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- Urgent need for cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests and conclusion of a treaty designed to achieve a comprehensive test ban: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /29/ (continued)

- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 3079 (XXVIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General /30/ (continued)

- Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean /31/ (continued)

- World Disarmament Conference: report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference /32/ (continued)

- General and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament /33/ (continued)

- Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2286 (XXII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Tlatelolco) /34/ (continued)

- Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East /35/ (continued)

- Prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health /36/ (continued)

- Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia /37/ (continued)
AGENDA ITEMS 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 100, 101, 103, 107 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to announce that the delegations of Czechoslovakia and Portugal have become sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.692.

Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): It is my intention to speak on agenda item 107, "Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia". This is a proposal that is of very great concern to us, as it has a bearing on our own proposal, the establishment of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. There is a cognate item, item 101, on the agenda, "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", but I find that no draft resolution on that item has yet been submitted. I shall therefore confine myself to the two draft resolutions that have been submitted in regard to agenda item 107: the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681, submitted by India, and that in document A/C.1/L.682, presented by Pakistan. They were both submitted on the same date, but it appears to me that the Indian horse has won by a short head.

Although the item is inscribed as "Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia", it will be noticed from the contents of both draft resolutions before us that what is in contemplation is a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We consider it unfortunate that on a question on which there could be, and on which there is, no difference of opinion, namely, the desirability of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, a single draft resolution could not have been submitted. But a sharp difference of opinion exists in regard to the approach to the question.

We have examined the Indian draft resolution and, although we have no difficulty in supporting it, it has, in our opinion, one serious and, I should say, fatal flaw: it contains only one operative paragraph, which states as follows:

"Considers, therefore, that the initiative for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the appropriate region of Asia should come from the States of the region concerned, taking into account its special features and geographical extent."
In our opinion, any resolution should go beyond an expression of what is desirable if it is to merit the status of a resolution. The propositions contained in the only operative paragraph are self-evident ones, namely, that the initiative should come from the region, and, secondly, that account should be taken of the special features of the concept and the geographical extent of its application. It is not necessary to have a draft resolution to express such an opinion. A draft resolution should at least contain some proposal for concrete action. The operative paragraph contained in the Indian draft resolution should really have been a preambular paragraph, and concrete expression should have been given to a proposal for positive action that should have been embodied in an operative paragraph. This is all the more necessary, as the precedent of the creation of demilitarized zones has already been established and as they were convinced that the highest priority should be accorded to nuclear disarmament, as is stated in the preambular paragraphs of the Indian draft.

We have all shared that conviction ever since Hiroshima, but appear to be powerless to go beyond the stage of intellectual or moral conviction on that point.

As I have stated, we have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting the Indian draft, despite its inadequacies and deficiencies. But we cannot agree to stopping there. Its adoption must not preclude a vote on the Pakistani draft, and we should like to have an assurance that no such tactic will be adopted.

To come to the Pakistani draft, document A/C.1/L.682, we are satisfied that it meets all the objections that had earlier been raised during the period of its gestation. And I must admit that my delegation itself raised certain objections to it -- not so much raised objections, as made certain suggestions for what we thought were improvements that would make it more palatable and more acceptable. We are grateful to the Pakistani delegation for having met those objections and for having given their favourable consideration to the suggestions we made.
The first suggestion was that the draft resolution should first of all take note of
"... the affirmation by the States of the region not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons and to devote their nuclear programmes exclusively for the economic and social advancement of their peoples".

The second, and by far the most important, operative paragraph is the one that "Endorses, in principle, the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". You will note that it does not either declare South Asia to be a nuclear-weapon-free zone, nor endorse the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia; it merely endorses in principle the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.
Can any State in the region, however restricted the region may be, seriously object to endorsement of the principle? It is, to our minds, the first and most logical step in this process. The smaller the area to which the concept is to be applied the greater the prospects of its acceptance. The example set by a few could provide the inspiration for many, and this is the great merit of operative paragraph 2 of the Pakistani draft resolution.

The Foreign Secretary of Pakistan, in introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.682, referred to certain criteria that had been stipulated by the representatives of two nuclear Powers for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. With their vast experience in creating nuclear-weapon-infested zones, we might perhaps benefit from their advice in regard to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones, but it reminds me of a homely proverb in my country which, freely translated, means: "The burglar's mother is the last person one should consult in any effort to detect the burglar." However, we must either express our gratitude to those nuclear Powers for what could be construed as sound advice or express our concern for what might be construed as containing a warning that if their criteria are not satisfied we cannot expect their support. I hope it is the former that will be more applicable.

