



General Assembly

Official Records

First Committee

19th Meeting

Monday, 13 November 1995, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.40: Bangladesh;

Agenda items 57 to 81 (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42: Bangladesh and Israel;

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43: Poland;

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45: Latvia;

The Chairman: I call upon the Secretary of the Committee, who wishes to make a statement.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46: Bangladesh, Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Ecuador;

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48: Bangladesh, Cuba and Pakistan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7: Cape Verde, Malta, Italy and Portugal;

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49: Bangladesh;

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50: Bangladesh;

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8: Belarus, Cape Verde and Latvia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1: Austria, Belarus, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Finland, Iraq, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Ukraine, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12: Kazakhstan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13: Kazakhstan;

The Chairman: Today the Committee will take action on the following: in cluster 1: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10; in cluster 7: draft decision A/C.1/50/L.51.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20: Cape Verde;

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1: Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Turkey;

Action on the other draft resolutions that were supposed to be considered this afternoon will have to be deferred because of ongoing consultations. We will therefore be taking action on one draft resolution and one draft decision.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1: Bangladesh, Ecuador and Indonesia;

I now call upon delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10.

Mr. Sukayri (Jordan): I should like to explain Jordan's position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

Jordan attaches great importance to the establishment of such a zone in the region because we believe that the existence of unsafeguarded nuclear facilities in the Middle East is a major source of threat to regional peace and security. We also believe that the elimination of such a threat would serve a twofold purpose. On the one hand, it would enhance the efforts of all regional parties towards maintaining peace and regional security. On the other hand, it would positively and effectively contribute to the international nuclear-non-proliferation regime.

Mentioning the international nuclear-non-proliferation regime makes it imperative for us to recall the decisions and resolutions adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

In its resolution devoted to the Middle East (NPT/CONF.1995/32 (Part I), annex), the Conference, *inter alia*, recognized that efforts in the Middle East peace process contributed to such a zone as well as to a zone in which all weapons of mass destruction would be banned. It called upon all States in the region to take practical steps towards the establishment of a verifiable Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction. It also called upon States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and in particular the nuclear-weapon States,

"to extend their cooperation and to exert their utmost efforts with a view to ensuring the early establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction and their delivery system". (NPT/CONF.1995/32 (Part I), annex, p. 14)

In the course of the consultations that took place earlier last week on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10, my delegation indicated its wish to see the same language as that used in the NPT Conference resolution, which enjoyed the consensus of all States parties to the Treaty, reflected in this draft resolution. We believed that this was legitimate, and we therefore unofficially proposed an amendment to that effect. However, there was a concern that that might

lead to a recorded vote, which would mean that there could be no consensus on this draft resolution at this session.

Given the fact that since 1980 the draft resolution on this subject has enjoyed consensus in the Committee as well as in the General Assembly, and taking into consideration the importance we, as well as many other delegations, attach to such consensus, my delegation decided not to pursue its proposed amendments. Nevertheless, my delegation wishes to take this opportunity to confirm its full support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, as well as its commitment to spare no effort to achieve that goal — hence, our active participation in the multilateral negotiations within the arms-control and regional security group.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the Committee's 15th meeting, held on Tuesday, 7 November 1995, and is sponsored by Afghanistan and Egypt.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call upon those delegation wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): I would like to explain my delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10. Israel has advocated in the past and continues to support the concept of establishing the Middle East in due course as a credible and mutually verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone, freely negotiated by all States of the region.

However, Israel has reiterated over the years its policy on both the modalities of such a zone and the timing of its negotiations and establishment. I should like briefly to restate our policy on this matter. It is based on the following principles.

First, the nuclear issue, as well as all regional security problems, conventional as well as non-conventional, should

be dealt with in the full context of the peace process. It is Israel's conviction that nothing should be done to separate the nuclear issue from the comprehensive framework of the peace negotiations and that the peace negotiations, bilateral as well as multilateral, should be respected and in no way eroded. In this regard, Israel subscribes to the statement made by the Secretary-General in his report A/48/399 of 25 October 1993, that:

“a nuclear-weapon-free zone cannot be conceived of or implemented in a political vacuum, separate from the process of mutual reconciliation.” (A/48/399, para. 22)

Secondly, a regional framework, regional confidence- and security-building measures and regional arrangements on conventional as well as non-conventional arms control, including a nuclear-weapon-free zone, will be negotiated in due course only at the regional forum, that is, the Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security. This Group has achieved some tangible progress within the framework of the peace process, and Israel fully supports its activities. However, it should be emphasized that certain confidence- and security-building measures have not yet been implemented. However, it is through such measures and a step-by-step approach that the needed confidence among the regional parties could be achieved and thus promote the overall peace process, including arms control.

