



General Assembly

Fiftieth session

First Committee

27th Meeting

Monday, 20 November 1995, 10 a.m.
New York

Official Records

Chairman: Mr. Erdenuchuluun (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

arms limitation and disarmament agreements” in document A/C.1/50/L.42/Rev.1.

Agenda items 57 to 81 (continued)

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

The Chairman: At this meeting the Committee will take a decision on the remaining draft resolutions which appear in the following clusters:

Cluster 5: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42/Rev.1 and its amendments in document A/C.1/50/L.55;

Cluster 8: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.2;

Cluster 11: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.23/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.25.

The Chair has been approached by the sponsors and some other delegations to defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 and its amendments until this afternoon. With the consent of the Committee, action on that particular draft resolution will be deferred until this afternoon.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolution in cluster 5, I shall call on those representatives wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their positions or votes on the draft resolution.

Mr. Ledogar (United States): I am pleased to be able to introduce the draft resolution entitled “Compliance with

The United States has sponsored this draft resolution since 1985 and has submitted it on a biennial basis since 1989. During this period the draft resolution has always been adopted without a vote. The revised draft resolution before us reflects the results of intensive consultations between the original co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42 and the sponsors of the amendment document to which you, Sir, referred, A/C.1/50/L.55. We are grateful for the cooperation of all involved that has led to what we believe is a consensus text that presents the concerns of all parties.

There is one small administrative error in A/C.1/50/L.42/Rev.1. In the eighth preambular paragraph the words “all provisions of” should be inserted after the words “Believing that compliance with”, so that that preambular paragraph would begin

“Believing that compliance with all provisions of arms limitation and disarmament agreements”

and so on. I should like to assure the co-sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.55 that those words, which were important to the sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.55, were indeed in the draft handed in to the Secretariat but got dropped out in the press of business.

We believe that the issue of compliance is of fundamental importance to international security and that the importance of universal adherence to arms control obligations cannot be overemphasized. Such compliance

contributes directly to world order. We hope that this draft resolution will serve to reaffirm the importance of compliance with existing treaties, as well as to highlight the critical areas of monitoring and compliance when negotiating new agreements.

For these reasons we feel the draft resolution this year is necessary and, in view of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, especially timely. The United States is grateful to the approximately 65 co-sponsors of the original draft resolution and we request that the revised draft resolution be adopted without a vote.

The Chairman: I thank the representative of the United States for his introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42/Rev.1.

I now call on the representative of Myanmar.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): On behalf of the delegations of Iran, Pakistan and Myanmar, the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.1/50/L.55, I have the privilege of informing the Committee that we held fruitful consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42, entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements". These have led to the accommodation of our main concerns on this question, which are duly reflected in the revised version, A/C.1/50/L.42/Rev.1. Accordingly, we should like to say that the amendments contained in document A/C.1/50/L.55 will not be pressed to action.

Two main principles underpin our amendment proposals. They are: first, compliance should be with all the provisions of disarmament and arms limitation agreements; and, secondly, compliance concerns should be effectively addressed, consistent with the relevant provisions of such agreements, by all States parties.

Finally, we should like to emphasize that we attach importance to this draft resolution and we hope that consultations among interested delegations on this issue will continue with a view to further improvement of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: I thank the representative of Myanmar for his statement that Myanmar will not press the amendments in document A/C.1/50/L.55 to a vote.

Does any other representative wish to speak at this time. If not, does any representative wish to speak in explanation of their vote before the vote? I see none.

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42/Rev.1 contained in cluster 5.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42/Rev.1, entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements", was introduced by the representative of the United States of America at the Committee's 27th meeting, today, 20 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Nepal, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela and Zambia.

I am sure that delegations have taken note of the technical correction to the eighth preambular paragraph made by the United States Ambassador this morning.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed their wish that the draft resolution, as orally amended, 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.42/Rev.1, as orally amended, was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position. Does any representative wish to speak? There seems to be none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution in cluster 8, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.2.

Does any representative wish to make a statement other than in explanation of vote? If not, I shall call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote or position before the vote.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): With your permission, Sir, I would prefer to explain my vote after the vote.

The Chairman: Is there any other explanation of vote before the vote? If there are none, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution in cluster 8, A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.2.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.2, entitled "Observance of the environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of the agreements on disarmament and arms control" was introduced by the representative of Colombia, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 8 November 1995.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania,

Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Canada, Estonia, Japan, Republic of Korea

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.2 was adopted by 149 votes to 4, with 4 abstentions.