Experience has shown that, even when States of the region concerned take the initiative, the major Powers are not wanting in excuses for withholding their co-operation and can still display an attitude of lofty disdain for proposals put forward by us poor misguided creatures. It would be well-nigh impossible to secure unanimity even before taking an initiative of this nature, and we cannot agree with those who support such a contention.

Another of the criteria suggested by the two nuclear Powers which proffered their advice is that the creation of the zone should not "disturb existing security arrangements". What really is meant by that expression is something obscure to my delegation, especially when the idea originates with two nuclear Powers, themselves parties to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty. In what way could the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone disturb existing security arrangements? The criterion is, I
would say with great respect, a preposterous one. It means that we are not free to declare an area agreed upon by ourselves as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone is one of the most effective means of eliminating the feeling of insecurity that has been created through the existence of nuclear weapons and the likelihood of their being used, if not by calculated design, at least in a spasm of mental derangement.

We are not completely impressed with the argument that there should have been prior consultations. The General Assembly has endorsed the principle of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. In other regions of the world the concept has been accepted and applied, and as a concomitant the States of the regions have renounced the right to acquire nuclear weapons and have declared their opposition to the introduction of nuclear weapons into their regions.

The Foreign Secretary of Pakistan, in introducing the draft resolution, welcomed the assurance given by one nuclear-weapon State that it would respect the denuclearized status of the zone and, in view of that Power’s positive attitude on the question, he expressed his confidence that similar assurances would be forthcoming from the other nuclear Powers as well. I hope he is right, though I feel sure he is wrong, but at least he is entitled to be optimistic.

I am constrained to observe, however, that if assurances are given to that effect even when given by States that could by accession to the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty afford their most reliable earnest of their good faith and place their good intentions beyond doubt, despite the absence of any means of international verification of compliance with the provisions of the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty and even without the assumption of an obligation to accept some form of verification, what reason is there for rejecting or questioning assurances that a certain explosion has been conducted for peaceful purposes only? Are we entitled to accept the one assurance and reject the other? That, of course, is a matter for each individual to decide according to his own faith in a particular party.
The reason is that some of us are ready to accept such assurances from all but we are not all ready to accept such assurances from some. The third possibility is that some of us are prepared to accept such assurances from some. It is for this very reason that, though we do not link this proposal contained in the Pakistani draft resolution (A/C.1/L.682) with any particular incident, we consider it most timely to examine the possibility of creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone in an appropriate region of Asia, treating as a nucleus the region of South Asia. One has to start somewhere, and this, to our mind, is a sound start.

The Pakistani proposal does not confine even the initial consultations to the countries of South Asia. Other interested neighbours that are non-nuclear-weapon States are invited to participate in the consultations at their very inception, especially if they are of the same persuasion. The most obvious adherents would be the member countries of ASEAN and a powerful nation in Asia which not only is committed constitutionally to a policy abjuring a nuclear-weapon option but has been a staunch and consistent supporter of the concept of a regional peace zone, namely, Japan.

We must not allow parochial differences to stultify a laudable initiative or abort it at birth. No one in the area should feel any qualms of conscience about voting for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682 and a fortiori for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681 -- and of course I realize that document A/C.1/L.681 may be put to the vote first.

We see the process functioning in three stages: first of all, the endorsement in principle of the concept; secondly, the definition of the concept in greater detail; thirdly, the implementation of the concept. It is in regard to the second and third stages that consultations are absolutely necessary. My delegation will vote in favour of both drafts, but I must repeat that in no circumstances can we agree that an affirmative vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681 -- namely, the Indian draft -- would dispose of the Pakistani draft and render a vote on that draft superfluous and unnecessary.
It is not in any sense of the term redundant. I hope a majority of the members of this Committee will agree with our views.

At the same time we would urge that we avoid the temptation of referring this matter to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. We have had the advice of two nuclear Powers members of that body as to the criteria to be observed in creating such nuclear-weapon-free zones. According to those very criteria, the States immediately concerned and other interested States should consult with one another. If we refer to CCD at this stage, we will be employing a firm of undertakers who might feel inclined to emblazon the proposal. That is not the fate we desire for it.

