



General Assembly

Fifty-fourth Session

First Committee

21st Meeting

Monday, 1 November 1999, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chairman: Mr. González (Chile)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda items 64, 65 and 67 to 85 (continued)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): As I informed members of the Committee this morning, we will take decisions on the draft resolutions that appear in Secretariat Informal Paper No. 2. I believe all members have copies. Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.29 from cluster 6 has been deferred once again.

Mr. Ibragimov (Uzbekistan): On behalf of five Central Asian States I should like to introduce the draft decision entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia", A/C.1/54/L.35. The Central Asian States consistently undertake measures aimed at the maintenance and strengthening of regional peace and security. Among those, we can attribute the initiative of announcing Central Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Up to the present day significant progress has been achieved in the realization of this process.

Since the adoption by consensus of General Assembly resolution 53/77 A on 4 December 1998, the Central Asian countries have conducted a number of intensive United Nations-sponsored meetings of experts from Central Asian countries on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in our region. As a result of those discussions we have managed to come very close to agreement on many aspects of a draft Central Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone treaty. Our countries have agreed to submit a draft decision that calls for the inclusion of a separate item entitled

"Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia" in the provisional agenda of the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

On behalf of all countries of our region, allow me to express our sincere hope that the draft will have the support of all countries and will be adopted by consensus during the current session.

Mr. Forquenot de la Forte (France) (*spoke in French*): I should like briefly to introduce the draft decision submitted by France entitled "Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters", document A/C.1/54/L.28. France was approached by the United Nations Secretariat with a view to proposing to the General Assembly an endorsement of the recommendations of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters at its last working sessions in Geneva and New York, held respectively in January and June 1999 under the chairmanship of Ms. Thérèse Delpech, and endorsed again by the Secretary-General in his report dated 12 August 1999, document A/54/218.

Inasmuch as the French expert in the Advisory Board has presided over the work which led to those recommendations, France agreed to the request, which pertains to a purely procedural decision, while recalling, of course, that the experts appointed by the Secretary-General to sit on the Advisory Board are acting on their own behalf and not as representatives of their countries.

The recommendations involved here are to change the language in the mandate of the Board so as to bring it into closer conformity with its actual functions as they have been performed for more than a decade. If the First

Committee and the General Assembly agree to this, the mandate of the Advisory Board would henceforth be

“(a) To advise the Secretary-General on matters within the area of arms limitation and disarmament, including on studies and research under the auspices of the United Nations or institutions within the United Nations system”.

The other functions of the Advisory Board under the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research and the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme would remain unchanged.

Since this draft decision is essentially procedural in nature, France has not asked for any co-sponsorship and hopes that the text will be adopted without a vote.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those delegations who wish to make general comments on draft resolutions in cluster 4.

Mr. Al-Albuge (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): I have two comments. The first concerns draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.22, entitled “Prevention of an arms race in outer space”. At a time when the international community is making efforts to coordinate activities aimed at the exploration of outer space and to consecrate its use for purely peaceful purposes, we are concerned at the steps taken by the United States of America towards the militarization of outer space. Among them is what has been declared by the United States National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) with regard to the project “Vision for 2020”, which has extended the scope of the American military in outer space by conducting tests of anti-satellite laser weapons, using laser beams to dislodge satellites from their planned orbits.

In addition to developing anti-ballistic missiles the American plans, if executed, would violate the Outer Space Treaty, to which the United States itself acceded in 1967, which stipulated that the exploration and use of outer space would be for all mankind. The Treaty also stipulated that outer space should be used by all States parties to the Treaty for purely peaceful purposes. We hope that the American delegate will ensure the safeguards for Member States by making sure that his country does not continue implementing the Vision 2020 project, which is aimed at the militarization of outer space.

Secondly, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.26, on the prohibition of the development and

manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, spent uranium, depleted uranium, is considered one of these types. We hope in the near future that it will be understood as such so that it can be prohibited from being used for military purposes. Such use had led to an environmental disaster in Iraq, as the United States and Britain used it in their act of aggression against Iraq in 1991.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Does any delegation wish to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.44 before we take action?

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.44, entitled “Illicit traffic in small arms”, was introduced by the representative of South Africa at the 18th meeting, on 28 October. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/54/INF.2, the following countries have also become sponsors: Bolivia, Canada, El Salvador, Haiti, Jamaica and Venezuela.

