



**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 37th MEETING**

Chairman, Mr. **ROCHE** (Canada)

**CONTENTS**

**CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS**  
**[51 to 69, 139, 141 and 145) (continued)**

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC-2 730, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

**AGENDA ITEMS 51 TO 69, 139, 141 AND 145 (continued)**

**CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS**

The CHAIRMAN: As members of the Committee are aware, intensive consultations have been taking place on draft resolutions in cluster 6 and will continue over the next few hours.

At this meeting and at the meeting this afternoon, therefore, I shall take up draft resolutions in the following order: in cluster 6, draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L. 5, A/C.1/43/L. 6 and A/C.1/43/L. 40; in cluster 7, draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.13, A/C.1/43/L. 23 and A/C.1/43/L.51; and in cluster 10, draft resolutions A/C. 1/43/L. 10/Rev.1 and A/C.1/43/L. 15. I shall then revert to cluster 2 and take up draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 45, and after that I shall go to cluster 11 and take up draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.19/Rev.2 and A/C. 1/43/L. 49.

I call on Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, Secretary of the Committee for a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform members that the following countries had become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/43/L.12: Peru

A/C.1/43/L. 45: Colombia

A/C.1/43/L.67: Portugal

A/C.1/43/L.52/Rev.1: Portugal

A/C. 1/43/L. 40: Honduras

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on delegations that wish to make statements concerning draft resolutions in cluster 6.

Mr. OBEIDAT (Jordan) (interpretation from Arabic) : First, I would like to point out that I am speaking on behalf of the member countries of the Arab Group, because the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is currently chairing that Group, which consists of Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahir iya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Jordan. I shall confine my statement to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", which was introduced by Egypt on 9 November 1988 under agenda item 54,

The Middle East region has played an important role in civilization. Each and every inch of its land is a testimony to that civilization; it was the seed-bed of the three great religions and must therefore be preserved from the threat of nuclear weapons, not only for reasons of self-defence but also because of its vital role in civilization, which is an international responsibility.

On that basis, the Arab Group has always supported the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. It has also supported the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions concerning that matter, as well as the recommendations of international organisations in that respect. Its position is not confined solely to matters concerned with the Middle East, but is one based on principles rooted in its civilization. We are in favour of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in all parts of the world so as to achieve the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons and the dangers emanating therefrom.

The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East requires, first, that all the parties concerned accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

(Mr. Obaidat, Jordan)

Secondly, all parties concerned should place their nuclear facilities under the international safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA),

Thirdly, all parties should commit themselves not to attack, either by nuclear or conventional weapons, nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful purposes.

Fourthly, all parties should commit themselves not to stockpile any nuclear material or nuclear weapons for non-peaceful purposes on behalf of other States, on either a permanent or a short-term basis. Such stockpiling must not take place either on sovereign territory or territory under the parties' jurisdiction.

Fifthly, all States should abjure clandestine or overt bilateral treaties that provide for the stockpiling or importing of nuclear weapons from outside the region.

When we consider objectively the circumstances of the region, we may observe that Israel, since 1952, has adopted policies that have enabled it to produce and stockpile nuclear weapons, it has collaborated with the racist régime of South Africa, and it has practised nuclear piracy that has since been disclosed. Israel stands in the way of the implementation of the draft resolution with regard to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East; it has consistently ignored the will of the international community; it has always rejected accession to the non-proliferation Treaty under the pretext of certain flimsy arguments; it has ignored Security Council resolution 487 (1981), which calls on Israel to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards; it has also ignored the IAEA régime. Israel refuses to abandon nuclear weapons, despite repeated calls by the General Assembly, the Security Council and IAEA. The statements it made last week with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.6 and A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1 make it clear that Arab Egypt has had some influence with Israel. However, Egypt's efforts were in vain.

(Mr. Obaida t. Jordan)

The **countries** of the Arab Group reaffirm my **earlier statement** with regard to the ● **establishment** of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the **Middle East** and we take into **account the explanation** given when the **draft resolution** was introduced last week. **Therefore, the Arab Group** will vote in **favour** of the **draft resolution** as a contribution on **its part** to the promotion of the **objectives** of the **first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament**, which adopted a **resolution** with regard to a nuclear-weapon-free zone as a step towards eliminating nuclear weapons.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Do **66** any **other** delegation wish to **speak** on the draft resolution in **cluster 63** If **not**, I now **call** upon **those delegations wishing** to **speak** in explanation of vote or **position** before the voting.

