



# General Assembly

Official Records

## First Committee

### 17<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Thursday, 9 November 1995, 3.00 p.m.  
New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun . . . . . (Mongolia)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.*

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. de Icaza (Mexico), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

revision of Protocol II on land-mines, booby-traps and other devices, and therefore decided to suspend its work and continue at resumed sessions to be held in Geneva from 15 to 19 January and 22 April to 3 May 1996.

#### Agenda items 57 to 81 (continued)

#### Consideration of draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

##### **The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*):

The first speaker is the President of the Review Conference of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects.

**Mr. Molander** (Sweden), President of the Review Conference of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects: I am indebted to the First Committee for giving me the opportunity to report on the Review Conference of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or To Have Indiscriminate Effects.

The Review Conference opened in Vienna on 25 September this year. On 13 October it adopted, by consensus, a fourth Protocol on blinding laser weapons, which will be attached to the Convention. The Conference was, however, not able to conclude its other main task, the

Let me first address the major breakthrough and success of the Review Conference: the adoption of Protocol IV banning blinding laser weapons, contained in document CCW/CONF.I/7. The new Protocol prohibits the employment of laser weapons specifically designed to cause permanent blindness as well as the transfer of any such weapons to any State or non-State entity. It further prescribes that all feasible precautions shall be taken, including training, in order to avoid blinding as a collateral or incidental effect of such legitimate military employment of laser systems as are not covered by the prohibition. For the purposes of the Protocol, it also gives a definition of blindness.

The adoption by the Review Conference of this Protocol is a landmark event in the development of international humanitarian law. Far too often, Governments react only when a particular weapon has been deployed, used and, indeed, abused. It was in such a reactive way that rules on incendiary weapons were drafted. And again, reacting to the global land-mine catastrophe, we now try to strengthen the rules on land-mines. The Protocol on blinding laser weapons shows that it is possible to pre-empt the development of a weapon before the weapon has been widely deployed, thus saving soldiers and civilians alike from new horrors.

Speaking one sentence on behalf of my own country, Sweden regards the ban on blinding laser weapons as a

major achievement. Sweden has reiterated its call for such a ban in this Committee for almost 10 years. I want to express in this context my gratitude to the International Committee of the Red Cross for its persistent and inventive support in this endeavour and in particular I want to thank Ambassador Wolfgang Hoffmann of Germany, whose skilful, dedicated and authoritative chairmanship of Main Committee III of the Conference brought this work to its successful conclusion.

On the basis of a Chairman's rolling text, the Review Conference made great efforts to reach a conclusion on the revision of Protocol II on land-mines, booby-traps and other devices. In a number of areas, important progress was made. We are close to final agreement on such issues as the extension of the scope of application to conflicts not of an international character, on a number of stiffer and clearer general restrictions on use, on some transfer restrictions, on technological cooperation and assistance, on higher protection for the United Nations, the ICRC and humanitarian missions, and on regular reviews of the operation of the Convention. These are all important and significant steps forward, both in terms of the land-mine Protocol itself and in terms of the development of international humanitarian law. In that context, I want to thank the Chairman of Main Committee II of the Conference, Ambassador Jorge Morales of Cuba, whose drive and ambition helped achieve many of these results.

Progress was made in spite of persisting important differences on the very core issue of land-mines, in particular anti-personnel land-mines. These differences arise from several factors. While some countries look at anti-personnel land-mines as inherently indiscriminate and thus intrinsically illegitimate, others view them as necessary and legitimate weapons of self-defence. For many countries, land-mines play a marginal role in defence planning: for others, they make a crucial contribution to territorial defence. Some live behind secure borders, others do not. Land-mine stockpiles vary as to metal content, fusing and reliability. Methods of use vary. Climate impacts on the life-time of mines. And so on.

It is only natural that Governments try to draft the new rules of the Protocol in such a way that they entail the least complications for their own stockpile and their own use. If, however, the revised Protocol is to take into account the specifications of each individual stockpile of land-mines, the end result would be an even weaker Protocol than the one we have today.

No single State or any particular group of States is to blame for the inability of the Review Conference to conclude its work within the foreseen time-frame. By the same token, all delegations share the responsibility for the fact that the preparatory work proved insufficient. The amount of new proposals and indeed new positions, which Governments had not revealed during the preparatory process, became a major complication.

It is therefore of the utmost importance that Governments reflect thoroughly on the new insights and understandings gained during the technical discussions in Vienna in order to be able to resume negotiations with a view to reaching demonstrably stricter rules on anti-personnel land-mines, specifications and use. This will demand readiness on all hands to make some real short-term sacrifices, at least in economic terms. But it should also be understood that even apparently modest progress in this field involves highly difficult military, technical and economic complexities for individual countries. These complexities are often underestimated by the media and by the non-governmental organization community. It is my sincere hope that the resumed session in January will be able to focus squarely on some of these technical issues.

The understanding of concepts and positions that we gained in Vienna must be brought forward to an understanding on new specifications for detectability on all anti-personnel land-mines as well as on standards for self-destruction, self-neutralization and self-deactivation of anti-personnel land-mines used outside fenced and patrolled areas and for remotely-delivered mines. This would set the stage for a successful final negotiation of all elements during a last phase of the Conference in April and May. I will be available for consultations with interested delegations for the next few days in New York. I am also ready to be in contact at any time and, indeed, at any place with any delegation between now and the resumed session.

In concluding, I should like to emphasize that there is no ground to be discouraged by the extension of the negotiating process. We are all under heavy pressure from public opinion to achieve a result. We also know that the end result may not satisfy public opinion nor indeed our own preferences. This must not discourage us, however, from achieving what is possible and realistic today, knowing that only consensus solutions will ever be adhered to.

In the meantime, the mere negotiating process goes a long way towards keeping the very issue of land-mine abuse on the international agenda. It brings us a steady stream of new States parties; it brings us moratoriums on transfers and on production; it certainly complicates life for illicit traders and it probably brings us better observance of existing rules. I am confident that it will also bring us new and stronger rules in a revised Protocol IV of the conventional weapons Convention. Ultimately, it will bring us the elimination of anti-personnel land-mines.

**Mr. Richards** (New Zealand): It gives me much pleasure to speak briefly in support of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21, which was introduced yesterday by the representative of South Africa. In her statement she analysed the content of the draft resolution and explained what lay behind it. It is inevitable that the international community should have varying concerns on matters of disarmament, especially when negotiations relating to security are involved. It is our task to reconcile those concerns. Those of us who support the text of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21 believe that it fulfils that obligation.

There is no question but that the Conference on Disarmament, in order to carry out its functions in a meaningful way in the post-cold-war world, needs a new focus and a wider constituency. The step forward proposed two years ago has been delayed for too long. The decision taken by the Conference in September is an acknowledgement that the step must be completed in the very near future. When that has been accomplished, the opportunities for the Conference on Disarmament to play a more varied and vigorous role in security negotiations will be greatly enhanced. I accordingly have great confidence in joining my South African colleague in commending this draft resolution to the Committee with a view to securing its adoption without a vote.

**Mr. Martínez-Morcillo** (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21, on expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament, which was introduced yesterday by the delegation of South Africa. In an earlier statement in which we addressed the question of disarmament machinery my delegation made clear the great importance and urgency we attach to this subject; none the less, we want to reiterate our support and our interest and once again to place our views on the record.

We strongly support the provisions of paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, whereby new members, in pursuance of

the decision taken by the Conference on Disarmament decision of September 1995, should begin participating in Conference activities and negotiations at the start of the 1996 session of the Conference. We also strongly support the initiative of the current Chairman of the Conference on Disarmament, the representative of Morocco.

My delegation hopes that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21 will be adopted without a vote, as was resolution 49/77 B, which was adopted under the same agenda item at the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly, and which serves as background for the draft resolution now before the Committee.

