

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2103  
3 December 1975

ENGLISH

Thirtieth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND  
THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 3 December 1975, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Baron von WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany)

Rapporteur: Mr. ARTEAGA ACOSTA (Venezuela)

- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3254 (XXIX): report of the Secretary-General /34/ (continued)
- Napalm and other incendiary weapons and all aspects of their possible use: reports of the Secretary-General /35/ (continued)
- Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /37/ (continued)
- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference /40/ (continued)
- General and complete disarmament /41/ (continued)
  - (a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament
  - (b) Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 4 DECEMBER 1975, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 9 DECEMBER 1975.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

- Mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade: report of the Secretary-General /42/ (continued)
- Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa /43/ (continued)
- Comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /44/ (continued)
- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East: report of the Secretary-General /46/ (continued)
- Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other hostile purposes, which are incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /47/ (continued)
- Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia: report of the Secretary-General /48/ (continued)
- Conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests /122/ (continued)
- Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons /126/ (continued)
- Organization of work

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 34, 35, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 122 and 126 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its consideration of the draft resolutions relating to the disarmament items.

Mr. PASTINEN (Finland): The Finnish delegation has joined the co-sponsors of the two draft resolutions before this Committee concerning the banning of nuclear-weapon tests. These have been presented respectively by the delegation of the USSR and others in document A/C.1/L.707/Rev.1 and by the delegation of Australia and others in document A/C.1/L.738. The latter is in line with earlier resolutions on this subject which my delegation has consistently supported and co-sponsored.

This year we have co-sponsored both draft resolutions on the test ban for the following reasons: first, both draft resolutions seek the same end -- the discontinuance of all nuclear-weapon tests for all time, that is, a comprehensive test ban treaty. That indeed is a goal which the international community has been seeking for the last 17 years and which has been reaffirmed in the Moscow test ban Treaty, in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, in the threshold test ban Treaty and in numerous resolutions of this General Assembly.

Secondly, while the aim of both draft resolutions is the same, the methods by which they seek to achieve that aim are different but, in the view of the Finnish delegation, not contradictory. In our view every method of achieving a comprehensive test ban treaty should be attempted, none should be left unexplored.

Thirdly, in this respect the draft resolution presented in the name of the delegation of Australia and others builds on the valuable work already done in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on this subject. This work obviously must go on. The resolution presented by the Soviet Union and others places the main responsibility for negotiations on a test ban on those States in whose power it ultimately lies to put an end to tests -- namely the nuclear-weapon States. Thus the proposal of the Soviet Union is also responsive to

(Mr. Pastinen, Finland)

the earlier resolutions of the General Assembly reminding the nuclear-weapon States of their special responsibility to initiate proposals for a comprehensive test ban treaty.

These are in brief summary the main reasons for which the Finnish delegation has been happy to co-sponsor the two draft resolutions on the banning of all nuclear-weapon tests. We have done so in the expectation that both will be approved by the overwhelming majority of the General Assembly as a further demonstration of the urgency with which the international community seeks an end of all nuclear-weapon tests.



Mr. PAC (Poland): The Polish delegation had the occasion already to make known its position on the major problems covered in the disarmament debate at the current session of the General Assembly.

At present, therefore, I wish to address myself briefly to one of the draft resolutions which have emerged from the debate, namely that contained in document A/C.1/L.734/Rev.1 concerning the comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all its aspects.

The Government of the Polish People's Republic welcomed with appreciation the comprehensive study, prepared on the initiative of Finland, not as a worthwhile theoretical exercise on a subject of considerable interest to Poland but, first and foremost, as a useful reference work that may prove to be of assistance to those who are actively exploring the concept of denuclearization.

By placing the issue of nuclear-weapon-free zones firmly within the context of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, hence of regional and global security, the study has borne out the basic view of my Government that while the establishment of such zones may supplement and, indeed, enhance the scope of the régime of non-proliferation, it can never be a substitute for the Non-Proliferation-Treaty.

My delegation believes that those fundamental considerations are adequately reflected in the language and course of action envisaged in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.734/Rev.1. Indeed, as one of the countries with an expert participating in the preparation of the study, we would have been glad to co-sponsor that draft resolution. We agreed, however, that it was preferable for Finland to submit it alone.

The Polish delegation therefore fully concurs with the recommendation of the representative of Finland that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus of the First Committee.

Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal): I want to make some observations on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726, submitted by Mexico and Sweden. I would urge the Committee to bear with me if I try to take them back to the origin of this item and briefly discuss the developments since then. My only objective in doing so is to try to bring the whole matter into its correct perspective.

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

When the Foreign Minister of the USSR, Mr. Gromyko, made the proposal at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly to include a new agenda item entitled "Reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries", my delegation was one of those which welcomed this initiative of the USSR with great zeal. We gave our wholehearted support to the resolution. I said:

"My delegation tends to believe that in submitting this draft resolution the sponsor has been motivated by a genuine desire, on the one hand, to reduce military expenditure as a further step towards disarmament and, on the other, to help the developing countries of the world. Such a [double] motive, if it really exists, has obviously a double merit and therefore deserves wide support". (A/PV.2178, p. 12) While making the proposal, Mr. Gromyko had observed:

"We consider it advisable to take as a starting point for the proposed reduction the level of military budgets for the current year of 1973". (A/PV.2126, p. 38)

When he made this proposal, many of us expected a positive response from all the other permanent members of the Security Council, and hoped to see a gradual decline in the military budgets simultaneously with the growth of an atmosphere of better understanding among the Big Five. The responses aroused by the resolution were, on the whole, positive although remarks of some scepticism appeared in many statements on grounds of difficulties of defining military expenditures, making assessment of military expenditures, difficulties in verifying these, and so forth.

However, my delegation thought that unless a freeze was made on expenditures at the 1973 level, a reduction in itself might not be sufficient to generate a better atmosphere, if the over-all total expenditure went on rising. With this view in mind, we suggested that:

"... there should be a freeze on the level of spending for military purposes at the 1973 level". (A/PV.2178, p. 12)

The reason given by us was:

"The goal of disarmament will remain as remote as ever if reduction of the military budget for a particular year by 10 per cent is followed by

(Mr. Upadhyay, Nepal)

an increase of 20 per cent in the subsequent year. A freeze on the level of military spending will mean that there will be a limit beyond which expenses cannot go up..." (Ibid.)

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute put the estimate for world military expenditure for 1973 at \$US 207.4 billion. The United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's preliminary figures indicated even greater expenditures, amounting to \$US 234.6 billion for 1973. Some estimates put it around \$US 240-275 billion then. However, the estimate for the current year is \$US 300 billion. Out of this expenditure, no less than 70 per cent, or over \$US 200 billion, is spent by the big five.

When we proposed that there should be a freeze on the level of spending for military purposes at the 1973 level, we took into consideration the very fact that, although it would be difficult to put an immediate halt to the manufacture and production of armaments, a freeze would ensure a cut-down in the level of armaments and future stockpiles because of two factors: first, the rising cost of materials needed for armaments, and second, the rising cost of research and production for more and more sophisticated armaments. Apart from that, we believe that the proposal was not intended for a single year. So once the principle was accepted by the big Powers and other States which had economic and military potential it would contribute positively towards the relaxation of tension and the generation of trust. This would naturally encourage similar reductions again and again, thus contributing towards the reduction and control of the production of armaments and the paving of a further path towards general and complete disarmament.

The draft resolution under consideration, contained in document A/C.1/L.726, does not contain any suggestion or appeal for a freeze in military expenditures. The reason is understandable. However, it contains very constructive proposals that may further contribute to dealing with the question in a more objective way.

I further hope that the Committee will realize the importance of the proposal for a freeze and will be seized of this idea sooner or later as a concrete step towards general and complete disarmament. For the record, let me express that my delegation will continue its efforts in pursuit of this objective. We remain convinced of the merit of the proposal, and this makes us undaunted and optimistic.

With these observations, my delegation wholeheartedly supports the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.726.

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The representative of Finland, Ambassador Pastinen, on behalf of a number of States, including the German Democratic Republic, yesterday presented a draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.739 on item 47 of the agenda on the prohibition of action to influence the natural environment and climate for military or other hostile purposes incompatible with the interests of maintaining international security, human well-being and health.

This initiative last year won the support of an overwhelming majority of Members of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Talks on this subject at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), with the assistance of experts, have proved very useful. They led to recognition of the fact that the early conclusion of an appropriate agreement would avert the inclusion in the arms race of new unconventional means of waging war. The report of the experts at the CCD rebutted the view that because of inadequate technical knowledge and the difficulties of these questions it is premature, so they allege, to conclude such an agreement now.

