has 21 sponsors and was introduced by the delegation of Kuwait at the Committee 5 30th meeting, on 7 November 1989. I call upon the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of sponsors.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Dr aft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 21 has the following sponsors : Alger ia, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Dj ibou ti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, the Libyan Arab Jamahir iya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

The CMAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : Separ ate votes have been requested on the sixth and tenth preambular paragraphs and on paragraphs 2, 6 and 7, after which action will he taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Committee will first take a vote on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 21. A separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour : Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Daruesalam, Bulgar la, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt,

Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People s Democra tic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar , Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger ia, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Soc ial ist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslav ia, Zamb is, Zimbabwe

Aga inst: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States Of America

Absta in ing: Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Greece, Jamaica, Japan, Malawi, Malta, Samoa, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela

Preambular paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.21 was retained by 86 votes to 20, with 18 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish) : The Committee will next vote on the tenth pr eambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 21. A separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour8 Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Dar ussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovak ia, Democra tic Yemen, Djibouti , Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People s Democra tic Republic , Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar , Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger ia, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Roman ia, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania , Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chile, Ecuador, Fiji, Greece, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Samoa, Spain, Suriname, Togo, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela

The tenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.21 was retained by 73 votes to 22, with 24 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will now vote cm paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.21. A separate , recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People s Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippinea, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway.. Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chile, Fiji, Greece, Japan, Lesotho, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Togo, Uruguay

Paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.21 was retained by 88 votes to 20, with 17 abstentions,

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish)% The Commi ttee will now vote on paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.21. A separate, recorded vote has been requested,

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: AC ghan Satan, Alban ia, Alger ia, Angola, Arqen tina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dj inouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic F&public, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People sDemocratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamah ir iya , Madagascar, Malays ia, Maldives, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger ia, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Wanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somal ia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sur iname, Swaziland, Syr ian Ar ab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia , Austr ia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spa in, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abs ta in ing: Barbados, Ben in, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Fiji, Greece, Jamaica, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Samoa, Singapore, Togo, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela

Paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 21 was retained by 78 votes to 22, with 22 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The First Committee will now take a separate vote on operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.21. A separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People s Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahir iya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Niger ia, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Wanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic , Tunis ia, Uganda I United Arab Emirates, united Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbalwe

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan , Luxembourg , Nether lands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Hungary, Jamaica, Kenya, Malawi, Malta, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Samoa, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialis t r&public, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Venezuela

Operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 21 was adopted by 68 votes to 22, with 31 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Comnittee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 21 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

---

* Subsequently the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour,

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladeeh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Bepublic, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamae, Barbados, Belgium, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1 44/L. 21, as a whole, was adopted by 91 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now call upon deleqatione wishing to make statements in explanation of their vote.

Mr. PELAEZ (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The deleqation of Argentina voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L.21, "Israeli nuclear armament „ as a whole and abetained in the voting on some of the separate paragraphs. In spite of that, Argentina wishes to recall ite well-known position against putting preaeure upon States to place their nuclear installations under the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) aafeguards.

(Mr. Pelaez, Argentina)

We also wish to point out that we voted in favour of operative paraqraph 3 in spite of its reference to delivery systems, which, in our view, deaerve to be more carefully considered. We would suggest the desirability of not assimila ting that question with the central question, the product ion of nuclear weapons.

Mr. KASULIN (Union of Soviet Soc ialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian) a The Soviet delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/44/L. 21 as a whole. However, it abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 7. We did so because of our belief that at the present staqe of development in international relations it is more than ever important to respect the principle of the universality of international orqaninations, since one of the underlying principles of their good functioning is that all States should participate in them. In that connection it would hardly be correct to exclude any State from co-operation with an international organisation. That would not promote the search for a balance of interest in each individual case.

With respect to the question of the International Atomic Energy Agency, it is our view that it is through the involvement of all States in the Agency's activities that it can exercise effective control over the peaceful Azvelopment of nuclear energy and thereby foster the development of a stable foundation for international security.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan) : I wish to explain Japan s vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/44/L. 21. Japan abstained in the voting on the draft resolution because it contains several paraqraphs on which we have reservations and on which we cannot make judgemente owing to lack of objective information.

We have listened carefully to the accusations and also to statements in reply to them on the question of Israeli nuclear armaments. Japan, as a strong eupporter of the non-proliferation Treaty regime, is very much concerned at the persistent

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

stories about possible Israeli nuclear armaments. Japan earnestly hopes that Israel and other countries that are not parties to the non-proliferation Treaty will accede to that Treaty as soon as possible and further strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation régime, thereby removing the apprehensions of the international oommunity.

Mr. AWAD (Syrian Arab Republic) (interpretation from Arabic): Following the voting on draft reaolution A/C.1/44/L.47/Rev.1 I attempted to explain my country's position, but the Chair did not see me asking to speak. I should therefore like to explain my country s vote in favour of that draft resolution.

The Syrian Arab Republic has vital national interests in the prohibition of chemical weapons and also in the banning of all weapons of mass destruction, in our own region as well as in the world as a whole. My country reaffirmed that position by approving the Final Declaration of the Paris Conference, and it now reiterates it and reaffirms the need to link the prohibition of chemical weapons with the banning of bacteriological (biological) weapons, as stated in paragraph 45 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, of 1978.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We have thus concluded consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament agenda items with the exception of agenda item 67, "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", in respect of which the Committee has decided to take no action at this stage.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like briefly to express my views about the first stage of our work. The weekend between this and the next stage of our work affords us an opportunity to reflect on the way in which the Committee's work has proceeded over the past five weeks, and thus to gain a clearer picture of the work that lies ahead of us. At the beginning of our work, I said the Committee had been convened this year in a climate of hope. East-West relations have improved noticeably. A number of regional conflicts have been resolved and others are in the process of being resolved. Added to renewed confidence in the United Nations as an international body, all this has contributed to renewed hope and faith in the united Nations.

The tone of our debate benefited from those positive trends in the international arena. Thus far, the Committee's work has been carried out in a constructive, co-operative climate) all delegations have manifested great flexibility and a readiness to co-operate in discussing the items and adopting draft resolutions before us.

What I wanted to stress was that this year there was an even greater reduction in the number of draft resolutions before the Committee. Two years ago there were 79, last year 74, and this year we had before us 64 draft resolutions. We have adopted 57, of which 22 were adopted without a vote, thanks, undoubtedly, to the combined efforts of all delegations and to the fact that fewer draft resolutions were submitted on a single agenda item.

(The Chairman)

In evaluating our work this year, I cannot fail to express my gratitude to the Secretariat for all its work thus far. I must mention the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Yasushi Akashi, the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, and all the other Secretariat staff who have worked with the Chairman. I also thank the other Committee officers, who have co-operated with me in the first stage of our work.

ORG.ANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): At its next meeting, the Committee will begin debate on agenda item 70, "Question of Antarctica". I urge delegations to place their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible.

In the light of ongoing consultations, I propose that the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions under agenda item 70 be extended to 6 p.m. on Monday, 20 November. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to that proposal.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): With respect to the items on international security which the Committee will be considering later in the session, I have received a communication from delegations of socialist countries informing me that, bearing in mind the General Assembly's adoption at this session of a resolution on enhancing international peace, security and international co-operation in all its aspects in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the sponsors of agenda item 73, allocated to the First Committee for consideration, will submit no draft resolution to the Committee on that agenda item. It may therefore be possible to reduce the time allocated for the consideration of items on international security, and for the work of the Committee to end one day earlier than originally planned, on 29 rather than 30 November.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.