Thirdly, a step-by-step approach. Practicality dictates beginning the process with confidence- and security-building measures. Once agreed upon, they have to be tested over time in order to confer confidence. Meaningful arms-control negotiations, where priority is assigned to weapons systems that experience has proven to be destructive and destabilizing, can follow a proven and durable peace among the States of the region and reconciliation among the peoples of the region. These conditions do not exist as yet.

Unfortunately, several regional States are still in a state of war with Israel. Moreover, large regional States still refuse to forswear war as a means of settling disputes and attempt to impede the peace process. Therefore, at this sensitive juncture in the peace process in the Middle East, restraint and caution are strongly recommended in order to arrive at greater achievements in the future. What is needed now is to promote the bilateral peace process and creation of overall confidence in the region and not to address divisive issues.

It is through its unqualified support for the peace talks and their framework that the United Nations General

Assembly can make its own contribution to enhancing confidence. Attempts by the United Nations to lift the nuclear issue out of its comprehensive context would be seen as detracting from the sovereignty of the peace talks. Such attempts in the past have blocked the road to peaceful accommodation and might shake the delicate balance achieved through direct negotiations.

While Israel supports the concept of establishing the Middle East as a nuclear-weapon-free zone in due course, it has never supported the modalities of this draft resolution. Israel is not bound by those provisions of the present draft resolution which are not in accord with its policy. We therefore do not consider the modalities of this draft resolution as relevant in future negotiations, including in the discussions of the Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security. We hope that the consensus reached here, as modest as it is, will contribute to the good will and moderation so needed for the crucial effort we all have to invest in the ongoing peace process.

Mr. Hasan (Iraq): I should like to explain my country's position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10. My delegation welcomes the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10 without a vote. The draft resolution contains important elements which, if implemented, would lead to the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Nevertheless, my delegation has some remarks to make with regard to the draft resolution.

First, we have reservations on the wording of operative paragraph 4.

Secondly, we consider that the draft resolution ignores the role of the Security Council and its resolutions on the matter. I refer here to Security Council resolution 487 (1981), in which the Council called upon Israel to place its nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and resolution 687 (1991), adopted under Chapter VII of the Charter, in operative paragraph 14 of which the Security Council noted that measures taken by Iraq in dismantling certain categories of its weapons were steps towards the goal of establishing such a zone in the Middle East. In addition, in resolution 715 (1991), which was also adopted under Chapter VII, the plans the Security Council approved submitted by the Secretary-General and the Director General of the IAEA, thus reiterating the Security Council's commitment to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Thirdly, it is not logical to pretend that the establishment of the zone could come after the achievement of lasting peace in the region. No lasting peace can be achieved while Israel's nuclear arsenal is exempted from international non-proliferation measures. The establishment of the zone is a step towards lasting peace in the region, and not the contrary.

Mr. Mubarak (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I take the floor after the adoption of this resolution to explain my country's position with regard to some of its paragraphs. My delegation joined in the consensus on the draft resolution, but that does not mean in any way recognition of what is called Israel or that we accept some of the elements of the so-called peace process in the Middle East.

While we welcome the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, we should like to draw the attention of the international community to the fact that those hopes and aspirations, lofty as they may be, would never be achieved unless the huge nuclear arsenal of Israel is destroyed or eliminated, for it constitutes an obstacle to making the Middle East a zone that is completely free of all weapons of mass destruction.

Furthermore, the Israelis must be compelled to place all their nuclear facilities under the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Then, and only then, will the Middle East become a safe and nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Mr. Nasser (Islamic Republic of Iran): Iran was one of the original supporters of the initiative to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. The Islamic Republic of Iran has been fervently pursuing that objective and hopes for its realization at as early a date as possible. It is in that light that we fully support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10, which has just been adopted, and we continue to pursue its implementation with urgency.

My delegation would have liked to have been a sponsor of the draft resolution. Regrettably, however, because of a reference in the ninth preambular paragraph to the peace negotiations, about which we have reservations based on our principled positions in that regard, and because this is an unnecessary reference to an unrelated matter, we were unable to become a sponsor of the draft resolution. We nevertheless wholeheartedly support its content.

Mr. Karem (Egypt): Now that we have adopted draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10 by consensus, I wish to extend, on behalf of the Egyptian delegation, our gratitude and appreciation that this initiative, which has been on the agenda of the General Assembly since 1974, is still alive and well and has been renewed and again endorsed by consensus.