**Mr. Espinosa** (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to address draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21, which was introduced yesterday by the delegation of South Africa and of which my delegation is a sponsor. An essential element of international disarmament negotiations is the functioning of the disarmament machinery, or institutions. In this connection, expansion of the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral negotiating forum, is of the highest priority.

It is vital to have participation by a larger number of countries, representing all regions, in the negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty and subsequent agreements. It is urgent for the Conference on Disarmament, in conformity with its September decision, to complete the first stage of its expansion to 60 members, as the General Assembly urged in resolution 49/77 B. By reaching that objective, the legitimacy of the process of expansion of the Conference on Disarmament will have been re-established, and it will be possible to consider additional new members in an organic, regular and periodic fashion.

Expansion of the Conference on Disarmament should also make it possible to remove obstacles in the programme of work, and should result in a better operational relationship with the Disarmament Commission and with the First Committee, and in a meaningful contribution by Conference on Disarmament to the work of a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We hope that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21 will be adopted by consensus.

**Mr. Alimov** (Tajikistan) (*interpretation from Russian*): Tajikistan is among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, entitled "Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan", which was introduced yesterday. I am pleased to note that the Tajik leadership has a high opinion

of the foreign policy of Turkmenistan, a country with which we have a friendly relationship; that policy is aimed at building mutually beneficial relations with all interested States.

It is well known that Turkmenistan actively promotes the strengthening of peace and security in the region, *inter alia* within the framework of the Commonwealth of Independent States. We note with satisfaction and with gratitude the efforts of the leaders of Turkmenistan, and in particular of President Saparmurat Niyazov, towards the speedy resumption of dialogue between the Government of Tajikistan and the Tajik opposition. We welcome Turkmenistan's stated readiness to act as an observer at the inter-Tajik talks, and to render good offices through hosting the continuing inter-Tajik talks at its capital, Ashkhabad.

The efforts and contributions of the leadership of Turkmenistan towards the settlement of the inter-Tajik conflict were acknowledged in the statement of the President of the Security Council of 6 November 1995, when the Council considered the situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border.

As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, we want to note a number of arguments in favour of the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan. As members know, Turkmenistan stands at the very centre of an unstable region, which takes in Central and southern Asia, the Caspian Sea and the Caucasus. It is in this very post-Soviet space that disputes and conflicts have yet to die down; these conflicts are the object of attention by the United Nations. Yet Turkmenistan is not involved in any of these conflicts, and is not a party to any military alliance or bloc. Moreover, it is important to remember that Turkmenistan has always taken a constructive and balanced position on issues related to the expansion of zones of confidence-building and security.

Finally, the neutrality of Turkmenistan, as we all know, was recognized by a number of States of the region at the Islamabad summit of the Economic Cooperation Organization, and by the Non-Aligned Movement at its Cartagena summit.

With this international recognition of Turkmenistan as a neutral State, and as this draft resolution involves no financial implications for the United Nations, it is our view that Turkmenistan can make an even greater contribution to the cause of consolidating peace, stability, economic development and progress in the region, which would without question be universally welcomed.

We believe that it should be possible to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 by consensus.

**Mr. Ziauddin** (Bangladesh): Bangladesh joined in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, entitled "Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan", with much pleasure and satisfaction. We feel proud to be supporting Turkmenistan's stand on permanent neutrality. The Charter of the United Nations provides every Member State with the sovereign right to determine and pursue without interference its own independent domestic policy and foreign policy, in accordance with the norms and principles of international law. It allows States thereby to benefit from the relationship with countries in and around their respective regions, and all over the world.

The legislative confirmation by Turkmenistan of its status of permanent neutrality has the support of the Non-Aligned Movement, and that, of course, means Bangladesh too. We believe that Turkmenistan's status of permanent neutrality does not in any way adversely affect the fulfilment of its obligations under the United Nations Charter. Indeed, it can actually contribute to the achievement of the purposes of the Organization, by strengthening peace and security in the region. It would also confirm Turkmenistan's aspiration to complete independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Bangladesh therefore congratulates Turkmenistan on its declaration of permanent neutrality, and supports it wholeheartedly.

**Mr. Fridegotto** (Italy): We listened yesterday with great interest to Ambassador Ataeva's introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, on the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan. Italy fully respects the desire of Turkmenistan to contribute constructively to the maintenance of international peace and security on the basis of the principle of neutrality. For that reason, my delegation believes that the initiative of Turkmenistan deserves the most careful consideration possible, and hopes that the ongoing consultations on the draft resolution will result in a positive outcome and in adoption of the text by consensus.

**Mr. Esenli** (Turkey): It gives me great pleasure to speak in support of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, introduced yesterday by Turkmenistan. Turkey is among the sponsors of this draft resolution, which is entitled "Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan", because we are in full agreement with the sovereign right of every State to determine independently its foreign policy in accordance

with the norms and principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

Furthermore, Turkey is of the opinion that this draft resolution will contribute to the strengthening of peace and stability in the region. It is therefore important that the First Committee adopt this draft resolution by consensus. A clear endorsement would give additional impetus to Turkmenistan's sincere desire to play an active and positive role in developing peaceful, friendly and mutually beneficial relations with the other countries of the region.

**Mr. Bandura** (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): My delegation is among the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9. Ukraine is committed to the principle that every State should have the opportunity to determine its own policy in accordance with the norms and principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, and is convinced that the adoption of confidence-building measures and measures of cooperation on a regional level promotes international peace and security in general. We therefore support the confirmation by friendly Turkmenistan of its status of permanent neutrality. We view with favour Turkmenistan's desire to build good-neighbourly, peaceful relations not only with countries of Asia but with other States as well.

According to this draft resolution, the General Assembly would call upon States Members of the United Nations to respect and support the neutral status of Turkmenistan and also to respect its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The importance of these principles is beyond question, and their enduring importance was reaffirmed during the recent celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations and is stated in the Declaration endorsed by the General Assembly, including many Heads of State or Government.

In our view, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 is a balanced text, and reflects the good will of a State Member of the United Nations and its intention to contribute to the strengthening of peace and stability. We urge all members of the First Committee to agree to adopt this draft resolution by consensus.

I turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21, which Ukraine also supports. In introducing this draft resolution yesterday, the representative of South Africa stressed the importance of the decision adopted by the Conference on Disarmament in September, on expansion of its membership, based on General Assembly resolution 49/77 B. I thank the Chairman of the Conference on

Disarmament, Ambassador Benjelloun-Touimi of Morocco, and all delegations members of the Conference, for their willingness to cooperate and their readiness to compromise, which made the decision possible.

In accordance with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21 the General Assembly would call on the Conference on Disarmament, in accordance with its decision, to begin its 1996 session with an expanded membership. This would be a successful and logical conclusion to the efforts of all States, both those that are members of the Conference on Disarmament and those that wish to become members. New members would give new, positive impetus to the work of the Conference, which is on the threshold of completing its work on a very important document.

In our view, the text adequately reflects the current state of affairs on this issue; the delegation of Ukraine hopes that the draft resolution will be adopted without a vote.

**Mr. Zainuddin** (Malaysia): My delegation echoes previous speakers in welcoming the desire and commitment of Turkmenistan to play a constructive role in the development of peaceful, friendly and mutually beneficial relations with other members of the international community on the basis of the principles of positive neutrality. We believe that pursuing this policy will contribute to stability in the region and will enable Turkmenistan to realize its economic potential, which is based on vast natural resources.

The thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, which was introduced by the representative of Turkmenistan and which calls upon Member States to respect the status of permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan and also to respect its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, is consistent with the letter and the spirit of the United Nations Charter. As one of the sponsors of this draft resolution, my delegation hopes that it will command the full support of the Committee and will be adopted by consensus.