Mr. SHARMA (India) : This year once again this Committee has been presented with a draft resolution - A/C.1/43/L.5 - on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. Such draft resolutions are brooming a ritual, and our position on them has been explained in the past. However, WI should be happy to place our views on record once again.

It has been the consistent position of India that nuclear disarmament is a global, and not a regional, issue, and that this focus should not be allowed to be diluted by measures which do not solve the problem at its core, but which may give the impression of progress when in fact there has been none in addressing the intractability of the subject.

India believes that lasting world peace can be built only on the basis of general disarmament and a just international order. We remain convinced that the advent of nuclear weapons has made a qualitative difference to the international-security environment. Therefore, the highest priority has to be accorded to the elimination of all nuclear weapons, a priority that was recognized universally and that was reflected in the Programme of Action adopted at the very first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control is our common goal. That applies most forcefully in the nuclear area. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, in our view, falls short of that objective. The objective of a world free of nuclear weapons cannot be met by nuclear "zoning measures". Nuclear-weapon-free zones will not be immune to the nuclear holocaust caused by weapons from regions which have such weapons. The only answer is the elimination of such weapons, and not regional fencing which might gain a devastation that will descend equally on all.

(Mr. Sharma, India)

We have had two recent prestigious studies on the environmental consequences of nuclear war, one conducted by the United Nations and the other by the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment. I am sure that members of this Committee are familiar with those two studies and are aware of their conclusions. A major nuclear war would lead to large-scale climatic perturbations. The system that currently sustains life on Earth would be extremely vulnerable. There would be devastating societal disruptions. There would be unprecedented consequences for both non-combatant and combatant countries alike.

Apart from the point of principle, there is the question of the practicality of these measures. The presence of nuclear weapons on the ground and in the waters bordering South Asia raises fundamental problems of defining the viability of any such zone. The problems here reinforce the perception that any attempted geographic delimitation in this field is fraught with difficulties, imponderables and contradictions. It is self-evident that this draft resolution, unlike other proposals of a similar nature, does not enjoy the consent of all Member States of the region. Further, a precondition for any such initiative is the presence of a climate in which declarations that national nuclear programmes serve only peaceful purposes are credible and in which there does not exist convincing evidence to the contrary.

It is therefore pertinent to note that in respect of the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia even the basic criteria are not met.

The Indian delegation recognizes that nuclear-weapon-free zones have been established in other parts of the world and, as they represented a consensual and closely coordinated approach, it has even supported them. It is clear that those efforts enjoy the consent and will of all countries of the region concerned. We

(Mr. Sharma, India)

● □□□□◆ that the United Nations can play a role by endorsing an ● agreement freely and voluntarily arrived at between the States concerned.

Am the present proposal could not have been introduced in this forum with a view to ● obtaining regional consensus, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the intent behind the draft resolution is not serious. We believe that ● such draft resolutions, introduced as a ritual and lacking in substantive intent, run counter to the provisions of the Final Document of the first ● special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It is ● somewhat ironical that in the seventh paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution, the General Assembly would bear in mind "the provisions of paragraphs 60 to 63 of the Final Document", whereas paragraph 60 of the Final Document clearly states that the ● establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones ● should be on the basis of ● arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region. Paragraph 61 of the Final Document states that the special characteristics of ● each zone should be taken into ● account.

I trust this statement will make clear why my delegation opposes draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.5.

Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka): My delegation would like to make a few remarks in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.5, on the ● establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, on which Sri Lanka will cast a positive vote.

Sri Lanka has ● supported the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia because of our belief that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world should be ● encouraged in the context of the ultimate aim of ● establishing a world entirely free of nuclear weapons. Initiatives at the regional level should not be neglected pending the attainment of reaching that overall goal,

(Mr. Rodrigo, Sri Lanka)

Paragraphs 60 to 63 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and the Declaration adopted by the non-aligned countries at their summit meeting at Harare deal with that concept.

We are fully aware that a viable zone can be established only through careful consultation and on the basis of arrangements freely negotiated and reached among the States of the region concerned. The particular characteristics intrinsic to each specific region or zone must, of course, be taken into account. The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia can reach fruition through the efforts primarily of the States of the proposed zone, and we hope sincerely that the necessary understandings can be reached.