[Subsequent to the voting, the delegations of Benin and the Gambia informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I have asked to speak to explain why the United States voted against this draft resolution, A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.2. First, we do not understand the real purpose of this draft resolution, or what the sponsors hoped to achieve by its adoption. What is clear, however, is that the potential effects of the draft resolution could be to divert us from the productive work that Governments are already engaged in regarding arms control and disarmament agreements and, instead, have us focus on drawing up vague environmental norms.

It goes without saying that no one can be against the protection of the environment. Clearly, in the implementation of arms control agreements, such concerns, when relevant to the task at hand, should appropriately be taken into account. For our part, the United States has stringent environmental legislation that requires the preparation of environmental impact statements when it undertakes any number of actions — for example, when we remove missiles from silos or when we set about deciding how to destroy our chemical weapons — but this draft resolution selectively singles out certain arms control and disarmament agreements, either completed or under negotiation. In singling out these agreements the draft resolution also takes them out of context. The last

preambular paragraph, for example, implies that the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques is not effective and it fails to reflect accurately the scope of this Convention.

In operative paragraph 3 States parties are urged to consider all relevant norms related to the protection of the environment in implementing the Biological Weapons Convention. What are those norms?

The draft resolution also implies that in the negotiation of arms control agreements an objective should be the development of environmental norms. My delegation thought the objective was to reach agreement on control, reduction and/or the elimination of armaments. The draft resolution also unacceptably implies that all nuclear testing has a negative impact on the environment.

In short, while we strongly support efforts to protect the environment, we question the purpose and utility of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: Does any other delegation wish to speak? There seems to be none.

The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 11: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.23/Rev.1, and A/C.1/50/L.25.

I call on those representatives who wish to make statements other than in explanation of their positions or votes on draft resolutions in cluster 11.

Mr. Bakala (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): A few weeks ago the delegation of the Congo, on behalf of the 11 States members of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, introduced a draft resolution on regional confidence-building measures. That draft resolution, A/C.1/50/L.20, was amended following consultations which we held with three delegations that approached us. We amended draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20, removing the provision which had budgetary implications.

That passage required the Secretary-General to provide the financial means to train officers, who in turn would train the soldiers who would make up the special units in the peace-keeping operations at a regional level.

We made these major amendments, therefore, which resulted in A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1. We consider that the draft

resolution as amended meets the views of all delegations present here and so, on behalf of all the co-sponsors, we suggest that the draft resolution should be adopted without a vote.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation is speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, which submitted draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

After consultations we decided to include the following amendment to our draft resolution. Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution will now read as follows:

(*spoke in English*)

"Decides to convene its fourth special session on disarmament to be held in 1997, if possible, with the exact date and agenda to be decided before the end of the current session of the General Assembly through consultations;"

(*spoke in Spanish*)

Operative paragraph 2 would have a slight amendment in the first line, which would be to include the words

(*spoke in English*)

"Decides to establish a"

and then the words "Preparatory Committee" and so on.

(*spoke in Spanish*)

In the second line of that paragraph between the words "special session," and "to examine" the word "and" should be inserted. The paragraph would then read:

(spoke in English)

“Decides to establish a Preparatory Committee to prepare a draft agenda for the special session and to examine all relevant questions ...”

and so on.

(spoke in Spanish)

Thus and, I repeat, after long consultations, we decided that this wording and drafting could obtain broad acceptance among representatives meeting here.

The Chairman: I thank the representative of Colombia for the oral amendments that he has introduced to A/C.1/50/L.25.

Does any other representative wish to speak at this stage?

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): Will a revised draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25 be produced with the amendments that have just been put forward by its sponsors?

The Chairman: Since we need to finish our work today I am not sure whether the Secretariat will be able to produce the revision of the document before the end of the meetings of the First Committee. Would delegations go along with the oral amendments presented by the representative of Colombia?

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I am afraid that I am going to complicate both your question and your life for a short while. Certainly there will not be broad support for this amendment. The text as drafted is unacceptable to the United States. The amendment proposed orally makes it no better. I too would have to propose amendments in order to salvage anything from this draft resolution and would be prepared to do so right now if you, Sir, so suggest — and I could do it at dictation speed or in principle — or if you prefer we could submit the amendments in writing. I would be prepared to outline them and then perhaps you, Sir, could decide.