**Mr. Meier-Klodt** (Germany): We too listened with interest to the comprehensive introduction made yesterday by the Permanent Representative of Turkmenistan, Ambassador Ataeva, of the draft resolution (A/C.1/50/L.9) on her country's permanent neutrality. She has convincingly outlined the importance her country attaches to the draft resolution for its own sake and for the region as a whole. We have equally taken note of the positive reaction the draft resolution has enjoyed from previous speakers in this

Committee and, as I understand, from a large number of other Member States.

Delegations are aware that my Government has always attached great importance to a further streamlining and rationalization of the Committee's work. Permit me to take this opportunity to thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, and, through you, the Ambassador of Mongolia, for the very substantial results achieved in this regard. Consequently, we have also looked at the present draft resolution from this angle.

In conclusion, however, we are convinced that the affirmation of Turkmenistan's neutrality warrants and deserves our support. My delegation therefore expresses the hope that other Member States will also be in a position to support this draft resolution and to join in a consensus on it.

**Mr. Marschik** (Austria): We have taken note with great interest of the decision of Turkmenistan to adopt the status of permanent neutrality. We believe this decision reflects the desire of Turkmenistan to play an active and positive role in maintaining friendly and good-neighbourly relations with all countries and to contribute to the strengthening of peace and security in its region and in the world.

We welcome the decision taken by Turkmenistan, and we support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9. We hope it will be approved by consensus by the General Assembly.

**Mr. Volski** (Georgia)(*interpretation from Russian*): My delegation is speaking for the first time today, and I should therefore like to congratulate the Chairman and the other officers of the Committee on their elections to their posts.

Speaking in support of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 on the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan, as one of its sponsors, Georgia would once again like to inform the international community of its position of universal support for the principle of State sovereignty. The Government of Georgia believes that universal support for the draft resolution is support for progress and for the aspiration to establish peace and security in the region.

In the light of the difficult inheritance of confrontation that has come down to it, the decision taken by the Turkmenistan Government is an outstanding event. We should like to congratulate the friendly people of Turkmenistan. In so doing, the Government of the Republic

of Georgia hopes that the draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

**Mr. Osman** (Afghanistan): The Afghanistan delegation is a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, on the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan. I should like to reiterate my conviction that the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan will enhance peace and security in the region, and I call on all delegations to adopt the draft resolution by consensus and bring us one step closer to achieving peace and security in that region as well as in other regions of the world.

**Mr. Aitmatov** (Kyrgyzstan): Kyrgyzstan is glad to support and co-sponsor the draft resolution on the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan (A/C.1/50/L.9). We respect the choice made by friendly neighbouring Turkmenistan, and we consider the proclamation of its neutrality to be a logical continuation of its constructive domestic and foreign policy since gaining independence.

It is evident that this is a step of great historical responsibility for Turkmenistan's own future and the geopolitical future of the region of Central Asia. In the post-Soviet era, newly independent Central Asian States are facing serious challenges to regional stability and security and the need to work out, on their own, appropriate responses to them and to elaborate new forms of regional cooperation. To this end, for example, Kyrgyzstan initiated the Permanent Conference on Sustainable Development in Central Asia and put forward the idea of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region, Kazakhstan is working on the organization of a conference on confidence-building measures and security in Asia, and this year Uzbekistan held the first seminar on security and cooperation in Asia. We consider the initiative of Turkmenistan to be an important contribution to the efforts to formulate models and mechanisms for maintaining security and cooperation in the entire region.

Recognition of the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan will represent a tangible support for these efforts by the international community and will facilitate the formulation and implementation of concrete mechanisms for the realization of that neutral status. My delegation expresses its hope that the First Committee will give positive consideration to this draft resolution and adopt it by consensus.

**Mr. Berdennikov** (Russian Federation)(*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian Federation has always favoured the early conclusion of an international, universal, effective

and verifiable comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. We had hoped that this treaty might be concluded this year for the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, as was proposed by the President of Russia at the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

We regret that it has not been possible to achieve this goal. In that light, we support the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban of the Conference on Disarmament to complete the negotiations

“as soon as possible and no later than 1996.” (A/50/27, para. 23 (12e))

We attach great importance to the wish expressed by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8 to see it adopted by consensus. That is our goal as well. Indeed, if, unlike the two previous resolutions 48/70 and 49/70, this draft resolution — the last, we hope, on the subject of negotiations on the comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty — is not adopted by consensus, it would send a most undesirable signal to the negotiations at Geneva and could even be interpreted as revealing a decline in the support of the international community for the early and speedy conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. We are convinced of the need to do everything possible to achieve consensus this year.

In that connection I would request the Chairman to make all the necessary efforts and to hold any needed consultations to ensure consensus on this important draft resolution.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I would ask the Ambassador of the Russian Federation if he was addressing me — I am simply exercising the duties of the Chairman in his place — or is he addressing himself to the speaker who introduced the draft resolution?

**Mr. Berdennikov** (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I was addressing the Chairman. I have full confidence in the Chairman and in you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

**Mr. Sitaula** (Nepal): My delegation, as one of its sponsors, is speaking in support of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.31, “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”. As host to the Regional Centre, Nepal highly appreciates the role of the Centre in carrying out useful activities with a view to encouraging regional and subregional dialogue for the enhancement of openness, transparency and confidence-building, as well as the promotion of disarmament and

security through the organization of regional meetings known as the “Kathmandu process”. Given the extremely important role it has been playing since its inception, it is imperative that the Centre’s activities be expanded and strengthened to ensure that it continues with greater vigour to disseminate information about disarmament, peace, preventive diplomacy and development.

Viewed from this perspective, the present draft resolution could not have come at a more appropriate time. The draft resolution, in its preambular paragraphs, notes the trends in the post-cold-war era that have brought into focus the Regional Centre’s function in assisting Member States as they deal with the new security concerns and disarmament issues emerging in the region. It also recognizes the need for the Regional Centre to pursue effectively its new and expanded functions. In the operative paragraphs the General Assembly would commend the important work carried out by the Kathmandu Centre in the interests of peace and disarmament in the region and would reaffirm its strong support for the continued operation and strengthening of the Centre.

In the draft resolution also an appeal is made to Member States, particularly those within the Asia-Pacific region, as well as to international governmental and non-governmental organizations and foundations, to make voluntary contributions to consolidate the programme of activities of the Kathmandu Centre and its implementation. Since the Centre operates in the interests of peace and disarmament in the region, thereby contributing to the global disarmament goal, it is important that it receive the widest support possible from the Member States of the region and beyond. Needless to say, such overwhelming support by Member States will help re-energize the Centre to be actively engaged in furthering the objectives set in motion by the “Kathmandu process”. Nepal therefore earnestly hopes that the draft resolution will, as in the past, be adopted without a vote.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call upon the representative of Nigeria to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.11.

**Mr. Olusanmokin** (Nigeria): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.11, entitled “United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services”, on behalf of its sponsors, which include Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Mongolia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger,

Pakistan, Peru, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, the United States of America, Viet Nam and, of course, Nigeria.

In introducing his report "New Dimensions of Arms Regulation and Disarmament in the Post-Cold-War Era" (A/C.1/47/7), the Secretary-General reminded us of the need to realize that disarmament constituted an integral part of international efforts to strengthen international peace and security and that solutions to political and economic issues were often found to be linked with disarmament measures. He therefore recommended a globalization of the process of arms control and disarmament, whereby all States would be engaged in the process of disarmament, giving practical content to their declared intent.

More recently, in his statement to the First Committee on behalf of the Secretary-General, the Under-Secretary-General noted that along with striving for further progress in the control of weapons of mass destruction, there was a need to work harder to prevent proliferation in the conventional field. The international community is today faced with outbreaks of armed conflicts all over the globe, and no region has been spared the bloody and traumatic experiences of war. The resources of the Organization have been stretched to the very limit, making the need for preventive diplomacy and confidence-building very obvious.