In the Disarmament Committee itself in Geneva the delegation of the German Democratic Republic drew attention to the fact that all scientific and technological questions can be resolved when a practical decision is taken by States on their readiness to conclude such an agreement.

We welcome the fact that after the submission by the USSR and the United States of identical draft conventions at this summer's session of the Disarmament Committee, the chances of an early preparation of a convention on the prohibition of climatic warfare have grown considerably.

The draft resolution before us refers to the CCD and requests it, if possible, in 1976, to come to an agreement on the text of a convention. The German Democratic Republic, as a member of the Disarmament Committee, will do everything it can to bring about the early conclusion of such an agreement and urges support for this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Nigeria to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.742.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): Please permit me to announce at the outset that Gambia, Guinea-Bissau and Somalia should be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.742 of 1 December 1975 that I am about to introduce. I sincerely regret that because of the hectic nature of the activities of the current session it has not been possible to establish closer liaison with the delegations of very close and friendly sister countries and others, in order to include them in the list of sponsors which appears on the document I have just referred to.

There is a popular and, indeed, most disquieting misconception that it is a privilege for a State to belong to a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The corollary is that certain States, probably the nuclear-weapon States, have the inherent right to confer that privilege on States that wish to establish or belong to a nuclear-weapon-free zone. If this assumption were correct, it would be a very dangerous development in international relations, not only for its implications for the fundamental belief in the equal rights of nations, large and small, under the Charter of the United Nations, but also for the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both with immeasurably deleterious effects on international peace and security.

Anyone with a serious approach to this matter would see that there is a tremendous difference in the consideration of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in parts of the world where nuclear weapons have not been introduced and the basic question of nuclear disarmament which involves, on the one hand, the continuing production, development and stockpiling of nuclear weapons, and, on the other hand, the desirable objective of freezing their present levels previous to their total elimination under effective international controls. In the former case, that is, the case of nuclear-weapon-free zones, agreement on the scope and characteristics of the zone is the primary responsibility of the contracting parties. The contracting parties, acting within international law, must not assume obligations which contradict the free and legal exercise of their sovereign will. While it is desirable for them to consult with outside States so as to ensure that the international community as a whole, particularly the nuclear-weapon Powers, accept and respect the status of their zone in all aspects, it is absolutely necessary

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

for them to resist any imposition of prior conditions from outside. If they and the other members of the international community fully appreciate the awesome danger of nuclear weapons, they must conceive the idea of nuclear-weapon-free zones not in terms of ability and capacity to produce them at a material time. Rather, the objectives of such zones must be to strengthen international peace and security in the regions where they exist and in the world at large; to arrest the costly arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race; to work with a plan and purpose for complete and general disarmament under effective international control; to give priority to economic and social development through diversion of resources from armaments to peaceful purposes; to use nuclear science and technology exclusively for peaceful purposes; and to apply the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

Let no one deceive himself that nations, like people, are not capable of rearranging their priorities so as to sacrifice and acquire weapons reportedly beyond their present reach, if they feel threatened with untoward humiliation or total annihilation. The African States, therefore, do not approach the question of the denuclearization of their continent negatively or from a defeatist stance. A continent of 46 virile States, with more than half of the known deposits of uranium, is not without bargaining chips.

Being mainly non-aligned countries, the African States attach the highest importance to international security, peace and justice. The Cairo Declaration of our Heads of State and Government regarding the denuclearization of Africa was not directed against any military alliance or Power. Neither will its translation into a formal instrument be directed against anyone.

Pariahs of the international community, like South Africa, may have their nuclear designs. It is common knowledge that South Africa is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Though a permanent member of the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency, South Africa has refused to place its uranium-processing facilities and nuclear activities under appropriate IAEA safeguards.



(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

It is also common knowledge that, contrary to United Nations injunctions and appeals, several Western Powers, particularly the Federal Republic of Germany, are investing vast material and human resources in South Africa; that they are, by licensing, technical and financial agreements, building up South Africa's war machine in order to institutionalize terror and bestiality in that unfortunate country with a view also to intimidating independent Africa; and that they are actively assisting in building one of the largest uranium-enrichment plants in the world in South Africa. If by all the facts the uranium-enrichment project in South Africa is absolutely unjustified on economic grounds, one may ask what is the reason, other than military, for funding and constructing the plant? It is hard not to be cynical, if one may paraphrase Juvenal, when eunuchs claim to father children.