The Chairman: Perhaps the representative of the United States would read out his amendments to the draft resolution and then give the Committee the written version of the amendments he has in mind.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): First, in order to balance the language chosen by the original sponsors for the fourth preambular paragraph, we would require a new fifth preambular paragraph reading as follows:

“Also noting the Secretary-General’s report on the deliberations of the Advisory Board on Disarmament in which the Secretary-General noted the serious doubts expressed by Board members about the advisability of holding a special session on disarmament in the near future”.

The second change is that we would require a new sixth preambular paragraph reading as follows:

“Welcoming also the decision of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to extend the Treaty indefinitely, taken without a vote, as well as the decisions on strengthening the review process for the Treaty and on principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament”.

Then, the existing sixth preambular paragraph which begins

“Expecting that, since negotiations on”

and so on, would have to be dropped.

The current language of operative paragraph 1 would be replaced by the following:

“Decides to keep under consideration until the year 2000 the prospects for and timing of a fourth special session on disarmament”.

There are three other small fixes. Operative paragraphs 2, 4 and 5 would fall away.

The Chairman: I am not sure whether all delegations were able to get the amendments down on paper because it was being read at normal speed rather than dictation speed but if delegations wish to have that language right now I will ask the United States representative to read the amendments at dictation speed.

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): We were not able to take down the amendments proposed by the representative of the United States. For the time being it would be helpful for us to have it repeated at dictation speed and thereafter submitted in writing.

The Chairman: May I ask the representative of the United States to read out the amendments at dictation speed.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I would be glad to. The first change on page 2 would be to insert a new sixth preambular paragraph reading as follows:

“Also noting the Secretary-General’s report on the deliberations of the Advisory Board on Disarmament in which the Secretary-General noted the serious doubts expressed by Board members about the advisability of holding a special session on disarmament in the near future,”

The second change would be the deletion of the existing sixth preambular paragraph, the paragraph that begins with the words “Expecting that, since negotiations” and replacing it with a new preambular paragraph, now the seventh preambular paragraph, which would read as follows:

“Welcoming also the decision of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to extend the Treaty indefinitely, taken without a vote, as well as the decisions on strengthening the review process for the Treaty and on principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament,”.

The next change would be to delete the existing operative paragraph 1 and replace it with the following:

“Decides to keep under consideration until the year 2000 the prospects for and timing of a fourth special session on disarmament;”.

Then the existing operative paragraphs 2, 4 and 5 would be deleted.

The Chairman: In view of the number of amendments put forward by delegations, the Chair is placed in a very difficult situation in terms of timing. The Secretariat informs me that it will not be able to reproduce the documentation for the amendments by this afternoon. It will probably take a whole day. We will probably be able to have all the documentation tomorrow morning. There is a possibility that the Committee will be able to take this up tomorrow.

I call on the representative of Colombia.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I asked to speak before you, Sir, suggested that action on this draft resolution could be taken tomorrow. We would be prepared to accept that suggestion from the Chairman.

The Chairman: If there are no comments I shall call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): My colleague has been checking with meeting services and I should like to bring it to the Committee’s attention that we have been told that we will probably be able to get a room with all conference facilities for the First Committee tomorrow morning. However, there is a question whether it will be a room with a mechanical voting machine. We are looking into that matter and an announcement will be made in the *Journal*, but should it transpire that we have to meet in another room without mechanical voting we will have to have recourse to other modes of voting, as has been done in the past.

The Chairman: Are there any comments? I call on the representative of Brazil.

Mr. Felicio (Brazil): Since the Committee is to have a session tomorrow would it not save the United Nations some money if we could also postpone until tomorrow the draft resolutions that were to have been voted on this afternoon?

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wanted to make a proposal similar to that which has just been made by the representative of Brazil.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I would appeal to the Committee to try to dispose of whatever work we can today. Many of us have schedules to keep and I have to confess that the latest series of amendments that have been submitted to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25 were not anticipated. They are considerable in nature. So perhaps it is inevitable that that draft resolution should be postponed. As for the rest of the draft resolutions I submit that we should take action as soon as possible. We could go on postponing action on various draft resolutions and end up past Thanksgiving Day.

The Chairman: The intention of the Chair was to continue our work this morning so as to take action on those draft resolutions that are before us and do not pose problems.