Nations great and small have therefore embraced the basic principle of preventive diplomacy and confidence-building. Today, in the First Committee, there are many more draft resolutions on regional arms control and confidence-building. The international community has come to recognize the importance of disarmament and arms control at the regional levels as a necessary complement to the global process.

The world will continue to need more expertise in the field of disarmament, arms control and other security-related areas. The United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme has been responding to this need in the number of fellows that it has trained and will continue to train. The programme has taken the current challenges of the post-cold-war era into consideration in its curriculum, which now includes courses in regional arms control and disarmament arrangements, openness and transparency, conflict resolution, non-proliferation, preventive diplomacy and peace-keeping. The need for the continuation of this programme cannot, therefore, be overemphasized.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to thank the Secretary-General and the Centre for Disarmament Affairs for their continued support for the programme.

The draft resolution before the Committee in document A/C.1/50/L.11 is essentially similar to those of past years. In the preambular paragraphs, the General Assembly would note with satisfaction that the programme has trained an appreciable number of public officials selected from all geographical regions represented in the United Nations system and also that many officials of developing countries have acquired expertise through the training programme.

In its operative paragraphs, the Assembly would reaffirm the relevant decisions on the programme as contained in annex IV to the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly and would express its appreciation to the Governments of Member States that invited the 1995 fellows to study selected activities in the field of disarmament, thereby contributing to the fulfilment of the overall objectives of the programme.

The support of all Member States is required to enable the training programme to continue to achieve its important objective of providing expertise in the areas of disarmament and security to officials from developing countries in the field of disarmament. It is the hope of the sponsors of this draft resolution that it will be adopted without a vote, as in previous years.

While I am speaking, I wish to make a few comments on some of the draft resolutions before the Committee, of some of which Nigeria is a co-sponsor. My delegation is happy to note the enlargement of the sponsorship of the draft contained in A/C.1/50/L.8, entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", which now enjoys wider support than ever before, including support from those who bear the main responsibility for ensuring the cessation of all nuclear testing. At this stage of the negotiation, political will is needed to speed up its pace. A successful conclusion of the ban at the appropriate time will also be a source of revitalization for this single multilateral negotiating forum.

In that connection, Nigeria would like to see a swift decision taken on the commencement of full participation of the additional 23 States that have been admitted in principle to join the negotiating forum and also on the review of its agenda to include new items. We will therefore support the draft resolutions contained in A/C.1/50/L.4 and A/C.1/50/L.21.



I wish to turn to the draft contained in A/C.1/50/L.22, entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes". Nigeria is happy to note that, in the past few years, the resolution on this subject has been adopted by consensus, signifying the recognition of the importance of this subject to the African countries and other developing countries that do not have the capacity to detect such wastes, let alone to deal with the situation that they might cause. The Pelindaba Treaty, which will be endorsed during this session of the General Assembly, has taken the same into consideration, as one of its articles covers the prohibition of nuclear-waste dumping in Africa.

We further welcome progress on this matter as it is being recorded at the International Atomic Energy Agency, where preparations are being made for a draft convention on the safe management of radioactive wastes. It is to be hoped that when that convention is completed, it will have a wider scope and application than the existing instruments dealing with nuclear, radioactive, toxic and hazardous wastes. It is therefore our hope that the draft resolution in A/C.1/50/L.22 will once again be adopted without a vote during this session.

Turning to the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/50/L.24 on the United Nations Regional Centres for Peace and Disarmament in Africa and elsewhere, my delegation was saddened to hear the Secretary-General announce that the three Centres might be closed for lack of funds and that their operations will be directed from New York. This has been the case with the Centre in Africa for a few years now and the result has been a serious reduction in United Nations-organized activities in that region. We were hoping to see a reversal of that situation and we are certainly disappointed at the latest development.

While we understand the reasons for the decision, in the present circumstances we would like to appeal to Member States generously to contribute funds for the Centres. At a time when the international community views regional confidence building and arms control as essential to peace and security, regional Centres, which are the most effective mechanism for their promotion, should be gaining more importance. We therefore hope that the United Nations will work closely with the major regional organizations to find a way for the Centres to resume in earnest their vital activities in the very near future.

Finally, I should like to turn to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.23, entitled "Final text of the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (the Pelindaba Treaty)", which was introduced by the representative of the Republic of

South Africa. I want to reiterate the view of the Nigerian delegation that the African nuclear-weapon-free zone will assist in strengthening the security of the States of our region against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. My delegation therefore calls for the adoption of this draft resolution without a vote.

**The Acting Chairman** (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Sri Lanka, who will speak in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

**Mr. de Silva** (Sri Lanka), Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean: I have the honour to present the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, contained in document A/50/29. I have also been requested to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.27, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", which has been submitted by Colombia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are also members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

Following the adoption of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, contained in General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI) in 1971, in pursuance of an initiative of Mrs. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, an Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean was established. Since then, the United Nations has been actively involved in the efforts of the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, major maritime users and the permanent members of the Security Council to establish a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. In pursuance of this objective, an important Meeting of the Littoral and Hinterland States of the Indian Ocean was held in July 1979, which led to the expansion of the Ad Hoc Committee and clarified certain regional perceptions of the zone.

The concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace was conceived at the height of the cold war and the accompanying great-Power rivalry, which was very much evident in the Indian Ocean at that time. This climate of stress and strain in international relations, among other matters, prevented the Ad Hoc Committee from achieving desired progress in accomplishing its objectives.

The littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean are pleased that the great-Power rivalry now belongs — it is hoped — to history, as does the cold war, which effectively smothered the entire world. These positive changes and the emerging international climate of confidence, trust and cooperation have had a major impact

on the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. Members will recall that the General Assembly, in its resolution 49/82, welcomed these positive developments and saw them as favourable opportunities to pursue global and regional cooperation in the Indian Ocean region.

Meanwhile, there appears to be renewed interest in the Indian Ocean, not only in respect of strategic and security matters but also in respect of non-military aspects of security and economic development. This has been reflected in the meetings that were held at Grand Bay, Mauritius, and at Perth, Australia this year. The main focus of these meetings is on cooperation, particularly in the economic field, among the Indian Ocean rim countries. Sri Lanka, while supporting these new initiatives, firmly holds the view that the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean remains the most broad-based and the primary vehicle for taking practical measures to ensure conditions of peace, security and stability in the Indian Ocean region. This view, my delegation is pleased to note, is shared by members of the non-aligned countries. Hence, their endorsement of the present draft resolution and its submission as a text of the Non-Aligned Movement.

During 1995, in my capacity as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee and in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 49/82, I held consultations with the authorities concerned in the capitals of France, the United Kingdom and the United States. My assessments of the consultations are contained in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean — document A/50/29 — and these are self-explanatory. Meanwhile, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, during its meetings this year, noted the initiatives taken by countries in the region to promote cooperation, in particular economic cooperation, in the Indian Ocean area and the possible contribution of such initiatives to the overall objectives of a zone of peace. The Ad Hoc Committee also expressed its conviction that the participation of all permanent members of the Security Council and major maritime users of the Indian Ocean in the work of the Committee was important and would assist the progress of a mutually beneficial dialogue and helpful discourse to develop conditions of peace, security and stability in the Indian Ocean.

The Ad Hoc Committee also requested its Chairman to pursue his dialogue on the work of the Committee with the permanent members of the Security Council and other major maritime users. The Ad Hoc Committee felt, as its report indicates, that greater efforts and more time would be required to develop a focused discussion on practical measures to ensure conditions of peace, security and

stability in the Indian Ocean region. For this purpose, it is the intention of the Ad Hoc Committee to hold one meeting next year to enable me to report on the progress of the dialogue and consultations made in this regard.

*The Chairman returned to the Chair.*

These decisions of the Ad Hoc Committee are reflected in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.27 and it is the desire of the non-aligned countries that this draft be adopted with the widest possible support. I would therefore commend it for the approval of the Committee.