Our detailed position on the nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia has been indicated in our response to the Secretary-General's request for views.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolutions in cluster 6.

We turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.5. That draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, held on 7 November, and is sponsored by the delegations of Bangladesh and Pakistan.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Bhutan, India

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Vietnam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.5 was adopted by 99 votes to 2, with 32 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6, which was introduced by the representative of Jordan at the 29th meeting of the First Committee on 7 November and is sponsored by the following: Algeria, Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

Separate recorded votes have been requested on the sixth and ninth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution and on operative paragraphs 2, 5 and 6; a recorded vote has also been requested on the draft resolution as a whole.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will therefore vote first on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Swaziland, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

The sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6 was adopted by 77 votes to 19, with 32 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will next vote on the ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6. A recorded vote has been requested.

---

\*Subsequently the delegation of Bolivia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: **Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia**

Against: **Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America**

Abstaining: **Argentina, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire**

The ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6 was adopted by 69 votes to 21, with 35 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on operative paragraph 2 of *draft* resolution A/C.1/43/L.6. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Ireland, Japan, Malta, Mexico, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Samoa, Swaziland, Togo, Uruguay, Zaire

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6 was adopted by 79 votes to 19, with 28 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6. A recorded vote has been requested.

A roaorded vote was taken.

In favour : **Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprur, Czechoslovakia, Demcoratio Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Demooratio Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niaaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swasiland, Syrian Arab Republic!, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Repuhlio, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Ropublio of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia**

Against: **Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America**

Abstaining: **Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Corta Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Eauador, Fiji, Greeae, Guatemala, Jamaica, Lesotho, Malta, Mexioo, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Samoa, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia**

Operative paragraph 5 of drat t resolution A/C. 1/43/L.6<sup>1</sup> was adopted by 71 votes to 34, with 31 abstentions.\*

---

\*Subsequently the delegation of Liberia informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 6.

A recorded vote has been requested.

**A recorded vote was taken.**

**In favour :** Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia

**Against:** Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United States of America

**Abstaining:** Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Greece, Guatemala, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Samoa, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia

**Operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 6 was adopted by 72 votes to 23, with 32 abstentions\* \***

● Subsequently the delegation of the United Kingdom advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote against.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution

A/C.1/43/L.6 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malta, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Portugal, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.6, as a whole, was adopted by 67 votes to 2, with 45 abstentions.

(The Chairman)

The Committee will now take up draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.40. The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1986, and has been sponsored by the following countries: Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Surinam, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, France, Senegal

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.40 was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. WAYARABI (Indonesia) : The Indonesian delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.5, concerning the establishment of the nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Our position regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known. We are working actively to promote the establishment of South East Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free zone in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. As can be seen from paragraphs 33 and 60 of that document, the General Assembly declared that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely entered into among the States of the region concerned, constituted an important disarmament measure. In paragraph 61, the General Assembly further stated that the process of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world should be encouraged and the States participating in such zones should undertake to comply fully with all the objectives, purposes and principles of the programme or arrangements for establishing the nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Noting the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/43/505, which reflected the fact that the countries in South Asia were still in the process of achieving agreement on the issue, my delegation considered that, pending the conclusion of such an agreement, it should abstain on the draft resolution.

Ms. COURTNEY (Australia) : My delegation would like to make the following explanations of vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.5 and A/C.1/43/L.6.

Australia voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.5, which deals with the question of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. That vote reflects the deep concern which Australia has about the mounting proliferation pressures in that and a number of other regions in the world. Australia is vehemently opposed to vertical and horizontal proliferation wherever and whenever it occurs. Such

(Ms. Courtney, Australia)

proliferation has serious consequences both in the regional context and for international stability. For that reason, Australia supports the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime, including strengthening through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We therefore wish that all countries of the South Asia region would implement this draft resolution.

Australia abstained on resolution A/C.1/43/L. 6, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament" for the following reasons. Operative paragraph 6, in requesting the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to suspend scientific collaboration with Israel, and operative paragraph 5, in calling upon all States and organizations that have not yet done so, to discontinue co-operating with and giving assistance to, Israel in the nuclear field, could have implications for Israel's rights and privileges of membership in IAEA.