Mr. HYVÄRTIMI (Finland): I would simply like to inform you that it is the intention of my delegation to put before the Committee, as I had the occasion to indicate in my last statement, a draft resolution on a comprehensive study of the question of nuclear-free zones in all its aspects. It is our intention to submit the draft text for the resolution to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I would just like to make a small comment on the statement of the representative of Sri Lanka. He referred to the fact that the co-Chairmen of the Disarmament Committee, particularly the Soviet Union, put forward criteria for the creation of nuclear-free zones. He named one of the criteria which was put forward as being supported by our country. I would like to make clarification that the Soviet Union did not put forward any criterion of this kind, particularly the criterion to which he referred -- that is, the criterion of protecting the security of States. This is a question which requires study and which we intend to consider. But this is a criterion we never put forward.

Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): I cannot understand why my good friend, the representative of the Soviet Union, has put on a cap that was not intended for him.
Mr. MISHRA (India): I listened with great care and attention to the statement of our very good friend, Ambassador Amerasinghe of Sri Lanka. The Indian delegation is grateful to the delegation of Sri Lanka for having declared that it will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.691.

There are one or two points he made this afternoon which require some clarification on our part. I mean the remarks directed towards the draft resolution A/C.1/L.691 which he has said he will support.

The practice of the United Nations in regard to the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones is very clear, and we have yet to come across a declaration by the United Nations in regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones which was contrary to the opinion expressed by the States of the region concerned. Reference has been made to the resolutions on nuclear-weapon-free zones in Latin America and in Africa. If the vast body of literature on this subject is gone through, if a careful study is made of the circumstances leading to the adoption of various resolutions, it will be quite clear that no action was taken by the Assembly without the agreement of the States concerned. This is what we have had in mind in regard to mutual consultations and mutual agreement among the States concerned. I realize, of course, that in particular regions there are some States which would like to move faster on a particular proposal. There are others which would like to take gradual steps, each step by agreement, in order that the end product should be totally acceptable to all.

Nuclear-weapon-free zones are concepts which involve the vital interests of States. In many respects they are what might be termed geographically limited non-proliferation treaties. Take the case of the so-called region of South Asia. Five out of six States in this region are not parties to the non-proliferation Treaty. Sri Lanka itself is a signatory to the Treaty but has not ratified it. Now, with all respect, I would like to say that there is a certain lack of grasp of the implications of the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the statement we have heard this afternoon. If the idea of even small regions declaring themselves nuclear-weapon-free zones had been practicable, then by now we would have had a leopard-skin pattern of such zones all over the world.

The reality is otherwise. It is necessary that a zone large enough and viable should be created which satisfies the security and other vital interests of not only some but of all of the members of the region. Any proposal which fails to meet these requirements in respect of all countries in a zone is destined to failure.
If any particular country feels that it is in its interest to declare itself a nuclear-weapon-free zone or a part of such a zone, we shall be the last to object to that. Each country has to decide for itself. If country A in our region is satisfied, is keen to create a zone irrespective of its size, we shall not oppose that. If country B feels that certain factors have to be taken into account, then we shall be very glad to discuss that with country B in order to arrive at mutual agreement. The point is that if the Assembly were to endorse the concept in principle in advance of mutual consultations and mutual agreement, then the countries which have serious questions in regard to feasibility of proposals are at a disadvantage. On the other hand, if the idea of prior consultation and agreement is the one which is suited best in a particular region, then we think that that particular practice is of no disadvantage to anyone, but of advantage to all.

It is in this spirit that we have put forward the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.681. It excludes no proposal. It gives support to the concept of nuclear weapon-free zones. It says that the initiative should come from the States of the appropriate region in Asia. This is merely following the practice which has been followed for years in the General Assembly.

We would not like to impose our views on anyone, however small or big that country might be. At the same time, we cannot accept imposition of a concept from anyone. That is a matter of principle; that is a matter of sovereign equality of States represented here.

I am afraid I must say with all humility and with all respect that concepts are acceptable to us if there is mutual agreement which has arisen from mutual consultation but not otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As there are no other speakers, I shall now call on those members who wish to explain their vote before the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.688 on agenda item 35, "General and complete disarmament". The draft resolution is co-sponsored by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Sweden and Yugoslavia.
Mr. Rome (Canada): Although the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks are bilateral negotiations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, they are of course also of vital interest to the whole international community. Leaders of the two great Powers have recognized their responsibility to the international community by pledging themselves actively to pursue the negotiations. Our delegation, perhaps as some others, might have envisaged different language from that in the draft resolution before us. But it does express the recognition of this Assembly of the very great importance of these negotiations and the common desire of the international community to see the Soviet Union and the United States pursue their current negotiations to a fruitful conclusion. Canada fully shares that desire and will therefore support this draft resolution.