Finally, on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee, I should like to express our deep appreciation to Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, Special Adviser to the Ad Hoc Committee, and Mr. Timur Alasaniya, Secretary to the Ad Hoc Committee, for the valuable advice and support that they made available to the Committee.

**The Chairman:** I call on the representative of Sri Lanka, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33.

**Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka):** I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.33, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”.

As members may be aware, the subject of the prevention of an arms race in outer space has engaged the attention of the First Committee for over a decade. During this period, Egypt, Venezuela and Sri Lanka have in turn taken the responsibility of introducing draft resolutions for consideration by the Committee.

Views have been expressed in this Committee and in the Conference on Disarmament that there is no ongoing arms race, so to speak, in outer space. Hence, it is argued that there is no reason to continue with a resolution of this nature. Even if we admit that there is no ongoing arms race in outer space, that in itself is no guarantee against developments that may take place in the future.

There is another important factor: the international community should not focus its attention on situations only when adverse developments affecting international security take place. The sponsors of this draft resolution believe in the saying “Prevention is better than cure”. We should therefore make use of the current propitious international political situation by reaching an understanding on this matter.

In this context, Sri Lanka regrets the non-establishment in 1995 of an ad hoc committee by the Conference on Disarmament on the prevention of an arms race in outer space. It is no secret that the Ad Hoc Committee fell victim to the controversy involving the work of the Conference on Disarmament, which prevented it from being re-established. The present draft resolution notes this development in thirteenth paragraph of the preamble, and in operative paragraph 6 the Conference on Disarmament is requested to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee in 1996 and to consider the question of preventing an arms race in outer space.

In 1994, resolution 49/74, on the prevention of an arms race in outer space, was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 170 in favour, none against and 1 abstention. The sponsors of the present draft resolution sincerely hope that it will be adopted in a similar manner, thereby sending a strong signal of the conviction of the international community that progress on this matter is important to it.

Finally, on behalf of the delegations of Algeria, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, the Sudan and Ukraine, sponsors of the present draft resolution, and my own delegation, I am pleased to introduce the draft resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space and express the hope that it will be adopted with the widest possible majority by the First Committee and the General Assembly.

**The Chairman:** I call on the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43.

**Mr. Calovski** (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): I should like to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Development of good-neighbourly relations among Balkan States", contained in document A/C.1/50/L.43 and sponsored by Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

According to the draft resolution the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to continue to seek the views of the Member States, particularly those from the Balkan region, and of international organizations, as well as of competent organs of the United Nations, on the development of good-neighbourly relations in the region and on measures and preventive activities aimed at creation of a stable zone of peace and cooperation in the Balkans by the year 2000, and to submit a report to the General

Assembly at the fifty-second session, taking into account, *inter alia*, the views expressed by Member States.

In the draft resolution, relevant international organizations and competent bodies and organizations of the United Nations system are urged to submit to the Secretary-General their views on the subject. This refers first to organizations such as the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and other United Nations bodies and organizations of the United Nations system engaged in the Balkan region. Of particular importance are the expected contribution and input of the Secretary-General and the European Union.

The draft resolution stresses that closer engagement of Balkan States in cooperation arrangements on the European continent will favourably influence the political and economic situation in the region, as well as the good-neighbourly relations among all Balkan States.

In my previous statements, I have underlined that, now and in the future, the most important endeavour of the Balkan States — and, for that matter, of all European States — is the Europeanization of the Balkans and not its further Balkanization. Naturally, this politically and otherwise very important cause and aim can be achieved only by mutual cooperation among the Balkan States in all fields, which is why this point is emphasized in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

It goes without saying that all current efforts should be aimed at stopping the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina and at reaching a peaceful solution to the conflict. This is why in the draft resolution, in its fifth preambular paragraph, the General Assembly would welcome the present international efforts to achieve an overall political settlement of the conflict and, in operative paragraph 6, would urge normalization of the relations among all States of the Balkan region.

The history of the Balkans is one of uncertainty, problems, conflicts, and so on. The region has always been referred to as a keg of dynamite. We have to change that, and the only means of doing so is by Europeanization of the Balkans.

I should like to take this opportunity to express sincere thanks to all the delegations that have sponsored our draft resolution. Let me single out the extremely positive cooperation of the delegation of Greece and of the

delegation of Spain on its own behalf and on behalf of the European Union.

I hope that our draft resolution will receive the approval of the Committee and that it will be adopted without a vote.

**Mr. Stoian** (Romania): I wish to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.11, which was introduced by the representative of Nigeria.

The United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme should be perceived today in the spirit of our times — the spirit of understanding, cooperation and mutual respect. This is very important because, as was underlined at the Pledging Conference for the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme, the new era in disarmament negotiations requires, *inter alia*, the education of

“a new generation of disarmament diplomats”.

The programme of disarmament fellowships has an important role to play in the education of the participants and in the provision of an independent source of balanced and factual information that takes into account a wide range of views and, in this way, facilitates an informed debate on arms limitation, disarmament and security.

Although it does not deal directly with issues of the control of armaments and disarmament, the programme, in the opinion of my delegation, is one of the United Nations activities contributing greatly to the attainment of the objective of a safer world, in that it ensures the training of specialists in the field. The fact that an appreciable number of public officials from different countries, most of whom are now in positions of responsibility in the field of disarmament affairs in their respective countries, have already been trained under the programme is proof of its utility and importance.

Now, with the demise of ideological confrontation, negotiations in the field of disarmament are more active than ever, necessitating more negotiators.

All of these points demonstrate the role of the programme in enhancing the capabilities of countries in respect of ongoing deliberations and negotiations in the sphere of disarmament.

Romania is one of the States which, a few years ago, benefited from the facilities offered. I wish once again to

thank the countries contributing to this programme, which has enabled Romanian young people to specialize.

Romania is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, and I take this opportunity to call on the other Member States to support it, as in previous years.

**Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt): My delegation is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 on the permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan.

With regard to the question of enhancing international peace and security, as well as peace and stability in the region of Central Asia, we should like to emphasize the importance of the initiative taken by the Government of Turkmenistan in becoming permanently neutral.

My delegation would like to emphasize that this draft resolution should be adopted by consensus, and we call upon all States to direct their efforts to that end.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): I should like to take this opportunity to express our views on several draft resolutions that have been submitted and/or introduced and on which the Committee is likely to take action within the next few meetings.

First, Pakistan is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, on Turkmenistan's declaration of permanent neutrality. We welcome and support this action by Turkmenistan, and we hope that the General Assembly will adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

My delegation also welcomes the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.21 — Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament — which was submitted by South Africa. My delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution. We hope that it will be adopted unanimously and that the Conference on Disarmament will implement it unanimously.

We warmly welcome the adoption of the Pelindaba Treaty on the declaration of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone, and we have great pleasure in supporting the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.23.

It is the view of my delegation that one of the most important draft resolutions to have been submitted to the Committee this year is the one contained in document A/C.1/50/L.46 — “Nuclear disarmament” — which was submitted by the delegation of Myanmar, with the support of a large number of non-aligned and other countries. This

proposed course of action emanates from the decision of the Cartagena Summit of the non-aligned countries, which recommended the submission, at this session of the General Assembly, of a draft resolution calling for the commencement of nuclear-disarmament negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament early in 1996.

In paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would call upon the nuclear-weapon States to undertake a step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat and a phased programme of progressive and balanced deep reductions of nuclear weapons. In paragraph 5 it would call upon the Conference on Disarmament to establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to commence negotiations early in 1996 on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament, with a view to achieving the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

It is the hope of my delegation that this draft resolution, which reflects the decision of the Heads of State of the non-aligned countries in Cartagena, will be co-sponsored by as many non-aligned countries as possible and that it will be adopted with the largest possible majority by the General Assembly so that this Assembly can send a resounding message to the nuclear-weapon States and to the world that we are not reconciled to living in a world that is divided between those that have nuclear weapons and those who are prohibited from having these weapons. We are all committed to the goal of a nuclear-free world and we believe that the draft resolution in A/C.1/50/L.46 will make a major and landmark contribution to promoting this process, which we hope will begin in negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament early in 1996.