My intention now would be to take up draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.23/Rev.1 and to postpone taking a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 and its amendments and A/C.1/50/L.25 with its amendments.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I have just received word that we could have this meeting room with its mechanical voting devices tomorrow afternoon.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I formally move that we should take action on all draft resolutions today, including A/C.1/50/L.7 and A/C.1/50/L.42. Let us vote on the amendments that have been submitted. There have been precedents where amendments have been voted upon after being submitted orally or in English. I believe that the Secretariat could circulate these amendments to us in writing in at least one of the official languages. The Committee could take decisions if it is empowered to take decisions and act upon those amendments that have been submitted so late. In any case, we call for action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 today and are not in favour of postponing that until tomorrow.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): Would it help us all to take that action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 at some stage if the amendments that we understand there are, were circulated. As I understand it the oral amendment that was proposed by the representative of Egypt on Friday is not the last word on the subject. If we could be clear on that it would certainly help.

The Chairman: There is a formal proposal by the representative of Pakistan to act on all draft resolutions today.

We are checking with the Secretariat to see whether it would be possible to have the documents in provisional form this afternoon. The Secretariat is not sure whether it will be available in all languages. I do not know whether the Committee would agree to work only in English if the Secretariat was able to reproduce the documentation in English only.

Before I call on the representative of Mexico, could the representative of Egypt enlighten us about draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7? Would he be able to read out the

new amendment that has been the subject of discussion both yesterday and this morning?

Mr. Issa (Egypt): Egypt did indeed propose an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 on Friday afternoon. It was our understanding that this amendment had the approval of the majority of the co-sponsors. However, it appears that certain delegations — some are co-sponsors and some are not — still have problems with the amendment proposed by Egypt. On that basis, my delegation wishes to announce that it withdraws the proposal that it submitted orally on Friday afternoon.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation that I head is well aware of the difficulties that some eminent representatives have in remaining here tomorrow, and it would be desirable to finish work today on all pending draft resolutions.

My delegation in general terms does not mind considering oral proposals. By oral proposals I mean those changing a word and sometimes even a whole sentence in one paragraph of a draft resolution. But when it is a matter of amendments that cover most of the paragraphs of a specific draft resolution, which is equivalent to making it into another draft resolution, my delegation, of course, would like to have it in writing and would not mind these amendments being distributed in one language, if that language were to be Spanish.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): May I make a suggestion as to the Committee's procedures. We have left before us three draft resolutions. On two of them there are no problems and the Committee can act now. On draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 there is an amendment. Our colleague from Egypt had suggested a revision which, because the co-sponsors still had difficulties, he has withdrawn. At the moment, therefore, there is only one amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7, which is contained in document A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1. I suggest that we move quickly to put that to the vote.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25, the representative of the United States has moved extensive amendments which would amount to changing the whole draft resolution. If it is the desire of the Committee to see these amendments in all languages we can defer that to tomorrow but I suggest that we act expeditiously on the other draft resolutions.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation can agree entirely if it is the opinion of the majority of the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25 and its amendments tomorrow afternoon — my delegation has no objection to that — or even today, but if it were to be today my delegation thinks that it would be appropriate to suspend the meeting for 10 minutes. I think that the majority opinion is that we should have a better idea of the considerable number of amendments made. If so, my delegation would insist that, in accordance with our own rules of procedure, we should have them in the official working languages. My delegation would like to have them in Spanish as well as in English.

The Chairman: If the Committee is to have a meeting tomorrow the Chair suggests dispensing with the meeting this afternoon. We have a specific suggestion by the representative of Pakistan that we should act on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 today. If the Committee agrees, that would mean we would have to take it up this morning. I should like the Committee to consider these points before we move to those draft resolutions contained in cluster 11.

Mr. Arai (Japan): We are very much in favour of finishing all action today. As for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7, entitled “Small arms”, at the beginning of this meeting we heard the announcement by the Chair that some of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 and other delegations wanted to defer action. My delegation, however, is ready to proceed to the vote and I understand that that is the wish of all co-sponsors.

The Chairman: May we proceed in that manner? Is it possible for the Committee to act on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 and the amendments proposed in A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1, and A/C.1/50/L.23/Rev.1 this morning and to defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25 until tomorrow afternoon when the amendments in all official languages, which will be distributed to all delegations tomorrow morning, will be available?

Mr. Goosen (South Africa): We certainly go along with the proposal that you, Mr. Chairman, have just made. We would however propose that we should follow the same order as had been announced for the draft resolutions to be considered today, in other words that we first consider draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1, then draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.23/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.7.

The Chairman: I will follow that procedure only if the Committee agrees.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I believe that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 precedes the other two draft resolutions so we should act on A/C.1/50/L.7 first.