We should like to clarify our understanding of one aspect of the draft resolution, that is, operative paragraph 4, which would urge the Soviet Union and the United States to "broaden the scope" as well as to accelerate the pace of their talks. We understand that by the term "broaden the scope" is meant that agreement should be reached on important qualitative as well as quantitative limitations and reductions of their strategic nuclear-weapon systems. We make this observation because we believe the most pressing need is for the talks to arrive at a firm agreement on the objectives already set by the two Powers in their Basic Principles of Negotiations on the Further Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms of June 1973.

Mr. Meerbürg (Netherlands): The Netherlands Government fully subscribes to the views presented by the representative of Canada on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.688.

Mr. Elias (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.688 for one fundamental reason, namely, that the result of the conversations between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation of strategic weapons affects the whole of mankind, and fundamentally so, because if these weapons were ever used the consequences would jeopardize the very survival of all living creatures on our planet.
At the same time, my delegation, in voting favourably, will do so on the understanding that the words "Urge" in operative paragraph 4 and "Invites" in operative paragraph 5 are the expression of a wish and a hope of the General Assembly but not of any intention to interfere or to minimize the difficulties which have to be overcome in order to ensure success of the conversations referred to.

Mr. MISHRA (India): We have studied the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.693 with great care. As representatives may remember, we have in the past co-sponsored similar draft resolutions. On this occasion, however, we were unable to do so for the following reason.

In operative paragraphs 1 and 2, certain quotations are given from statements of the Secretary of State of the United States of America and of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, and then reference is made to those quotations in operative paragraph 3.

As a matter of procedure and sound practice, we believe it is undesirable to give quotations from representatives in draft resolutions that we vote upon. Sometimes the quotations may be in the proper context. At other times, if this practice is followed, we might see that the quotations are out of context. In any case, in our opinion it would create an unhealthy trend in the work of this Assembly. We would therefore very much hope that even at this late stage it would be possible to remove those three paragraphs because their removal does no harm to the principal objective of the draft resolution, which is contained in operative paragraph 4. We feel that this would be a more appropriate way of dealing with the situation.

If, however, the co-sponsors find it difficult to remove those paragraphs, my delegation would be unable to support this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): There being no delegation wishing to explain its vote before the vote apart from those we heard, we shall now proceed to vote. From now on, the regulations of rule 128 of the rules of procedure are in force.

The draft resolution (A/C.1/L.693) was adopted by 88 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I shall now call on representatives who have asked to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): I want to assure the members of this Committee that the United States continues to welcome the interest shown by the world community in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks between my Government and that of the Soviet Union. As Secretary Kissinger said recently our objectives in these talks are: first, to break the momentum of ever increasing levels of armaments; secondly, to control certain qualitative aspects, particularly MIRVs; third, to moderate the pace of new deployment; and, fourth, ultimately to achieve reductions in force level.

Now we are working with utmost seriousness to achieve these goals. By abstaining in the vote on draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.688, the United States is merely reaffirming its conviction that in order to accomplish our goal in the most expeditious manner the SALT negotiations should proceed along lines which are established by the parties themselves.

Mr. NISIEORI (Japan): My delegation has just voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.688 on the understanding that the phrase "broaden the scope", which appears in operative paragraph 4, is interpreted to mean that the two Powers should reach agreement on both qualitative and quantitative limitations and reductions of their strategic nuclear-weapon systems as is envisaged and set out by the two Powers in their basic principles of the negotiations on the further limitations of strategic offensive arms of June 1975.

Mr. GUVEN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): I share the view expressed by the representatives of Canada and Japan about operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.688.
Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): On behalf of my delegation I have just voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.688 but I should like to place it on record that I fully share the views expressed by the representative of India in his explanation of vote before the vote. I am referring particularly to operative paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft resolution where the two quotations are made. I should like to state that the question of general and complete disarmament is not the monopoly of certain Powers only. Several speakers in the General Assembly have made statements on the subject and I see no reason why two statements should be quoted in this draft resolution. I have no strong objection to it, but I believe it is rather a dangerous precedent, because if we go on like this it may lead to some very serious confusion in the future.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since no other representative has expressed the wish to explain his vote after the vote, the Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.688, relating to general and complete disarmament, agenda item 35.