By the same token, we find that the draft resolution on nuclear disarmament contained in document A/C.1/50/L.17 in actuality deals with proposals which have a marginal and peripheral relevance to the promotion of the process of nuclear disarmament. My delegation will therefore be unable to support that draft resolution.

Similarly, we believe that the draft resolution on small arms, contained in document A/C.1/50/L.7, endorses a partial and discriminatory approach to promoting peace and security in various parts of the world. Various parts of the world are being destabilized by the trade in armaments and the accumulation of armaments both illicit and licit, both big arms — such as aircraft and rockets and tanks — and small arms. Therefore, the attempt to segment the disarmament process in an artificial manner will, in our view, promote greater instability, rather than promote

security, especially the security of smaller States. In any event, we have suggested to the sponsors that it is necessary in the first instance to obtain the views of Member States on the issue of the control of small arms and light weapons and, only after receiving these views can this Assembly be in a position to identify the issues upon which we need to take further action. My delegation hopes to submit amendments to this draft resolution together with a few other countries.

The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.48, on science and technology, is an important text which underlines several important principles that should be adopted for the promotion of international transfers of science and technology for development. On the other hand, we find that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.13 is considerably deficient in various respects and could lead to interpretations which would endorse the unilateral regimes and restraints that have been imposed by certain States, principally against the non-aligned and the developing countries. We would therefore suggest some changes to the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/50/L.13 in order to affirm the legitimate right of States to acquire technology and to affirm that any standards that are adopted are non-discriminatory, multilaterally negotiated and universally acceptable.

The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.15, on the issue of fissile materials, has been carefully formulated by its principal sponsor, Canada, and we appreciate the thought that has gone into the drafting of this text. We must, however, draw attention to the fact that in certain paragraphs, especially in the preamble to the draft resolution, there are certain provisions which tend to endorse the view that the proposed treaty on fissile materials would only apply to a prohibition of the future production of fissile materials and would not cover stockpiles. It is the well-known position of my delegation and of a number of delegations, including those that are members of the Conference on Disarmament, that in order for the treaty to make a contribution to nuclear disarmament and to nuclear non-proliferation, it should prohibit both the production of fissile materials and provide for the progressive reduction and eventual elimination of stockpiles of fissile materials that are held at grossly unequal levels by the nuclear-weapon States and by other States.

We have therefore suggested to the sponsors of this draft resolution certain minor changes to ensure that the provisions of the draft resolution do not prejudice the views of either side of this argument regarding the future production and stockpiles. It is therefore our hope that the

sponsors of the draft resolution will find it possible to accept our reasonable proposals, which do not prejudice their own positions on this issue. In case this is not possible, my delegation will be obliged to consider submitting amendments to safeguard our position with regard to the scope of the treaty on fissile materials.

**Mr. Dembinski** (Poland): My delegation joins the other delegations in welcoming the intention and desire of Turkmenistan to become a permanently neutral State. This sovereign step on the part of the Government of Turkmenistan deserves, in our view, the full support and encouragement of the international community. Like many other speakers, Poland commends draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 and supports the calls for its approval by consensus.

**Mr. Yarka** (Papua New Guinea): With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few comments in response to some comments made at the 14th meeting regarding the draft resolution on nuclear testing. After hearing the statements made at that meeting by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom in defence of the nuclear testing by France in the South Pacific, I am compelled to make some comments on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, on nuclear testing.

Before I do so, however, I should like to place on record my delegation's full support for the explanatory comments made at the 14th meeting by the representatives of Australia and Mexico, both of whom put into clear perspective some misleading views and apprehensions held by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom.

My delegation found it hard to accept the comments — particularly those of the delegation of the United Kingdom — when the countries of the South Pacific, and also other members of the international community, have commended and acknowledged the leadership role of the British Government in its unilateral moratoriums on nuclear testing.

I wish to inform the Committee that many of the South Pacific countries, including Papua New Guinea, will, at the current Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, bring this nuclear-testing issue to be discussed at the level of Heads of Government. Both the representative of France and the representative of the United Kingdom, in their intervention in response to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, referred to earlier statements by sponsors and supporters as being reflections of emotions and polemic sentiments, with distorted and no factual information.

As far as the statement my delegation made that morning is concerned — and here I would say that I am speaking also for the other delegations that made statements — we considered the statements to be factual and to truly reflect current global public opinion against nuclear testing, both in the South Pacific and elsewhere.

Can we deny that there is a global outcry or that there is no demand for an immediate cessation of nuclear testing? Is what is happening in the South Pacific not “factual”? Or are we to assume that it might happen some day in the future? If the representatives of France and the United Kingdom believe that these events are distorted and not factual, what other realities and evidence do they seek?

We maintain our position that, during the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the nuclear-weapon States did make undertakings that they would not violate the trust and confidence placed in the non-proliferation regime by the international community, but that they would work towards further efforts that would enhance the global search for lasting peace and security.

The testing of nuclear weapons by France and China does violate the confidence and trust that we had all placed in the nuclear-weapon States.

The remark by the representative of France that France has a right to conduct nuclear testing is flimsy. Here I wish to reiterate my country's view that testing is now a backward step in view of the current international climate, for we believe that such an action can only perpetuate the threat to international peace and security.

Furthermore, the representatives of France and the United Kingdom described some of our statements as emotional and said they contained many polemic sentiments. I thought that every human being was allowed to exercise, in its place, some amount of emotion of one kind or another, the more so when it becomes apparent that one's life and environment are threatened by actions that are not of one's own making. Life is characterized by emotions, and if the representatives of France and the United Kingdom wish to claim that they do not have emotions, they must be of a unique and most peculiar type of human being.

Furthermore, if France wishes to conduct nuclear testing, we stand by our words that it should do so in metropolitan France and not in our region. France has no

right whatsoever to threaten the life and environment of our region.

The Permanent Representative of the Marshall Islands, in his statement on Tuesday morning endorsing draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, described a very sad and moving experience, in which his people had to suffer the effects of nuclear testing conducted over many years. Perhaps representatives should have to live through such horrific experiences, because only then would they know what it means to be personally affected by these nuclear tests.

With reference to the statement by Australian disarmament ambassador Starr, we wish to place on record the fact that the Australian scientists to whom the French delegation referred did not say that nuclear tests by France were safe both for the people and for the environment. They did, however, indicate quite clearly that, because of lack of access to proper and adequate information, the Australian scientists were not in a position of authority to verify the extent of any damage there might have been to the lives of the people and to the environment.

Finally, we wish to reiterate our call to the international community to support this draft resolution, which, we believe, will further promote and enhance peace and prosperity throughout the world.

**Mr. Moradi** (Iran): The Islamic Republic of Iran enjoys friendly relations with the Government and people of Turkmenistan, and both Turkmenistan and Iran, which are located in an important region, are committed to the promotion of regional and international peace and security.

In that context, we attach great importance to the recent initiative of the Government of Turkmenistan in submitting draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, entitled "Permanent neutrality of Turkmenistan". As a sponsor of the draft resolution, we hope that it will be adopted by consensus and enjoy the support of all Member States.

### **Organization of work**

**The Chairman:** There being no further speakers, I wish to make the following announcement.

As representatives may recall, at our informal organizational meeting I stated that a paper containing a list of draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items, arranged in appropriate clusters, would be prepared and distributed to the Committee.

After conducting intensive consultations with the officers of the Committee, I am now in a position to put forward to the Committee, for its consideration and approval, a paper presenting the programme suggested by the officers of the Committee listing all draft resolutions in 11 different clusters. The text is being circulated to the Committee now.