Mr. Kambire (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): I should like to add Burkina Faso to the list of sponsors.

Mr. Kerpens (Suriname): Suriname would also like to add its name to the list of sponsors of this draft resolution.

Mr. Pappalardo (Paraguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): Paraguay would also like to be added to the list of sponsors.

Mr. Fofana (Mali) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Mali wishes to become a sponsor of draft resolution L.44.

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

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.44 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to explain my Government’s position on draft resolution L.44. This resolution deals with one of the topics that is receiving priority attention from Member States right

now. Cuba supports the broadest possible debate on issues relating to the illicit trade in weapons, including small arms and light weapons, but we consider that in discussing the topic and adopting concrete measures we must take into consideration and respect the peculiar features of each region and country concerned.

My country's support for draft resolution L.44 does not prejudice Cuba's position on the Inter-American Convention against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials. We are very gratified to see that it is welcomed in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. Negotiations on the Convention were held within the context of the Organization of American States (OAS), so Cuba did not participate directly in them and therefore cannot fully commit itself to its outcomes. Furthermore, the Convention is open for signature only to members of the OAS, to which Cuba does not belong, for reasons that are familiar to all.

As regards the information that the Secretary-General is asked in operative paragraph 1 to submit to the international conference on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, Cuba does not object to the wording therein on the understanding that this does not in any way diminish the part which we believe should be played by the preparatory committee of the international conference. We reiterate our position to the effect that in the final analysis it will be up to the preparatory committee to take responsibility for the final decisions on the documents that must be sent in advance to the international conference.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Does any delegation wish to make a general statement on any or all of the draft resolutions contained in cluster 5? There seem to be none.

I now call on those members of the Committee who wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/54/L.37.

Ms. Kunadi (India): In 1993 the Disarmament Commission adopted consensus guidelines on regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security. Therefore, we are not convinced that draft resolution L.37 — in particular operative paragraph 2, which calls on the Conference on Disarmament, a forum for negotiation of disarmament instruments of global application, “to consider the formulation of principles that

can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control” — has any productive value.

A reference is made in the sixth preambular paragraph to conventional arms control in South Asia. India has security concerns that cannot be confined to what is referred to as “South Asia”. India has been committed to a composite bilateral dialogue with Pakistan, the main sponsor of this draft resolution, the first agenda item of which is peace and security, including confidence-building measures. The narrow definition in the draft resolution does not fully reflect the security concerns in South Asia and adopts an approach far more restrictive than the one on which the composite bilateral dialogue is based.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution L.37. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.37, entitled “Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels”, was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 19th meeting, on 29 October. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/54/INF.2.

In this connection, the representative of Norway has informed the Secretariat that Norway has withdrawn its sponsorship of L.37. Italy has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of),

Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia.

Against:

India.

Abstaining:

Benin, Bhutan.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.37 was adopted by 133 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Guinea informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Kambire (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): I was distracted during the voting and would like Burkina Faso's vote to be recorded as in favour.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We shall proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.38. Are there delegations who wish to explain their position before a decision is taken? There being none, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.38, entitled "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 18th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors are listed in the document itself and in document A/C.1/54/INF.2.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be

adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.38 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions in cluster 6. I call upon those delegations wishing to make general statements on the set of draft resolutions contained in cluster 6.

Mr. Al-Albuge (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to speak on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/54/L.29, entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification".

The international conventions in the field of disarmament and United Nations documentation — including the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification", document A/50/377 — show that verification is a process in which data are collected and then organized and analysed so as to reach a conclusion based on documented information on the compliance of a party with its obligations. United Nations documentation has confirmed also that effective verification could take place without affecting confidential national matters and that it is necessary to protect, in particular, the sensitive information and facilities of States. It is also important to steer away from any abuse in the field of verification so that it would not be used for other purposes.

However, the experience of the previous Special Commission in Iraq was in violation of all these concepts. The following are some examples of this.

First, the verification concept adopted by the previous Special Commission made it an issue totally different and separate from inspection. There were many exaggerations in the different aspects of verification. It was also used in an arbitrary fashion that was aimed at finding some relationship between the verification sources and the allegations of the Commission.