I should like now to ask the Committee to turn to the draft resolution on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons (A/C.1/L.692), agenda item 28. This was distributed this morning so, in accordance with the rules of procedure, it could be voted upon tomorrow unless the Committee decides otherwise. According to the impression I have formed, I feel that there may not be any difficulties with this draft resolution; I should therefore like to ask the Committee whether there would be any objection to its being put to the vote now.

Since I hear no objection, the draft resolution will now be put to the vote.

Would any delegation like to explain its vote before the vote? Since no delegation has expressed a wish to explain its vote before the vote, we shall now vote on the draft resolution.

Rule 128 of the rules of procedure will apply. If any delegation requests a formal vote, the voting will proceed in that way; if not, I shall consider that the draft resolution is adopted unanimously.
Mr. LIN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation will not participate in the vote on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The comment of the representative of China will be reflected in the record.

Since I hear no specific request for a formal vote, I consider that the Committee adopts unanimously the draft resolution relating to agenda item 28, on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons (A/C.1/L.692), sponsored by Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Finland, Hungary, India, Italy, Morocco, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Yugoslavia.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Does any delegation wish to explain its vote after the vote?

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation did not wish to oppose the consensus on the draft resolution on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. That approval does not mean that there is any change in the traditional position taken by France on the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to which the draft resolution is to be submitted. If there had been a vote we would have abstained, but I should like to say, with regard to the substance of the draft resolution, that France, which is the depository Power of the 1925 Geneva Protocol on the use of asphyxiating gases, is greatly interested in the practical regulation of the manufacture, possession and prohibition of chemical weapons. In this regard my country is carrying out studies and will not fail to make its views known when a convention is drafted and presented to this Committee and to the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The comments of the representative of France will be duly reflected in the records of the Committee.

Since no other delegation has indicated that it wishes to explain its vote after the vote, the Committee has thus concluded its consideration of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.692.
Does any representative wish to speak on any of the items now being considered by the Committee? I have no further speakers on my list, and it is only 4.30 p.m.
Since no representative wishes to speak or comment on the draft resolutions now under consideration by the Committee, the situation is as follows.

The draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/681 and A/C.1/682 are the subject of additional consultations, which I think should be allowed to continue. They can be put to a vote at our meeting on Wednesday.

Amendments submitted by the representative of Mexico to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/690, have just been circulated. I trust that we can vote on that text tomorrow, since it has been distributed for some time and the only thing that needs to be considered now are the amendments that have been circulated today.

So as to speed up our work, tomorrow we may possibly vote on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/685 and A/C.1/686.

I understand also that the Secretariat will receive some other draft resolutions dealing with the various agenda items now under consideration by the Committee. Therefore, I do not think that we should proceed to take any decisions on those texts which have been distributed and about which delegations may want to consult their Governments.

I should also like to urge those delegations which are preparing drafts to finalize them as soon as possible so that on Friday, as we have said, we will not only be in a position to dispose of all the texts before us on these items and thus comply with the work schedule that we have set for ourselves but, at the same time, enable those representatives who came here to deal specifically with disarmament matters to return to their respective places of work.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to disturb somewhat the procedure outlined by you.

This morning we listened very carefully to the representative of Mexico, and we were very grateful that he said so many positive things about the draft resolution in document A/C.1/690. The point I wish to make is that that text was drafted very carefully, during long negotiations, and we were a little
surprised that this morning amendments were proposed which we have received only this afternoon. I should like to ask whether it would be possible to postpone their consideration to Wednesday, because I think that we really need to hold consultations on them.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As representatives know, I have always tried to accommodate the wishes of delegations as far as possible, so as to make the best use of the time available to us. Consequently, if the development of our work permits, we will take a vote on Wednesday, when we shall hold two meetings. But, so as to be able to proceed in this way, I would urge all delegations which have any comments to make -- not only on document A/C.1/L.690, but also on other draft resolutions under consideration -- to inscribe their names on the list of speakers and to make their comments as soon as possible.

This morning we held a most positive debate in which delegations expressed their views on various proposals before the Committee. I believe this is a very useful way to proceed in this type of debate, because as representatives will have noticed the mechanical voting procedure in this room takes up very little time. It would be a pity for us to meet to hear a few comments and adjourn after a few minutes owing to a lack of speakers. But, as I have said, as far as possible, I do want to meet the wishes of representatives and it is only logical that the delegations which have submitted the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690 and those interested in the subject should like to be able to consult their Governments. Consequently, we shall vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690 on Wednesday.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.