These clusters, as members are all well aware, were devised by the officers on the basis of the pattern that has evolved in the course of the past several years. In the process of grouping the various draft resolutions, the officers of the Committee took into account the most logical and practical criteria available, and made every effort to group them by related subject-matter, taking into account the thematic approach adopted for disarmament and international security agenda items.

I should like to emphasize that no other significance should be attached to this endeavour than the desire to facilitate and expedite the work of the Committee with a view to enabling the Committee to use its time, and the conference services available, effectively and fully during this phase of its work.

Regarding the Committee's programme of work and timetable for action on draft resolutions, it is my intention, on the basis of past practice, to move if possible from one cluster to another cluster sequentially after the conclusion of action on each cluster. In this connection I should like to indicate that a desirable degree of flexibility will be maintained in order to ensure the most effective utilization of the time and conference services available for that stage of the work of the Committee.

I shall give a precise indication, whenever possible, of the days on which any particular cluster will be taken up and I shall inform the Committee accordingly.

The procedure during the decision-taking stage on each individual cluster will be as follows: first, delegations will be given an opportunity to make any introduction, or statements other than in explanation of vote or decision, which they consider to be necessary with respect to the draft resolutions contained or listed in the cluster.

Subsequently, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any or all of the draft resolutions contained in a particular cluster before a decision is taken will be able to do so. Then, after the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions contained in a given

cluster, the opportunity will be given to those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote after the decision.

I urge delegations, if possible, to make one statement on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, whether in explanation of position or of vote. This certainly will enable the Chair to conduct the proceedings of the Committee in a systematic and efficient manner.

If delegations have had time to look through the document, may I take it that the Committee accepts the paper prepared by the officers of the Committee and is in agreement with the programme of work and the procedure that I have just outlined?

I call on the representative of Japan.

**Mr. Yamamoto (Japan):** I seek clarification on cluster 11, which includes draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7. My delegation had informally asked for A/C.1/50/L.7 to be included in cluster 3 because of our understanding that there are no programme budget implications on this draft resolution.

**The Chairman:** After the decision I want to call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement in regard to the clusters, and specifically cluster 11.

If I hear no objection, may I take it that the Committee agrees with the procedure that I have just outlined?

*It was so decided.*

**The Chairman:** I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

**Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee):** As you, Sir, said my statement refers exclusively at this stage to the question related to programme budget implications and/or financial statements that may be required in pursuance of rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

I wish to point out that whereas every effort has been made to present as accurate a picture as possible with respect to the programme budget implications, nevertheless it must be kept in mind that when the substantive secretariat prepared this, in consultation with, and with the consent of, the Bureau of the Committee, it was done within a very short period of time, especially given the fact that the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions was extended. In that connection it will be recalled that on an earlier occasion I said that certain difficulties could be

experienced because of the extension of the deadline. This is one instance where we are beginning to feel the “crunch”, if I may say so.

Every effort has been made to look through the draft resolutions to ascertain whether or not any particular draft resolution and/or decision might or might not have a programme budget implication or require what we call a financial statement by the Secretary of the First Committee.

I should point out that, given the paucity of time, to which I referred, it is still necessary for various relevant units of the Secretariat, including the Budget Division, to go through every draft resolution that has been submitted with a fine-tooth comb to ascertain whether or not there are programme budget implications.

In the meantime, although we have grouped a number of draft resolutions under cluster 11 as “Draft resolutions entailing programme budget implications”, I must underline the fact that further consideration is being given to this at this moment by the Secretariat and some reshuffling may or may not be necessary. We will then proceed accordingly.

**The Chairman:** The Secretary’s statement clarifies a number of matters. When the programme budget implications are ready, the draft resolutions in cluster 11 will be placed in the appropriate clusters.

The suggestion I now make is that the Committee will proceed to the stage of taking action on all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items tomorrow. The following draft resolutions will be taken up tomorrow, Friday, 10 November: in cluster 1 - draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.5, A/C.1/50/L.6, A/C.1/50/L.32 and A/C.1/50/L.47. If there are no comments on cluster 1, I shall move on to cluster 2.

In cluster 2 the Chair proposes to take action on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.22. Are there any comments on cluster 2?

I call on the representative of Egypt.

**Mr. Karem (Egypt):** I apologize for returning to cluster 1, but things are happening somewhat quickly. You, Sir, mentioned that the Committee would make a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.6 tomorrow morning. That particular draft resolution deals with the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It was my understanding that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10 on agenda item 66, which also deals with another zone in a different part of the world,



could also be put to a vote. The reason is twofold. First, this has traditionally been a consensus resolution, enjoying the support of the Committee from 1974 and particularly through consensus from 1980 until now. Secondly, the draft resolution this year is identical to the resolution presented last year. I hope therefore that it will be possible to put draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10 to a vote tomorrow.

**The Chairman:** I should inform the representative of Egypt that the Chair received a specific request from some delegations to defer the voting action on this particular draft resolution until next week. We are obliging delegations which have made such requests.

**Mr. Karem** (Egypt): I did not hear you clearly. Did you mention "some delegations" in the plural? Would you please clarify.

**The Chairman:** This could be one delegation or several delegations.

Are there any other comments? If not, may we move to cluster 3, where the Chair suggests taking action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34. Are there any comments on cluster 3? If not, may we move to cluster 4. In cluster 4 the Committee will take action, *inter alia*, on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40. Are there any comments?

I call on the representative of Iran.

**Mr. Moradi** (Islamic Republic of Iran): I apologize for coming back to cluster 3, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34. Is it possible to defer a decision on that draft resolution until next week because it is under consideration by some delegations?

**The Chairman:** If the delegation of Iran makes such a request, the Chair will certainly oblige that delegation. The Committee will therefore defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 until next week.

We shall now move on to cluster 6, which contains only one draft resolution, A/C.1/50/L.33. Are there any comments?

May we now move on to cluster 7. The Chair proposes to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.4, A/C.1/50/L.21 and A/C.1/50/L.28. Are there any comments? If there are no comments, I shall take it that is so agreed.

Let us move on now to cluster 8. The Chair proposes to take action on draft decision A/C.1/50/L.2, and on draft

resolutions A/C.1/50/L.11, A/C.1/50/L.16, A/C.1/50/L.26 and A/C.1/50/L.27. Are there any comments on cluster 8? As I see none, it is so agreed.

Let us move on now to cluster 10 where the Chair proposes to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9, draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30 and draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.36/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.43. Are there any comments on cluster 10?

I call on the representative of Ireland.

**Mr. O'Rourke** (Ireland): I should like to come back if I may to cluster 7, where you proposed action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21, entitled "Expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament". When this text was introduced by the representative of South Africa he proposed the addition of a new operative paragraph 7. We have not yet seen this new text so I wonder whether it is ready for action tomorrow. I suggest that it should be deferred until we see the revised text.

**The Chairman:** May I call on the representative of South Africa to clarify this point.

**Mr. Goosen** (South Africa): The amendment to which the representative of Ireland is referring was handed in to the Secretariat this afternoon with a request that a revised text of the draft resolution should be issued. If the representative of Ireland wishes to wait until that revision has been issued we can by all means defer action until the early part of next week. That would not be difficult. As agreed with the representative of Ireland, that amendment, which was included in our statement yesterday, was submitted to the Secretariat this morning.

**The Chairman:** In that case, since the document will be out only tomorrow, it would be wise to defer the decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1 to next week.

**Mr. Berdennikov** (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like to refer to the draft decision in document A/C.1/50/L.30, in cluster 10, for a moment. As I understand it, consultations are still under way and it is quite possible that there may be a revised draft — A/C.1/50/L.30/Rev.1. In that connection, could the Committee perhaps defer action on that draft decision?

**The Chairman:** Of course, if the consultations on draft decision A/C.1/50/L.30 are still going on, I will defer action on it to next week.

**Mr. Calovski** (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): We would also prefer to act on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43 next week.