Secondly, the previous Special Commission used the verification process as a cover to implement its own policies in particular, and also the policies of one or two States that are known to be enemies of Iraq. The objective of that policy is to make the Special Commission a cover for continuing to impose sanctions on Iraq and continuing also the different false allegations for the ongoing aggression, as happened on 16 December 1998.

Thirdly, the United States has not denied the fact that the previous Special Commission inspectors who were American or British citizens carried out intelligence activities through exchanging visits and information among the American, British and Israeli intelligence services. It also implanted spying devices to monitor the movements of Iraqi officials and their communications.

The Secretary-General has not denied the accusations aimed at the previous Special Commission. During an interview with the British Broadcasting Corporation on 27 June 1999 he said that the accusations of spying for the United States, directed at the inspectors of the Special Commission, were partially true. At the same time we did not find any denial by any American official of these accusations aimed at the Special Commission.

Fourthly, the investigations carried out by the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) in the Special Commission's laboratory in Baghdad revealed last July that the Commission's work in Iraq was not professional and that international procedures in the field of verification were not adopted. There was no documentation of the work carried out in the laboratory, and the log book of the laboratory was also destroyed. The Special Commission had brought into Iraq samples of DX and did not declare its presence. It became clear that the objective was to leave some traces on Iraqi missiles.

Briefly, the behaviour of the previous Special Commission was quite detrimental to the credibility of the international Organization and to disarmament efforts, including the concept of verification. The United Nations has to start an investigation into these practices and impose disciplinary measures on those who are accused of negligence. Unfortunately, neither the Secretary-General's report nor the draft resolution that we have before us has referred to these serious deviations from the work of the United Nations and the fact that it did not abide by these objectives, and there is now a need to correct any shortcomings.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): When I was making some general comments on draft resolutions in this cluster I said that the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.29 had been deferred. The Committee will not be voting on that draft resolution today. Does any other delegation wish to make a general statement on draft resolutions in cluster 6?

The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.13. Do any delegations wish to

explain their position or vote before action is taken on L.13?

There being none, the Committee will now proceed. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.13, entitled "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament and non-proliferation agreements", was introduced by the representative of the United States at the 16th meeting, on 26 October. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution itself.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.13 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.13 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call upon the representative of the People's Republic of China to explain his position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): China joined in the consensus on draft resolution L.13, on compliance with arms limitation and disarmament and non-proliferation agreements. Strict compliance with various disarmament agreements is of crucial importance to promoting disarmament and maintaining results in that field. For that reason China has always supported the draft resolution on this topic presented by the United States and other countries since 1985.

Today, this item is of even greater significance than ever before. However, regrettably, we have noted the approach that on the one hand advocates the significance of compliance with disarmament agreements while, on the other hand, taking a negative attitude towards draft resolution L.1, on preservation of and compliance with the ABM Treaty.

We hope that the main sponsor of this draft resolution will match its words with its deeds and effectively implement and comply with the legal obligations that it has undertaken, not to have double standards, not to jeopardize the interests of others in seeking its own interests, or take a utilitarian attitude towards the agreements, conventions and treaties in the field of disarmament and arms control. This would otherwise jeopardize the basis of the existing arms control and disarmament efforts and hinder the disarmament process. We hope that compliance with arms

limitation, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements, including compliance with the ABM Treaty, will receive the unanimous support of all Member States of the United Nations next year.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.27. Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken? There being none, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.27, entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 16th meeting, on 26 October. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/54/INF.2. In addition, Haiti has become a sponsor.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.27 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.27 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

There being none, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39. I call on those representatives who wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken.

Mr. Al-Hariri (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution L.39, entitled "Transparency in armaments". My delegation fully supports the international trend towards the establishment of an international community free from the use of force or the threat of force, an international community in which the principles of justice, equality and peace prevail. We reaffirm our readiness to participate in any international attempt in good faith to achieve that objective.

Nevertheless, we wish to draw attention to the fact that this draft resolution does not take into account the special situation in the Middle East. In the Middle East the Arab-Israeli conflict continues to rage because of Israel's ongoing occupation of the Arab territories, in addition to its

continuing refusal to implement the relevant Security Council resolutions. Also, Israel continues to acquire the most lethal, destructive and sophisticated weapons it is capable of manufacturing and stores them domestically. Therefore, transparency in the field of Israeli armaments applies only to a very small part of its huge military arsenal, particularly nuclear weapons. My delegation will therefore abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

Mr. Khairat (Egypt): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39, entitled "Transparency in armaments", I wish to explain my delegation's vote.