We have heard denials, such as that which our friend from the Federal Republic of Germany made in the Special Political Committee and in this Committee. For the moment, we shall say no more on this matter. We shall leave it to the conscience of all who love human rights and human decency, who love peace and do not easily forget the lessons of history.

The resolution I have the privilege to present on behalf of the thirty-four African States in document A/C.1/L.742 should not present any difficulties for anyone who voted for resolution 3261 E (XXIX) of 9 December 1974. There are no basic differences. The object is one and the same. As I said on 20 November last year, when I had the honour of introducing that resolution:

"The purpose is simple and non-controversial: it is to reaffirm our conviction of the vital necessity of saving the world from the scourge of a nuclear war; it is to register our opposition to the harmful biological and other consequences of radio-active fall-out; it is to express our concern about the present rate of nuclear armaments and the possible spread of nuclear weapons; and it is to enable us to focus undivided attention on the task of harnessing the natural and human resources of our continent for the total advancement of our peoples." (2025th meeting, p. 28-30)

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

May I repeat what I also said last year, that we are not here to make a new declaration or to proclaim a new doctrine, nor are we seeking to impose on other States any new obligations which they have not hitherto freely assumed under General Assembly resolution 2033 (XX) of 1965. All we ask is recognition of the fact that Africa is master of its own destiny. Those who live in a nostalgic euphoria of the past cannot contrive to claim for themselves, at the expense of Africa, what they deny to others. International law is of universal application: it does not serve the interests of great Powers alone.

The first preambular paragraph of the draft resolution is cribbed from the introduction to the Secretary-General's annual report for this year: in fact it is a direct quotation from page 9 of document A/10001/Add.1. Now one may ask, why do nuclear-weapon-free zones provide the best and easiest means whereby non-nuclear-weapon States can ensure the total absence of nuclear weapons from their territories, when they have the choice of acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons? The answer is simple: look at the history of disarmament negotiations in the United Nations.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty does not, for reasons well known to all of us, appeal to everyone. Several African States are not parties to it. In any case, that Treaty does not mean the total absence of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles from the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States parties to it. It means only that non-nuclear-weapon States parties will not acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons. In other words, proliferation in the sense of that Treaty has more to do with ownership than with the general deployment of nuclear weapons. But all African States subscribe to the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa, which postulates the total absence of nuclear weapons from Africa. Furthermore, if nuclear weapons are not introduced into our continent, Africa will not be embroiled directly in the tiresome and tedious arguments on nuclear disarmament. Thanks to our own efforts and imagination, there are no foreign military bases or extra-territorial zones in Africa. We are all non-aligned and we are not subject to foreign security entanglements. A nuclear-weapon-free zone spontaneously established on our own initiative and by our own efforts will therefore be easier to achieve than an attempt to reconcile all and sundry to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or other treaties of similar arms-control dimensions with inherent contradictions.



(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

The second preambular paragraph is self-evident. Let me hasten to clarify that the clause "régime for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" is being used advisedly. The idea contained therein is not synonymous with the statute of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Many non-adherents to that Treaty strongly believe in the objectives of nuclear-free zones; hence the paragraph has been constructed to satisfy both parties and non-parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The remaining four preambular paragraphs have been taken from previous resolutions, dating back to 1965. They need no further elaboration, except to underline the fact that the definition of the continent of Africa in the fourth preambular paragraph is taken verbatim from the Charter of the Organization of African Unity. Naturally, the islands referred to therein include such island States as Mauritius, which became independent after the Charter had come into force.

It is probably a feat of artistic achievement that the preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution require more explanation than the operative paragraphs. I may add, however, that operative paragraph 1 is new. Like the fabled emperor in his new clothes, the kernel of the paragraph is bare and honest. It requires no special effort to see its essence and significance. It is a part of the standard folklore of the United Nations.

Lest there be some doubting Thomases, I should like to conclude by saying that operative paragraph 4 is one and the same as paragraph 3 of resolution 3261 E (XXIX) which was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly. The only correct construction to put upon the paragraph is one conceived in the light of international law that governs the sovereign rights of States, the high seas and the rights of innocent passage. We do not use the word "transporting" in a restrictive manner. We believe that nuclear-weapon States owe us a legal and a moral obligation not to transport nuclear weapons into or in transit across Africa. If for some unforeseen reasons that has to be done, such an exercise cannot be undertaken without permission as required by international law. Our fear, our concern, genuine and legitimate, is that nuclear weapons in transit across Africa,

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

might be dropped, or even fall accidentally, on our continent, resulting in incalculable havoc and calamity. Nuclear-weapon States must not do or be seen to do anything that will jeopardize States in nuclear-weapon-free zones that have voluntarily, and in the interests of mankind, renounced the nuclear option.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Nigeria for introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.742.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): The Israel delegation wishes to state its position, at this stage in the work of our Committee, with respect to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.741.