**The Chairman:** That will be done accordingly.

**Mr. Karem** (Egypt): We have had consultations with our colleagues and friends in the Secretariat on our own draft resolution, A/C.1/50/L.10, in cluster 1. I know that you, Sir, would like to end this meeting, but we would also like to end it on a positive note.

It is my understanding, that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10 is an entity in itself. By an "entity in itself", we mean that there is no linkage, in our view, with any other items, as we see it in the agenda of the First Committee. This is a resolution, as I explained earlier, that has been adopted by consensus by the First Committee from 1980 until now. As far as we are concerned, we have received to date no request for amendments on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10. We are not conducting consultations with any particular delegation because we have exhausted all the consultations with all interested parties, which have approved the draft text as it stands.

If a particular delegation or a few delegations or a group of delegations would like to delay action, then we would like to hear the request for deferment of action from them. But as far as we are concerned, we think that, since we are going to take a decision on respective nuclear-weapon-free zones tomorrow, we would like to see our own draft resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East also put before this Committee for consideration tomorrow.

**The Chairman:** If I have to call on each and every delegation as to why action on a particular draft resolution should be deferred, then I do not believe that we will be able to finish our work this afternoon.

I have been approached specifically with a request to defer the action on this draft resolution to next week. I am aware that no consultations on the draft resolution are being conducted, but I understand that some delegations may want to have instructions from their capitals on that particular draft resolution. From that point of view, I do not see any reason not to defer the action on this draft resolution to next week. I hope that the representative of Egypt will take note of this and abide by this.

**Mr. King** (United States of America): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 in cluster 10, my delegation

would like to defer action until further consideration of the legal matters involved can be finalized.

**The Chairman:** Action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.9 will thus be deferred to next week.

**Mr. Karem** (Egypt): You have addressed most of my concerns, Sir, except for one. Having proposed that we take action on that draft resolution tomorrow, if a group of delegations or a single delegation have a different view, we should perhaps resort to the rules of procedure of the First Committee. In that case, there should be a procedural motion in accordance with the rules of procedure to which I referred. That is the one outstanding point that I would like to see addressed.

**Ms. Ghose** (India): On another subject: I assume from your recapitulation, Sir, that you do not intend to take up any of the draft resolutions in cluster 11. I would therefore like to make a small clarification.

You described very clearly the way in which you would be conducting the action tomorrow. You said that you would encourage us to make one statement for every given cluster. We would like very much to abide by your instructions. However, since you and your Bureau, in which we have the greatest faith, have selected certain draft resolutions from outside the clusters, there may be occasions when delegations may have to make more than one statement.

I am just stating this to help you to get this over with, not because we want to make extra statements but because it may be necessitated by the fact that you have selectively taken some draft resolutions from a cluster. I am not quite sure on what basis this has been done, but we are willing to abide by your judgement and that of the Bureau. This would, however, entail some of us having to make more than one statement per cluster.

**The Chairman:** When we talk about clusters, I would wish delegations to make their statements or explanations of vote before and after — and if possible only once — on a given cluster and on those draft resolutions that are being specifically discussed within the cluster. Of course, if delegations wish to, or have to, make more than one statement, they are welcome to do that. But in order to save time and move faster in our proceedings, that was the procedure that the Bureau has come up with.

As far as cluster 11 is concerned, these are issues that have, or may have specifically financial implications. After

financial implications have been determined and clarified, the draft resolutions will be moved from that cluster into the appropriate clusters. The decision will be taken on those draft resolutions at an appropriate time.

**Mr. Etucket** (Uganda): My specific comment relates to cluster 11. My delegation notes the statement you made, Sir, with regard to the treatment of draft resolutions in cluster 11. We also note the statement made by the Secretariat with regard to this cluster.

My delegation wishes at this stage to appeal to the Secretariat to give, at the earliest possible time next week, at least an indication of the status of the programme budget implications for some or most of these draft resolutions. My delegation understandably attaches a lot of importance to many of these draft resolutions and would wish the Committee to act on them as soon as possible.

**The Chairman:** I fully share the views expressed by the representative of Uganda and the Secretariat is certainly doing everything possible in order to have all the necessary documentation in time.

**Mr. Karem** (Egypt): The delegation of Egypt put a question to you, Sir, and we are awaiting your response to it. Since we have so far not received your response, may I draw your attention to the following.

You have circulated a paper giving your suggested programme and we have approved the suggestions it contains. You have also suggested that tomorrow — and I will take only the first page of that paper — a vote be taken on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.5, A/C.1/50/L.6 and A/C.1/50/L.32. Draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.5 and A/C.1/50/L.6 deal with the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in densely populated areas. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.32 deals with — and this is no interpretation — the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in an unpopulated area. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10, as far as we understand, deals with the same subject, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone without regard to its being in a densely or non-densely populated area.

We think that there is a great deal of logic and wisdom in putting these four draft resolutions to a vote tomorrow. If we are speaking of clusters, I do not see a more vivid explanation of a cluster than that: four draft resolutions dealing with the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

If a group of countries believes that it is important to defer, then we would like to see that in a procedural motion tomorrow, when draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10 is put to a vote. At that moment in history, we should like to listen to a particular group or one delegation requesting a deferment of vote. I say that in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. That is why, I repeat, we insist that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.10 be put before this Committee tomorrow for consideration.

**The Chairman:** May I ask to what specific rule the representative of Egypt is referring?

**Mr. Karem** (Egypt): Let me answer the question with a question. On what rule are you basing your deferment?

**The Chairman:** I am ready to reply to that. If there are requests on the part of delegations to defer certain draft resolutions upon which they are not ready to act, I am ready to defer them, whichever draft resolutions they may be. I am not singling out any draft resolution in this sense.

We have clusters. Within the clusters we have different items, different themes and different questions. I do not believe that tying one draft resolution to another would be a logical thing, although what the representative of Egypt is saying is also logical. But there are many illogical things in our logical-illogical world.

I hope that the representative of Egypt will go along with my suggestion. I received a specific request on the part of a delegation or delegations to defer action on this draft resolution to next week and I do not want to change my mind on this one because I am treating each and every delegation on the same footing. I hope that the delegation of Egypt will be able to accept that.

**Mr. Karem** (Egypt): It is not traditional at all for the delegation of Egypt — which has presided over this Committee before and held the post of Rapporteur of this Committee many times — to challenge the Bureau. That is not at all our intention. I have personally worked in this Committee for six sessions of the General Assembly and I am lucky to have come here every year for the past four years.

However, may I just say that, in the light of what I have just said, we do not see these as clusters at all. If these are genuine clusters, then A/C.1/50/L.10 should be put to a vote tomorrow. Having said that, may I again repeat that we shall not challenge the Chairman of this Committee.

**The Chairman:** I thank the representative of Egypt for his understanding. This is my twenty-third session and I too have been working in this Committee for many years. I was also Rapporteur of this Committee in 1983.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Kheradi** (Secretary of the Committee): This is certainly not a statement concerning the rules of procedure, you can rest assured. But in all seriousness, I just wish to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1: Jordan;

A/C.1/50/L.3: Costa Rica and Trinidad and Tobago;

A/C.1/50/L.7: Costa Rica;

A/C.1/50/L.8: Mauritius, Senegal and the United Republic of Tanzania;

A/C.1/50/L.9: the Czech Republic;

A/C.1/50/L.13: Ecuador;

A/C.1/50/L.16: Jordan and South Africa;

A/C.1/50/L.24: Bangladesh and Trinidad and Tobago;  
A/C.1/50/L.29: Belize;

A/C.1/50/L.34: Jordan;

A/C.1/50/L.35: Kazakhstan;

A/C.1/50/L.36: the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;

A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40: the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia;

A/C.1/50/L.42: Kazakhstan and Monaco;

A/C.1/50/L.43: Bulgaria; and

A/C.1/50/L.45: Mauritius, Monaco and Senegal.

*The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.*