Australia believes in the universality of membership of international organizations, including, in particular, IAEA. Nor do we accept the thesis in the last three preambular paragraphs as having sufficient subsidiary basis. That being said, let me stress that Australia continues to be concerned about the failure of Israel and a number of other countries to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and it continues to urge that they do so at the earliest possible date.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): As in previous years, the United States delegation has joined in supporting the traditional text concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as contained in draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 5. I should like to recall our basic approach to the establishment of such zones. The initiative should come from States in the region concerned; all States whose participation is deemed important should participate; there should be adequate verification provisions; the zones should not upset

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

● xiating ● ourity ● rangmmtr to the detriment of regional and international security; it should ● ffrotivly prohibit nualrar ● xploaivr development or possession for any purpose; it should not restrain the exercise of right@, ruah a8 freedom of navigation, and †◆ ● hould not ● ffoot the rights of States to make ● rangrmntr for such matters as port calls and transit privileges.

My delegation la able to support the initiative to ● rtibirh a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia because the proposal appear8 to be in harmony with those criteria. At the same time, it is clear that there are othrr ● □□□□ in which thr conditions necessary for a nuclear-weapon-free zone would not be satisfied, ● uoh as ● roaa within thr region covered by the North Atlantio Treaty Organisation. Accordingly, my delegation wishes to note that the re ference in the thir'd preambular pargaraph to tha ● atablrhmnt of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions of thr world does not constitute for us an ● ndoraom8nt of such zones on a univer sal basis.

My delegation ha8 joined in support of draft rrolution A/C.1/43/L. 40 as an indication of the strong and abiding of the United States. for the Treaty of Tlatelolco. At thr ● un8 time, we wish to record once again our disappointment that the draft resolution focuses on Protocol I of the Treaty and not on the issue of universal ● dhrrncm to thr Treaty by all el igible Stake. In doing so, the draft resolution singles out on8 State for criticism rather than calling, as it should, on those other ● ligiblo Stake to become parties. Such a discriminatory draft resolution that ● ttacks only part of the problem lo888 much of its potential force and is less likely to ● ohiovo its intended result.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

As we have pointed out in the past, only when the Treaty of Tlatelolco, together with its Protocols, is fully in force for all eligible States will it be able to make its full contribution to regional and international security. We therefore urge its sponsors to consider ● bringing their ● approach should they decide to introduce a draft resolution concerning this Treaty in the future.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): The delegation of France abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.40.

We cannot agree to being ● singled out in this manner in the draft resolution inasmuch as other countries located in the area of ● application of the Treaty of Tlatelolco have not  ● signed that Treaty, or have not yet ratified it, or have not made use of the clause that provides for its immediate entry into force in respect of themselves before all the countries ratifying the Treaty or the Protocols have become parties to these instruments.

The French Government, at an ● appropriate time, will make a decision regarding ratification of Additional Protocol I, bearing in mind the status of the ratification of the Treaty itself.

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): The Kingdom of the Netherlands attaches great importance to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which exemplifies how, in certain regions of the world, the proliferation of nuclear weapons can be prevented by the area of nuclear-weapon-free zones. My delegation commends the Treaty. We believe that the 23 sovereign States in Latin America that have acceded to it deserve our praise.

As is recalled in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.40, the Kingdom of the Netherlands is one of the three States with territories in Latin America that have signed and ratified the Additional Protocol I of the Treaty, thus bringing it into force for the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.40 urges

(Mr. Meer burg, Nether lands)

a fourth eligible **State** to **ra ti fy** Additional Protocol I, which **would** result in **the Treaty 's** entry into **force** for the **Territories** of that State in the **zone** of application of **the Treaty** .

While we would, of course, welcome such a development, we also note with regret that **not** all eligible **sovereign** States in **Latin America** have **acceded** to **the Treaty of Tlatelolco**. For that **reason** my **Government** would **strongly** welcome all **appropriate** action<sup>s</sup> by all State<sup>s</sup> to which **the Treaty** is relevant that would **facilitate** its full entry into force at the **earliest possible** date. We do not understand why **an appeal** to **this** effect could not have been **included** in the draft **resolution**, and we sincerely hope that next year a more **balanced** draft **resolution** will be **presented** to us.

Mr. NYBERG (Finland) : I wish to explain the vote of Finland in favour of draft **resolu tion** A/C. 1/43/L. 5, entitled "**Es tabl ishment** of a nuclear-weapon-free **zone** in **South Asia**".