To us and to many of our regional partners and friends in the peace process in the Middle East, consensus is extremely important, because this is in fact the spirit in which we cooperate. Consensus is necessary to translate and implement the provisions of this initiative. Consensus is necessary to activate and to translate into practical reality the provisions of the draft resolution.

It was with some amazement, however, that I listened to some of the remarks just made that a certain delegation is not being bound by the modalities of the draft resolution. I must pause here and place on record the fact that although we have worked together with many peace partners in the Middle East, we — for the first time in the First Committee — have heard a statement going so far as to say that the provisions or modalities of the draft resolution are not binding. I would ask: Which modalities are not binding? Is it the modality noting the importance of the ongoing bilateral Middle East peace negotiations and the activities of the multilateral working group? Is it noting the peace negotiations in the Middle East? Is it welcoming the initiatives leading to general and complete disarmament and, in particular, the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction? Is it reaffirming the inalienable right of all States to acquire and develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes? I am simply reading from the consensus draft resolution.

Indeed, this statement brought me up short. I have been an attentive student of Israeli interpretations since 1974 and until today, and on the long road towards peace we have heard many statements to the effect that Israel will not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons to the Middle East. We have also heard arguments about a request for direct negotiations. All this has occurred and has been offered the peace process and the peace partners in the Middle East.

We have also heard other kinds of remarks, such as that this draft resolution or initiative will not be translated into practical reality until peace has been realized and that, even when that occurs, peace too must be tested before the initiative can become a reality. Today, much to my dismay, we heard a new argument — that we do not consider the

modalities of the draft resolution either applicable to the peace process or to the multilateral Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security, which we support and in which we work together, hand in hand, with all partners in the Middle East, including Israel, in support of this initiative, to help it succeed and to help the cause of peace in the Middle East.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote.

The Committee will now take action on draft decision A/C.1/50/L.51 in cluster 7, on "Rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee". The draft decision was proposed by the Chairman of the Committee.

The Chair proposes that the draft decision be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft decision A/C.1/50/L.51 was adopted.

Organization of work

The Chairman: Before adjourning the meeting, the Chair would like to go through the clusters to ascertain which draft resolutions the Committee would be able to consider at tomorrow's meeting. The Chair is aware of the ongoing consultations on a number of draft resolutions, but the Chair also wishes to ascertain whether there is a possibility of the Committee's taking decisions on others.

It is my understanding that tomorrow, under cluster 1, the Committee will be able to consider draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, L.44 and L.39/Rev.1. Does any delegation wish to comment?

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have one small clarification, but one of some importance. The Chairman has said that consideration of some of the draft resolutions in this cluster is being deferred because of ongoing consultations on them. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 are unaware of any ongoing consultations in its regard, and we have no intention of conducting any. Indeed, we would not agree to the holding of such consultations.

The Chairman: The representative of Mexico is correct. However, the Chair has consulted with the interested delegations and it is now my understanding that the sponsors and the delegations that requested that consideration of the draft resolution be deferred would

agree, after intensive consultations, that on Friday morning action would be taken on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. That is the Chair's understanding, and I hope that both the sponsors and the delegation requesting the deferral would agree.

Mr. Felicio (Brazil): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, I should like to state that my delegation is prepared to take action on the draft resolution — even today, if that is the Committee's wish. The Ambassador of Mexico is correct in saying that the sponsors are not negotiating anything in relation to the draft resolution. I wonder if we could not seize this occasion and take action on the draft resolution tomorrow. I fail to understand why we have to wait until Friday to do so, if we have time to do so tomorrow.

The Chairman: We have settled on Friday morning as a result of very intensive consultations, and I hope that the representative of Brazil will not press his point. We also discussed the possibility of Wednesday or Thursday, and I think that the agreement we reached was on Friday morning. I do not want to go into the details of the consultations I have conducted on this particular issue. I would hope that the representative of Brazil will go along with this.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Shortly before the beginning of the meeting, the Chairman was kind enough to inform some of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 that a single delegation had requested deferral of consideration of that draft resolution. Some of the sponsors of that resolution, including my delegation, expressed disagreement, but since we act in good faith and wish to be courteous, we agreed to defer action on the draft resolution until Friday morning. Those of us who consulted with the Chairman expressed disagreement, but the representative of Brazil is correct in objecting, since it was not possible to consult all the delegations sponsoring the draft resolution and certainly not all the delegations interested in it.