The Chairman: That is correct. We will proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 first, then A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.23/Rev.1.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I apologize. During the exchange of views, when the matter of taking decisions on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25 was mentioned, we were, unless my delegation is mistaken, still at the stage of general statements, as distinct from explanations of vote. My delegation intended to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25, but we did not intend to do so this morning because we understood that the decision would be taken this afternoon. I would like to know if we are still at the stage of exchanging views, and, if so, I would like to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7.

The Chairman: If the representative of Cuba wishes to make a statement of a general nature on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 within that cluster, he may of course do so now.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions in cluster 11, except for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25, which will be deferred until tomorrow afternoon.

The Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions contained in cluster 11 and I now call on those representatives who wish to make statements other than in explanation of their positions or votes on the draft resolutions contained in that cluster.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation intended to make a few comments on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 at this stage of our work. At past sessions we have discussed other draft resolutions relating to illicit trafficking in small arms and their collection. At this fiftieth session of the General Assembly we once again have some draft resolutions on this topic, some of which we have adopted. There are others that refer to this subject and relate to important aspects if only marginally. For a group of States this is a serious problem, and all delegations in the Committee have expressed their views on the subject.

My delegation would have liked draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7, relating to small arms, to have been included in efforts aimed at what we call rationalization, together with other texts so that we could have condensed or integrated the various aspects of the question of small arms in a single draft resolution. Unfortunately, this has not been the case, and we shall have several different draft resolutions on this subject. This would seem to show how very important this subject is in the work of the Committee and for the work of the Committee in the context of international events. My delegation, however, is not completely convinced. Still, all delegations have the right to submit draft resolutions, even individually and independently of other texts.

With regard to the content of this draft resolution, my delegation wishes to say that it worked with other delegations with the aim of clarifying this issue and perhaps even of finding a way to negotiate or consult with the main sponsors in order to clear up certain questions. I must say that we are not convinced, and we still cannot see clearly the fundamental objective of this draft resolution, which, in substance, calls for the establishment of a group of governmental experts in the Spanish version, or a "panel" in the English version, to carry out a task for which it is being given a mandate covering a range of questions that are really not clear to my delegation. We consider that the lengthy consultations and negotiations on many other important draft resolutions may have resulted in this one's being left until almost the last minute. A number of matters in the mandate of the group of experts are not clear. For example, what does paragraph 1 (b) mean when it says "illicit production"? I do not believe the General Assembly has ever defined the concept of illicit production. This would be like taking a decision on quicksand.

Furthermore, operative paragraph 1 (c) refers to

"The ways and means to prevent and reduce the excessive and destabilizing accumulation and transfer of small arms and light weapons",

stating that we should pay

"particular attention to the role of the United Nations in this field".

We do not know what the role of the United Nations is in the field of small arms and light weapons. That is another aspect that is not completely clear.

My delegation has certain fears relating to the fact that this year, as in years past, this issue has developed almost simultaneously along with draft resolutions, and in very specific ways. Now a wide range of tasks is being opened up for the group of experts, while at the same time States will be asked to express their views. My delegation would have preferred this draft resolution to invite all States to present their views so that on the basis of those views we could set up a group of experts next year. The current proposals for a mandate that is not very clear seem to us to have been set down in a bit of a rush.

My delegation finds some of these ideas somewhat incongruous, confusing and problematic. We would have asked the sponsors to allow some time for reflection and consultation by having the decision taken in the afternoon. However, since the decision is to be taken in the morning, all my delegation can do is state that, despite our awareness of the importance of the question, we cannot support the text because of the way its ideas are set out and will, regrettably, have to abstain in the voting.

The Chairman: I call on the representative of Pakistan on a point of order.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I wish to try to expedite the work that the Committee has before it. We do not have much time. May I suggest a 10-minute suspension in order to enable a few delegations to consult on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 and finalize our position so that we can take expeditious action.

The Chairman: I thank the representative of Pakistan for his suggestion. May I point out that we have only 20 minutes left. I am not sure how many delegations wish to make statements or explanations of vote before or after the vote. Since there is to be no meeting this afternoon I want to deal expeditiously with the three draft resolutions. Would it be possible for the delegation of Pakistan to have consultations during the meeting?

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

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I simply wish to support the request made by the representative of Pakistan that the meeting be suspended. It would only be for a few minutes.

The Chairman: I was asking whether it would be possible to consult without the suspension of the meeting.

I call on the representative of India, also on a point of order.

Mr. Surie (India): You said, Sir, that we were not going to meet this afternoon. Is there any specific reason for that? Could we not meet both this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon?