It is the policy of Finland to support endeavours to establish nuclear-weapon-free **zones**. Initiatives to **this** end should **arise** from the **States** within a region, and the **process** should enjoy the support **of** all States concerned.

Mr. GIEROW (Sweden) : On behalf of the Swedish delegation I should like to explain **Sweden's** vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 5.

On **several occasions** Sweden has expressed **i ts posi tive** attitude with regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free **zones**. Such a **development** could **result** in **increased** confidence and have a **positive** influence on the political climate and the security **situation** in the region.

The **establishment** of a **nuclear-weapon-free** zone **requires** the **non-possession** of nuclear **weapons** by **States** in the **zone**, as well as the **absence** of nuclear weapons from, and their **non-deployment** in, those States. Another **essential** element is the

(Mr. Gierow, Sweden)

commitment by the nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against targets within the zone.

As to concrete proposals for such zones, one basic prerequisite must, however, be acceptance of and co-operation with the initiative by all States in the region.

In line with these principles, Sweden has had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.5 regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as States concerned voted against the draft resolution.

Mr. CAPPAGLI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish) : The delegation of Argentina voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.6 - "Israeli nuclear armament" - as a whole but abstained in the case of some of the paragraphs that were voted on separately. We are opposed, however, to the request that has been put to States to subject their nuclear facilities to supervision by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish) : As a non-party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, Cuba would like to explain its abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.40. The reasons for our not being a party to that Treaty were enshrined by the General Assembly in the final document approved by consensus at the first special session devoted to disarmament. Paragraph 63 (a) of that document says that the following is one of the measures that are especially desirable:

"Adoption by the States concerned of all relevant measures to ensure the full application of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco), taking into account the views of the States at the tenth special session on the adherence to it". (A/S-10/4, p. 8)

The opinion that was put forward by Cuba at that time - an opinion endorsed by the General Assembly - is known to everyone, so I will not repeat it. However, we do not renounce our right to have the weapons that we need, inasmuch as part of our

(Mr. Nufiez Mosquera, Cuba)

territory continues to be occupied by a foreign military force. That condition has been imposed on us. This occupation is an act of hostility, an act of aggression, and many other acts of aggression and hostility have been perpetrated in recent years.

Mr. MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) : The Islamic Republic of Iran voted in favour of draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 5, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". As we have repeatedly and unambiguously explained, it is a fundamental part of our policy that the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, must be given top priority in disarmament measures. In this respect the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, of which my country is considered to be a part, is particularly important. The Islamic Republic of Iran fully supports this draft resolution, having co-sponsored a similar draft resolution in the 1970s.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take up the draft resolutions in cluster 7.

**Ms. NIELSEN** (Denmark) : The effort to achieve a comprehensive nuclear-test ban has been an issue that Denmark has highlighted for years in its statements. In our view, the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is one of the priority issues of our deliberations in the First Committee. It is not a nuclear-test ban not as an end in itself but as a means in the nuclear disarmament process.

A comprehensive test ban will not lead directly to reduction in nuclear weapons. It would, however, be a significant contribution to lowering the risk of further vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. It would impede development of new generation of nuclear weapons and assist in preventing the emergence of new nuclear-weapon States.

In our view, it is important that the very positive development we have seen in the area of quantitative reduction of nuclear arsenals should not be offset by qualitative improvements in nuclear arms. The conclusion of a comprehensive test ban would also serve to enhance the nuclear-proliferation treaty régime and the attraction of that treaty for non-nuclear-weapon States.

For those reasons, Denmark finds it important continually to urge and support efforts aimed at the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty banning all nuclear tests in all environments by all States and for all time.

The goal of a comprehensive test ban enjoys widespread support. Differences of opinion, however, still exist on how best and most realistically to reach it. Denmark has for many years been a co-sponsor of the Australia-New Zealand draft resolution, this year introduced as document A/C.1/43/L.51. We fully subscribe to the approach outlined in that draft resolution. Over the years, it has, in a realistic way, taken account of current realities while outlining the most feasible way of achieving a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Ms. Nielsen, Denmark)

This year, operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution urges the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its consideration of item 1 of its agenda, entitled "Nuclear-test ban" and to initiate preliminary work on all aspects of a nuclear-test-ban treaty at the beginning of its 1989 session. The Conference on Disarmament is the appropriate forum for multilateral negotiations on the test-ban issue. We support and closely follow the work of the Conference on Disarmament in that field. The efforts of the Conference on Disarmament in negotiating an effective and verifiable comprehensive nuclear-test ban are complementary to any bilateral negotiation on that issue.