Since the adoption of the General Assembly resolution 46/36 L in 1991, which established the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, Egypt has faithfully advocated the principle of transparency in military matters. Egypt has been supportive of the objective underlying the establishment of the Register. From 1991 to 1993, Egypt lent its support to the annual General Assembly resolutions on transparency in armaments, which were adopted without a vote. However, Egypt has abstained in the vote since 1994, when the Group of Experts was unable to reach any agreement on related aspects of the further development of the Register.

For the Register to attain its objectives as a truly significant confidence-building measure, capable of eliminating suspicion and misperception and thereby contributing to enhancing security and stability, in our view it should be based on the following requirements. First, it should be a universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory confidence-building measure. Secondly, it should ensure equal rights and obligations for all States. Thirdly, it should address the legitimate security concerns of all States. And fourthly, it should provide the broadest degree of transparency in all fields of armaments in a non-selective manner.

The United Nations Register in its present form may meet the security concerns of certain States, but it does not adequately meet those of Egypt. Only an expanded Register that provides a comprehensive picture and covers in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner the overall military capabilities of States can serve the cause of transparency in armaments. Therefore, we cannot help but conclude that other countries do not share our enthusiasm and wish to limit the transparency exercise to certain categories of conventional arms, namely those which currently make up the Register. Such an approach is not consistent with agreements reached in 1991 in the General Assembly regarding the early expansion of the Register's scope. It is

also discriminatory insofar as it requires those States which possess little more than the seven categories listed in the Register to report on virtually everything their armed forces own, while other States with more advanced military capabilities are not required to apply transparency to all the armaments and weapons systems in their possession, especially weapons of mass destruction.

Finally, we are emphasizing that we are unimpressed by the prospects of the possible eventual development of the Register in terms of expansion of its scope. Such prospects seem remote in view of the apparent lack of potential will by the international community to faithfully embrace the principles and objectives of transparency or apply them in a comprehensive, non-discriminatory and equitable manner.

For these reasons, my delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation participates in the United Nations Register and is up to date as regards the information that must be provided in that respect.

Operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39

“Invites the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work undertaken in the field of transparency in armaments”.

First, the Conference on Disarmament has not undertaken any work at all this year. Furthermore, it is the position of the Group of 21 of the Conference on Disarmament that the ad hoc committee on transparency that functioned some years ago completed its mandate. In subsequent years there has been a special coordinator who has consulted countries about the manner in which transparency in armaments in the Conference on Disarmament could be pursued, but no work has been undertaken. Paragraph 6 therefore does not reflect a reality, and my delegation will be abstaining on this vote.

Mr. Al-Ahmed (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia reiterates its full support for transparency in armaments as one of the measures that has contributed to strengthening international peace and security. My country believes that for any mechanism to succeed in achieving transparency it must be inspired by clear and basic principles, that is, it must be balanced, comprehensive and non-discriminatory. It must enhance national security as well as regional and

international security for all States in accordance with international law.

The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is a first attempt by the international community to deal with the question of transparency at a global level. Despite the fact that the possible value of the Register as a global confidence-building measure and as a mechanism for early warning is very clear, the Register has faced a number of notable problems, such as the fact that about half of the Members of the United Nations have consistently refrained from providing information to it. That makes it necessary for us to reiterate the need to take into account the fears and apprehensions of those States in an effective manner and in a manner that would ensure universal participation in the Register.

My country wishes to reaffirm the statement made in the reply from the States members of the League of Arab States to the United Nations Secretary-General regarding his report in document A/52/312 of 28 August 1997 on the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. That reply made it clear that an expanded Register as provided for in the founding resolution 46/36 L — to contain information on conventional weapons as well as weapons of mass destruction, in particular nuclear weapons, and on advanced technology with military applications — would constitute a more balanced and comprehensive and less discriminatory tool that would attract a much larger number of participants.