The Chairman: Tomorrow afternoon the Committee is supposed to discuss draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25 with its amendments. The amendments will be out in all languages only tomorrow morning. It would seem to me, personally, to be rather awkward to have a meeting this afternoon to discuss only one draft resolution. We would be wasting time if we were to discuss only one draft resolution. That was my main concern and as I understand it that concern is shared by many delegations.

If the Committee wishes to take a decision now to meet to discuss one draft resolution, A/C.1/50/L.7, this afternoon, that decision is up to the Committee: it will not be my decision.

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

Mr. Jallow (Gambia): The Gambia supports the position of the Chairman, namely that we should try to debate the issue now instead of meeting again this afternoon, probably for one or two hours, merely to discuss one issue. It should be remembered that the United Nations has very serious financial problems and the less time we spend debating issues that incur more expense the better. I suggest, therefore, that if it is not possible to deal with the matter before the end of business this morning it should be postponed until tomorrow.

Some of us can ill afford the time to wait while there is a break or a suspension of the meeting for one hour when we have other things to do. Some of us cover more than one Committee because of the small size of our delegations.

The Chairman: Does the representative of Spain wish to have a suspension of the meeting for five or seven minutes?

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to have a suspension even if only for a few minutes.

The Chairman: Very well then I will suspend the meeting for seven minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 12.40 p.m. and resumed at 1 p.m.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 11. We will begin with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7. Before doing that I shall call on representatives who wish to make statements.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am speaking with regard to the amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 contained in A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1. After consultations with some delegations my delegation wishes to make an alternative proposal to the paragraph contained in document A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1. It is paragraph 26 (k) of the Copenhagen Declaration, which contains language agreed on by consensus. I will read it.

(*spoke in English*)

“Reaffirm the right of self-determination of all peoples, in particular of peoples under colonial or other forms of alien domination or foreign occupation, and the importance of the effective realization of this right, as enunciated, *inter alia*, in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action adopted at the World Conference on Human Rights;”
(A/CONF.166/9, p. 10, para. 26 (k))

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): On behalf of my delegation and the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic I would like to express our gratitude to our colleague, the Ambassador of Colombia, for having proposed an alternative text to the amendment proposed in A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1. This proposal was the result of extensive consultations held with several interested delegations. We understand that it reproduces the language from the Copenhagen document and in view of the submission of this oral amendment from Colombia the amendment in A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1 will not be pressed to a vote. Instead, we will support the adoption of the amendment proposed by Colombia.

The Chairman: The Committee has noted the statements made by the representatives of Colombia and Pakistan. The amendment in document A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1 will not be pressed to a vote and an alternative text of an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 has been presented by the delegation of Colombia.

With the concurrence of the Committee I should like to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 and the oral amendment.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I certainly do not want to delay things and I am as keen to finish and get back to Geneva as anyone else, but I think it is unreasonable to expect us to vote on this immediately. I am only asking that we should have time to look at it in the form in which we have taken it down. My delegation would be very happy to meet to discuss draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 this afternoon. Since there are other draft resolutions in cluster 11 on which we have not taken action I suspect we would have a full afternoon's work ahead of us. I propose that we adjourn now, have lunch and come back at 3 p.m.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): We wish to see the amendment proposed by the Colombian representative in written form. We will not insist that the language should be Russian. We are ready to work in one language but we would like to see the amendment in writing.

The Chairman: It seems as though we will not be able to have the amendment even in one language distributed to all delegations by this afternoon — that is, not officially. If we distribute it informally in only one language this afternoon then when the decision is taken on the amendment we will have to bear in mind that that amendment will be an oral amendment rather than an official written amendment. The amendment would not be

distributed to delegations this afternoon in an official document.

Mr. Hamdan (Lebanon): The language that has been introduced is actually a paragraph taken from the Copenhagen Declaration, which exists in all languages. In English it can be found on page 10, under paragraph 26, subparagraph (k). All delegations have the chance to see this proposal in all languages if they refer to that Declaration.

The Chairman: A specific suggestion has been made by the representative of the United Kingdom. If I hear no objection to that suggestion, there will be a meeting this afternoon.

It was so decided.

Mr. Leteka (Lesotho): On Friday, 17 November, when the Committee took a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, my delegation mistakenly voted against it, when we had intended not to participate in the vote.

The Chairman: Your statement will certainly be reflected in the records.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make an announcement.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to announce that there will be a meeting of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement in Conference Room D immediately following the adjournment of the First Committee.

The Chairman: The Committee will meet this afternoon at 3 p.m.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.