We welcome the bilateral step-by-step negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union on nuclear testing, which we hope will lead to a first result to the ratification of the two bilateral threshold treaties. By increasing mutual trust and confidence and by expanding the area of agreed verification procedures, those negotiations and the connected joint-verification experiment have a significance that goes beyond the actual negotiations.

It is the hope of the Danish delegation that draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.51, before us again this year, will attract widespread support.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. SHARMA (India): I have taken the floor to speak on the draft resolutions on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty and my statement refers to all draft resolutions on that subject.

The question of a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons has been a priority issue on the multilateral disarmament agenda for almost 35 years. The objective was clearly reiterated in the third preambular paragraph of the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, as follows:

(Mr. Sharma, India)

"Seeking to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time..."

My delegation regrets that, despite the international community's repeated calls negotiations on the issue have not commenced in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. In our view, the Conference on Disarmament remains the most appropriate forum to commence negotiations on this subject of vital concern, given the presence of all five nuclear-weapon States around the conference table.

My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in documents A/C.1/43/L.13 and A/C.1/43/L.23. However, my delegation notes that the scope of the treaty, as envisaged in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13, is at variance with the generally accepted scope for such a treaty. In our view, the scope, for the purpose of our work is clearly determined by the preamble declaration of the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty. Our vote in favour of the draft resolution is therefore without prejudice to our position on the scope of a comprehensive test-ban treaty to be negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament and as visualized in the preamble of the partial test-ban treaty.

My delegation will not be able to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.51. We believe that the Conference on Disarmament is a negotiating body and that a mandate calling for anything less than negotiating would reduce its role and downgrade the importance attached to this issue by the world community.

We are aware of bilateral talks between the United States and the USSR on nuclear testing. However, as stated by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and India associated with the Six-Nation Initiative in the Stockholm Declaration, any agreement that leaves room for continued testing would not be acceptable,

(Mr. Sharma, India)

My delegation would also like to urge that, pending the conclusion of a treaty, all nuclear-weapon States suspend testing so as to facilitate a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Miss SOLESBY (United Kingdom) I should like to comment on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.23.

As I explained in my statement in the general debate, the United Kingdom's security will depend for the foreseeable future on deterrence based in part on the possession of nuclear weapons. That will mean a continuing requirement to conduct underground nuclear tests to ensure that our nuclear weapons remain effective and up-to-date.

A comprehensive test ban remains a long-term goal. Progress will be made only by a step-by-step approach, taking account of technical advances on verification, progress elsewhere in arms control and the attitude of other States. We do not believe that it would be appropriate to use the amendment procedures included in the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty to change totally the nature of that Treaty, even if all States parties were in favour of the objective of the immediate creation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Miss Solesby, United Kingdom)

I must make clear that the United Kingdom would not be able to support the outcome desired by those who have proposed the idea of holding such a conference. We are ourselves opposed to the idea of convening the conference.

Of course, despite the United Kingdom's position on the substance of the issue, we will continue to fulfil in an objective manner our duties as a depositary Power.

Mt. DOLEJS (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation is of the opinion that all venues should be considered and tried to make early and tangible progress towards achieving a comprehensive prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests. That is the reason my delegation supports all three draft resolutions relating to this matter: draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.13, L.23 and L.51.

The Conference on Disarmament continues to be an indispensable forum for negotiating a comprehensive nuclear-weapon-ban treaty. We recognize the difficulties encountered there, the nature of which leaves no doubt as to the complexity of the issues involved. Yet we are of the opinion that the present differences in position should no longer prevent the Conference on Disarmament from starting substantive work. With a view to making a contribution to the advancement of that work at the Conference on Disarmament, Czechoslovakia this year put forward a proposal, in working paper CD/863,

“to initiate, as a first step towards achieving a nuclear-weapon-ban treaty, substantive work on specific and interrelated test-ban issues, including structure and scope, as well as verification and compliance”.