My delegation's agreement to defer consideration of the draft resolution was given solely on behalf of Mexico and not on behalf of all the sponsors. If any sponsor does not wish to postpone consideration, another decision will have to be taken. All I can say is that, from my delegation's standpoint, I would have no objection to deferring consideration until Friday, as the latest possible date. I stress, however, that I speak on behalf of my delegation and not on behalf of the other sponsors.

Mr. Felicio (Brazil): My delegation will not insist that we take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 today or tomorrow. We also agree that it be postponed until Friday, but we were not consulted in this regard. My delegation would appreciate being consulted should a similar situation arise in the future.

The Chairman: I must confess that I am alone here, and it is very difficult to consult each and every delegation. I apologize to any delegation that may feel offended by the manner in which the Chair has proceeded, but it was not because I did not wish to consult them but only because I am in the difficult position of being only one man to consult with many delegations. I thank you all for your understanding and courtesy to me.

May we now move to cluster 2. I believe that the Committee is prepared to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14 tomorrow.

Mr. Boros (Hungary): As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1, I would like some information from the Secretariat about it.

The Chairman: Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 has financial implications, and we are still waiting for word from the Secretariat. Until we have such word we will be unable to take action on that draft resolution.

In cluster 3, the Committee will be able to take action tomorrow on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.29, there will be a revision.

Mr. Osman (Afghanistan): In regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1, I should like to say that we have already discussed the matter with the Secretariat and it is my understanding that they have agreed that the draft resolution has no financial implications.

The Chairman: The Secretariat informs me that pending receipt of the statement on financial implications we cannot take up the draft resolution tomorrow.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Returning to draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40, as far as my delegation is aware there are no amendments pending to those two draft resolutions nor have we been contacted by any delegation with suggestions for changes or for consultations on them. I would therefore like to inquire why action on them is to be deferred.

Mr. Moher (Canada): Canada, on behalf of a group of countries, has been requested to seek a brief deferral of the two draft resolutions — A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40 — while reflection on their content continues among the group. Those reflections are still under way, and today I therefore renew the suggestion to defer.

The Chairman: While that group of countries is reflecting, may I make an appeal to all delegations. It would be very difficult to conduct our work if we defer each and every draft resolution until the last minute. We have many such requests, and I would request delegations that have problems with certain draft resolutions or are consulting on them to act more swiftly in making up their minds.

I wonder whether the delegations mentioned by the representative of Canada would be prepared to take action on the draft resolutions the day after tomorrow?

Mr. Moher (Canada): I will undertake to do my best to give you an answer to that question tomorrow afternoon.

The Chairman: We now move to cluster 6, to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, "Prevention of an arms race in outer space". I understand that the Committee will be prepared to take action on that draft resolution tomorrow.

We turn now to the draft resolutions in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". It is my understanding that the Committee will be in a position to deal with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 tomorrow.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I apologize for having been unable to pick up on this immediately. I should like to go back to cluster 3, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45, "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines". It has been brought to my attention that there are proposed amendments and that it is not possible to have a meeting of co-sponsors in time for us to be able to consider the draft resolution tomorrow. I would appreciate having sufficient time for the sponsors to consult.

The Chairman: We will therefore defer consideration of A/C.1/50/L.45 to a later stage, but I would ask whether it might be possible to take it up the day after tomorrow.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): We will do our best.

The Chairman: I should now like to move on to cluster 8, "Other disarmament measures". It is my understanding that the Committee will be in a position to

take action tomorrow on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.12: "Verification in all its aspects".

The Committee will also be able to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9: "Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan" and on draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30, both in cluster 10.

Moving on to cluster 11, the Committee will take action tomorrow on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.18: "Transparency in armaments" and on draft resolution A/C.1/L.20/Rev.1: "Regional confidence-building measures".

I shall now read out the list of all draft resolutions to be considered tomorrow: A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1, L.44, L.39/Rev.1, L.33, L.21/Rev.1, L.12, L.9, L.18 and L.20/Rev.1; the Committee will also take action on draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30.

Mr. Starr (Australia): I should like to return to the issue of the timing for taking action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. My colleague from Mexico has already spoken about this, as has my colleague from Brazil.

Let me say straight away that I was part of the discussions that led the Chairman to the conclusions that he drew. However, it is also quite clear from your presentation, Mr. Chairman, and from the discussion in this meeting that there is real pressure to clear draft resolutions from our table. The Chairman has referred to the need for groups of delegations and single delegations seeking deferral to speed their consultations and considerations so that draft resolutions can be brought forward.