My country will therefore abstain in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. Babaa (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation will also abstain in the vote on the draft resolution before the Committee for the same reasons expressed by the representatives of the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Syrian Arab Republic and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Of course we support transparency in armaments, but we are also aware that in our Arab region there is a hostile entity that is armed to the teeth, even with weapons of mass destruction, and is developing new, completely unknown weapons, as we read in the *Sunday Times*, genetic weapons that kill a certain ethnicity in a certain race. That is information we could not obtain from that Register. Therefore, my delegation regrets that it will have to abstain.

Mr. Al-Ghanim (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution L.39, entitled “Transparency in armaments”. The delegation

of Kuwait deems it important to expand the scope of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms so as to include weapons of mass destruction. Therefore, my delegation seconds what was stated by the representatives of Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Libya and will abstain.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): As no other delegation wishes to explain its position, we will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39. A recorded vote has been requested. Separate votes have also been requested on operative paragraphs 4 (b) and 6.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of the Netherlands at the 17th meeting, on 27 October. The sponsors are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/54/INF.2. In addition, the following countries have also become sponsors of the draft resolution: Cape Verde, El Salvador, Haiti, Jamaica, Uzbekistan, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The Committee will now proceed to vote on operative paragraph 4(b) of draft resolution L.39.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain,

Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Mexico, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 4(b) was retained by 121 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution L.39. I call on the Secretary.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution L.39.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia,

Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen.

Operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39 was retained by 120 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39 as a whole. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution L.39 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru,

Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Algeria, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syrian Arab Republic.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39 as a whole was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 13 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Guyana informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I call now on those representatives who wish to explain their positions or votes.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I should like to make a statement on the position of the Chinese delegation after the vote on this draft resolution. The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is a transparency measure among sovereign States concerning the illegal transfer of arms. This has been specified by General Assembly resolution 46/36 L.

Regrettably, a certain country, in total disregard of the provisions of that resolution, in the four years since 1996 has registered its arms sales to the Taiwan province of the People's Republic of China with the United Nations by way of a footnote in the Register. Arms sales to Taiwan not only violate Chinese sovereignty but seriously interfere in the internal affairs of China. It is obviously not an arms transfer among sovereign States. To register arms sales to Taiwan in the United Nations Register has changed the special nature of the Register, namely the Register among and between sovereign States, and has politicized the Register. Therefore, China has been compelled to suspend its participation in the Register.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.39 calls upon Member States to provide the Secretary-General the requested data and information for the Register. When a certain country has not redressed its erroneous behaviour, and when the seriousness of the Register has not been maintained, China obviously cannot provide the requested information for the Register.

In the meantime, concerning the repeated requests to the Secretary-General to set up a group of experts for the further development of the Register and the requests to the Conference on Disarmament to carry out its work in the field of transparency in armaments, the Chinese delegation still holds different opinions. In view of the above, the Chinese delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.39.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Because of the positive balance emerging from draft resolution L.39, we voted in favour of it once again. However, despite our favourable attitude to the text as a whole, we would once again like our reservations on paragraph 6 to be recorded.

As in the past, Cuba abstained when there was a vote on the paragraphs because we consider that the Conference on Disarmament has already completed its work on transparency. The decision to continue or not with consideration of this topic in the Conference is a decision to be made only by the Conference itself, taking into consideration the priorities established by the General Assembly in this field. That is why my delegation reserves the right, as appropriate, to reserve its position on this matter in the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. Shein (Myanmar): I should like to explain the position of my delegation on the draft resolution on transparency in armaments contained in document A/C.1/54/L.39. Myanmar believes that transparency in armaments can be a useful confidence-building measure provided that it is universal, non-discriminatory and on a voluntary basis. However, my delegation has difficulties with the main thrust and certain elements of draft resolution L.39. In particular, my delegation has reservations on paragraph 4 (b) and paragraph 6.

In paragraph 4 (b) the General Assembly calls for the convening of a meeting of a group of governmental experts in 2000 and calls upon the Secretary-General to prepare a report on the continuing operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its further development. We believe that it is still premature and unnecessary at this

juncture to further develop the Register. In view of the past track record of the group of governmental experts, we also have misgivings about the effectiveness and usefulness of holding another meeting of a group of governmental experts on this subject.