That compromise proposal on the negotiating mandate reflects realistically the present stage of discussions in the Conference on Disarmament, and we believe it would provide a good basis for further meaningful work. It is our view that such an approach can be put to use in the efforts to realize the objectives set forth in

(Mr. Dolejs, Czechoslovakia)

the three draft resolutions before us, and with that understanding we shall vote in favour of them,

Mr. SOUZA E SILVA (Brasil): My delegation would like to speak in explanation of vote concerning draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13, on the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions, sponsored by Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The Brazilian delegation, following some new developments in the treatment of this subject in the Conference on Disarmament, will vote in favour of that draft resolution this year. That vote, however, does not mean that Brazil renounces the draft mandate for an ad hoc committee on a nuclear-test ban presented by the Group of 21 in document CD/520/Rev.2. As indicated in footnote 1 to document CD/829, the draft mandate presented therein is an important show of flexibility by the Group of 21 which could lead to the superseding of document CD/520/Rev.2 only if duly reciprocated by other parties involved.

Secondly, we should like to stress that our support of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13 does not imply any change in our long-held positions of principle regarding the specific end necessary scope of a nuclear-test-ban treaty and regarding what is authorized in article 18 of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take action on draft resolutions in cluster 7.

We turn first to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13. That draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, held on 7 November, and is sponsored by Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

**A recorded vote was taken.**

**In favour:** Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

**Against:** France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

**Abstaining:** Belgium, Canada, China, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

**Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13 was adopted by 118 votes to 3, with 13 abstentions.**

**The CHAIRMAN:** We turn next to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.23. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, held on 7 November. It is sponsored by the delegation of Ecuador, Indonesia, Mexico, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

**A recorded vote has been requested.**

A recorded vote was taken.

**In favour** Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

**Against:** France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

**Abstaining:** Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.23 was adopted by 108 votes to 3, with 21 abstentions.

**The CHAIRMAN:** We turn next to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.51. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, held on 8 November, and is sponsored by the delegations of Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Thailand, Vanuatu and Zaire.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour8 Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: France, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.51 was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 6 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote after the voting.

Mr. FRIEDERSDORF (United States of America): The United States delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13, entitled "Cessation of all nuclear-test exploration". The United States was unable to support this draft resolution because it is in fundamental conflict with United States policy regarding nuclear-testing limitations, which we have adopted here on several occasions and with which delegations in the First Committee are quite familiar.

(Mr. Friedersdorf, United States)

We were also compelled to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 51, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", because it is in some respects in conflict with United States policy. We regret this very much, because the two delegations have worked closely and constructively with our delegation in trying to resolve those differences.

Progress has been made in the last year on reduction of nuclear arms as a result of the constructive negotiations being conducted between the United States and the Soviet Union. We have had the signing of the Treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination Of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - and we have made progress towards a strategic-arms agreement. We have completed a joint verification experiment and will continue towards ratification of the threshold test-ban Treaty and the peaceful nuclear explosions Treaty. We appreciate the recognition of that progress offered in the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the preamble to draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 51.

As we have stated in the past, the United States does not believe that a conference to amend the partial test-ban Treaty is an appropriate or practical approach to the subject of a complete test ban. We have expressed our view again in our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 23. However, we wish to state clearly that the United States will carry out its responsibilities as a depositary State in regard to official requests for such a conference.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia) : Australia abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 23, but that should not in any way be construed as indicating that Australia does not continue to believe strongly that there is an urgent need for a comprehensive test-ban treaty, and was re-floating in our sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 51, which has just been adopted.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

At this stage the Australian Government has not yet taken a position on the proposal to convene a conference to amend the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty. Having made that clear, we consider that the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva is the body best equipped, in terms of authority, expertise and continuity, to address a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Australia doubts that the proposed amendment conference would possess those attributes to anything like the same degree as the Conference on Disarmament.

Dame Ann HERCULES (New Zealand): New Zealand has supported the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 13, entitled "Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions". We were pleased to be able to vote in favour of that text once again. We note that a number of textual changes have been made and, in our view, there have resulted in a considerable improvement in the draft resolution.

There are a number of themes that are common to both that text and to the draft resolution on a comprehensive test-ban treaty co-sponsored by New Zealand, which has also just been adopted by the Committee. Both call for the Conference on Disarmament to resume its responsibility to negotiate a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Both recognize the need for adequate verification and the usefulness of the work of the Ad Hoc Group dealing with seismic events.