As my colleague from Mexico has said, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 is ready for voting, and the sponsors had assumed that the vote would be held tomorrow, Tuesday. This does not seem to be the case because a delegation has requested a deferral, not for further consultations, not, I presume, so that they may seek instructions, but merely for deferral.

I do not want to complicate the Chairman's work, but the statement of my colleague from Brazil reminded me that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 — and they are numerous — have not been consulted on this matter, and with the Chair's indulgence I would like to propose that the sponsors of the draft resolution meet at noon tomorrow in a conference room to be announced in the *Journal*, to discuss the attitude of the sponsors to the timing of action on this draft resolution. I think it only fair to the sponsors

to consult them fully on the timing, and they would then get back to the Chairman in the afternoon.

The Chairman: I certainly sympathize fully with the statement of the representative of Australia and understand the motives behind it. I am sure that the sponsors of the draft resolution have taken note of the announcement of tomorrow's meeting.

Mr. Nasseri (Iran): I have two comments. The first is in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45 in cluster 3. The Ambassador of the United States has already brought to the Committee's attention the fact that there are some amendments on this issue in document A/C.1/50/L.56. They have not yet been formally introduced here, and since there will probably be consultations and consensus may evolve, in which case we may not have an opportunity to refer back to this document, I should simply like to suggest that the title of this draft resolution should read "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land-mines" and not "Memorandum on the export of anti-personnel land-mines".

My second comment relates to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14, on the Convention on Chemical Weapons. I note that the Chairman has announced that action will be taken on that draft resolution tomorrow. I am not certain whether the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14 are aware of a set of amendments that have been distributed on behalf of a number of countries in document A/C.1/50/L.54. If a decision is to be taken on A/C.1/50/L.14 tomorrow, I would like to inform the Committee that that decision would be taken without consultation of the co-sponsors of the amendment in document A/C.1/50/L.54, and that we would have to take action on the amendments in the latter document as well, in which case we will be introducing it formally at that time.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): With regard to amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.54, I am sure that the Secretariat will take note of the change of wording to "Moratorium".

As for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14, I would ask the co-sponsors whether they wish to defer action on the draft resolution, in the light of the amendments submitted in document A/C.1/50/L.54, or whether they are prepared to take a decision tomorrow.

Mr. Moher (Canada): My understanding from our earlier discussions is that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14 in

fact had been deferred for the reason cited by the representative of Iran.

While I have the floor, I should like, if I may, to add that there have been suggestions put forward with regard to three draft resolutions which Canada is concerned with at this session, and I would like to draw to the attention of delegations the following: at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, in Conference Room 6, there will be a meeting of co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14: "Status of the Convention on Chemical Weapons". At 12 noon tomorrow, again in Conference Room 6, there will be a meeting of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13, "The role of science and technology". At 2.30 p.m. tomorrow there will be a meeting in Conference Room B of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15: "Prohibition of the production of fissile material". All of these meetings will be announced in the *Journal*, but I thought I would take advantage of this opportunity to bring them to the attention of delegations now.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): In response to the statement by the Ambassador of Iran: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14 is not scheduled for action tomorrow. It does not figure in the list the Chairman read out before his departure.

The Secretariat informs me that if there is no objection by the sponsors, it might be possible to consider tomorrow draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1, "Measures to curb the illicit transfer and use of conventional arms". I would ask the sponsors, or any other delegation, whether they would be prepared to take action on that draft resolution tomorrow.

Since that appears to be the case, we will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.37/Rev.1 tomorrow.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I just wish to draw the attention of members of the Committee to the fact that a group of delegations has submitted amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15. Those amendments have yet to be circulated, but I believe that they will be circulated tomorrow by the Secretariat as document A/C.1/50/L.57.

The Acting Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am sure that that information will be useful to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15 when they meet tomorrow afternoon at 2.30.

I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee, who wishes to make some announcements.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to announce the following meetings:

There will be a meeting of the G-23 countries of the Conference on Disarmament today, immediately following the close of this meeting, on the question of expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament.

There will be a meeting of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42, "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements", at 12 noon tomorrow, 14 November, in Conference Room B.

I have just received an announcement that the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries in the First Committee will meet tomorrow to discuss First Committee matters at 10 a.m., in a conference room to be announced in the *Journal*.

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): I would like to bring to the notice of members involved in the negotiations on document A/C.1/50/L.49, "1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", that a meeting will be held tomorrow at 11.30, the venue of which will be indicated in the *Journal*.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.