Moreover, my delegation does not see any urgent need for the Conference on Disarmament to take up the issue of transparency in armaments, as called for in paragraph 6, especially at a time when the Conference ought to be concentrating on banning fissile material, nuclear disarmament and other important issues. For that reason my delegation abstained in the voting on paragraphs 4 (b) and 6, and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Algeria has always defended the principle of transparency in armaments, a principle which it believes to be part of security- and confidence-building measures among States. The United Nations Register as it exists meets some of our concerns, but not in a totally satisfactory manner. It is necessary and urgent to increase the scope of the Register to other arms for it to be universal and non-discriminatory.

Our difficulties with paragraph 6, which invites the Conference on Disarmament to continue consideration of this issue, are known. We believe that this body has already considered this question. For all these reasons the delegation of Algeria abstained in the voting on operative paragraphs 4(b) and 6 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions in cluster 7.

I will now call upon those delegations wishing to make general statements on the draft resolutions — not on specific texts, but on the group of draft resolutions contained in this final cluster.

There being none, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.3. Would any delegation like to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken on L.3?

Mr. Al-Ahmed (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation wishes to join the list of sponsors of draft resolution L.3.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Does any other delegation wish to speak? There being none, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.3. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.3, entitled “Report of the Disarmament Commission”, was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 13th meeting, on 21 October. The sponsors — namely extended Bureau members only, as is the practice and tradition — are listed in the document.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution L.3 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.3 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.10. Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote before action is taken? There being none, I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.10, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa”, was introduced by the representative of Burkina Faso, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the 19th meeting, on 29 October.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution L.10 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.10 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

There appear to be none, so the Committee will now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.14. Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution?

Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh): Bangladesh wishes to withdraw its sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.14. Let me explain. As all are aware, Bangladesh has ardently and consistently supported the thrust of this draft resolution

and has always wished to see the key aspects of past agreements implemented. This would also intend to shift the activities of the Centre from New York to Kathmandu. It is our view, however, that the present language does not adequately reflect our sentiments forcefully enough. To that end we made more proposals. Bangladesh will vote for the draft resolution, but as the language stands at present we are no longer in a position to sponsor it.

Mr. Douangthongla (Lao People’s Democratic Republic): My delegation would like to join in sponsoring draft resolution L.14.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.14, entitled, “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”, was introduced by the representative of Nepal at the 18th meeting, on 28 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/54/INF.2. In this connection the representative of Bangladesh has just announced that Bangladesh has withdrawn as a sponsor. The following countries have also become sponsors: the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Uzbekistan.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.14 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.14 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Al-Hassan (Oman): Let me briefly state the following on behalf of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.14, entitled “United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific”.

Oman supports the draft resolution entirely, and we have been doing so in the past. We are happy to see it receiving the widest consensus in this Committee. However, we think the Centre’s actual and current functions should have a broader scope. We hope also that it will have greater coordination with the Member States it aims to serve and represent.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): There being no other delegations wishing to explain their positions, we will now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.16.

Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken? There appear to be none. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.16, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 17th meeting, on 27 October. Jamaica has joined the sponsors.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution L.16 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.16 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Does any delegation wish to explain its position on the draft resolution just adopted? There appear to be none.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.49. Does any delegation wish to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken? I call on the Secretary.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.49, entitled "United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of South Africa on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, at the 17th meeting, on 27 October.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution L.49 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.49 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted. There being none, the Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.51.

I shall now call on any delegation that wishes to explain its position or vote before a decision is taken. There being none, I call on the Secretary.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.51, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", was introduced by the representative of Peru on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States at the 19th meeting, on 29 October.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution L.51 have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/54/L.51 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted. I see none.

We have concluded today's consideration of the draft resolutions before the Committee. Shortly members will receive another informal paper listing the draft resolutions to be examined tomorrow.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): For tomorrow morning a list of draft resolutions for action tomorrow morning is being distributed, but I will read it out: cluster 8, draft resolutions A/C.1/54/L.4, L.32, L.45, L.46 and L.47; cluster 9, draft resolution L.20; and cluster 10, draft resolution L.15 and L.50.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I think the members of the Committee now have a fairly comprehensive idea of what we will be doing tomorrow. I should like to remind members that we will be meeting tomorrow at 10.30 a.m. sharp.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.