My Government has studied with attention the Iranian-Egyptian proposal now before the Committee concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. The Government of Israel has already stated in the past its support in principle for the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East.

As it stated in its letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations:

"... the Government of Israel cannot disregard the fact that Governments of Arab countries bordering on Israel and beyond unstintingly evoke the threat of force and attempt actively and increasingly to ostracize Israel from the international community." (S/11778/Add.3, p. 2)

This attitude is clearly incompatible with the professed aim of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

As regards the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Government of Israel has voted in favour of it, has stated that it supports its principle, and is continuing its examination of the Treaty's implications, against the legal and factual background depicted in the foregoing remarks.

With reference to operative paragraph 3 of the proposed resolution, the Government of Israel has solemnly stated that Israel will not be the first to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East, and it reiterates its desire to consult and confer with the Governments of all the countries concerned in order to agree on the prerequisites from which the commitments sought by the operative paragraphs of the proposed resolution may emerge as a genuine, and not as a spurious, contribution to peace.

As my Minister of Foreign Affairs declared in his statement to the General Assembly on 30 September concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East:

(Mr. Ereli, Israel)

"Israel ... will be ready to enter into negotiations with all States concerned in order to attain that objective. By negotiations we mean a process of intergovernmental consultation similar to that which preceded the adoption of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and other international instruments of like character." (A/PV.2368, p. 28-30)

A process of this kind is envisaged also for the South Asia and South Pacific agreements on nuclear-weapon-free zones.

My Minister added the comment that:

"We do not think that so grave a matter can be settled by correspondence through the Secretary-General." (Ibid.)

The Arab States have so far shown no readiness to take part in such a consultation, and this is surely both significant and disquieting.

It is no doubt for this reason that the draft before us does not call for such a consultation. This deliberate anomaly weakens the text irredeemably, and in fact subverts its proclaimed purpose. Accordingly, we cannot support the present draft, and will abstain from voting on it.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce to the Committee that Pakistan has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.724.

Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): In connexion with the two draft resolutions before us, as my delegation has already stated earlier on, we feel that United Nations efforts in the field of disarmament have reached a turning point. However, this impression apparently is not shared by all of us, and we therefore attach particular importance to two draft resolutions which, if adopted, should enable us to proceed to a thorough evaluation of the present situation and to arrive at a series of agreed common conclusions. Because we attach so much importance to such efforts -- which is, in a way, only natural -- we are co-sponsoring the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.731 concerning the mid-term review of the Disarmament Decade, and also the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.732, concerning a review of the general role of the United Nations in disarmament.

My delegation is also looking forward, in this respect, to co-operating actively with the proposed Ad Hoc Committee.

## ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: I believe the Committee is aware of the fact that we have two more meetings -- one this afternoon and one tomorrow morning -- at which to continue our discussion and debate before we go into tomorrow afternoon's meeting to begin with the voting. May I invite members of the Committee to let the Chair know whether they would like to take the floor either this afternoon or tomorrow morning.

Mr. RESHETNIAK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, you have just said that we would be voting tomorrow afternoon. As I recall, our Chairman said yesterday that we would begin the voting tomorrow morning, Thursday. Has there been any misunderstanding here? I should appreciate a clarification of this point.

The CHAIRMAN: Although I was not present myself when the announcement was made, I understand that the voting might begin tomorrow morning, provided there are no further speakers. However, if in addition to this afternoon some representatives wish to speak tomorrow morning also, there would be time for them to address the Committee in the morning, and we would then proceed thereafter with the voting. We have a list of speakers for this afternoon. There may be further additions to that list for this afternoon and, possibly, for tomorrow morning. I do not wish to impose an obligation on the Committee to begin the voting only tomorrow afternoon, but in case there are speakers who would like to address the Committee tomorrow morning, we would begin with the voting only thereafter. This could be later tomorrow morning or, if necessary, tomorrow afternoon.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.