We do continue to have certain reservations about the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L. 13, however. In the first place, we regret the continuing, albeit now muted, emphasis on the responsibilities of the three States which act as depositaries of the partial test-ban Treaty. All five nuclear States, as well as other States, must be fully involved in the negotiation of such a treaty. Secondly, we regret that the draft resolution fails to emphasize in an unambiguous manner that a nuclear-test-ban treaty should apply to the test explosions of all nuclear explosive devices.

(Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand)

I should also like to take this opportunity to make some comments on draft resolution A/C. 1/43/L. 23, "Cessation of all nuclear-test exploration". New Zealand abstained in the voting on that draft resolution. New Zealand prefers to put its trust in the ability of the Conference on Disarmament to make progress towards the negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. New Zealand will support the option that appears most likely to yield practical and useful results on this most-important issue.

Mr. HOULLEZ (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolution in cluster 7 and specifically on draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L. 51 and L. 23. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 51, my delegation is pleased that we were able to approve it. As I pointed out in my statement on 21 October, my delegation welcomes the new approach of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the question of nuclear tests and, in particular, the recent developments in verification arrangements aimed at facilitating the ratification of the 1974 threshold test-ban Treaty and the 1976 peaceful nuclear explosions Treaty. We see here a reaffirmation of the policy we have championed for years aimed at the gradual and verifiable implementation of the final objective, namely, the total cessation of all types of nuclear testing.

Lastly, we would repeat the appeal to all the members of the Conference on Disarmament to consider, as soon as it resumes its activities in 1989, the proposal submitted by the representative of Czechoslovakia with regard to the mandate for an ad hoc committee to deal with the question of the cessation of nuclear tests to allow for intensified consideration of the primary question before the Conference, namely, the consideration of a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapons testing.

(Mr. Houlier, Belgium)

Turning to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 23, my delegation • obtained in the voting because we believe, among many other delegations, that the Conference on Disarmament represents the best framework for dealing, on the multilateral level, with questions of the cessation of nuclear-test • explosion, not isolated from other aspects of disarmament.

Mr. NUMATA (Japan) : With respect to Japan's abstention on Graft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.13 and A/C.1/43/L.23 I wish to state the following position of Japan on nuclear-testing issues.

Japan has consistently attached importance to the early realisation of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban as a step of high priority in the promotion of nuclear disarmament and has been working consistently towards that goal. Since the beginning in September last year to start full-scale stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing the United States and the Soviet Union have been conducting intensive negotiations towards the early ratification of the threshold test-ban Treaty of 1974 and the peaceful nuclear explosion Treaty of 1976. They have also carried out the joint verification experiment successfully.

Japan welcomes these developments and strongly hopes that the ratification of the two Treaties will become a reality without delay so that the two countries may be able to proceed promptly to the second phase, namely, negotiating further intermediate limitations on nuclear testing.

Like many other delegations my delegation believes it is of vital importance that substantive work be undertaken as soon as possible in the Conference on Disarmament on item 1 of its agenda, a nuclear-test ban, at its 1989 session. In order for this to come about all those concerned need to demonstrate a little more flexibility on the basis of an objective assessment of the reality, which includes important progress in United States-Soviet negotiations. In our view, draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.23 does not reflect such an approach.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13 my delegation understands the frustration felt by many at the lack of progress on a comprehensive test ban in that multilateral forum for many years. However, Japan is firmly convinced that the Conference on Disarmament provides the best avenue for reaching our shared goal of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban and cannot but have serious reservations over a

(Mr. Numata, Japan)

course of ● ation which might impair or ● idr-track thr work of the Conference on Disarmament on the ● ubjeot,

Those are the reasons why we ● batinod on draft reaolutiona A/C.1/43/L.13 and A/C.1/43/L.23.

Mr. PETERS (Federal Republ io of Germany): My delegation would like to explain its vote on thr draft resolutions on nuclear tenting contained in cluster 7, on whiah the Committrr ham just taken action. We voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.51 to underline our commitment to the realization of a comprehensive nuclear-teat ban, which we would like to see matrrialine at thr earliest possible date. The head of the Federal Government, Chancellor Kohl, ham reaffirmed thir urgent wish on various occaaiona. The way towards the aforementioned objective thr: seems to he thr most promising to us is a step-by-step ● pproaoh combining hilateral and multilateral ● ffortm. We therefore welcome the joint ● tatoment of 17 September 1987 in which the United States and the Soviet Union announced their agrerment to begin full.-calo, stage-by-stage negotiation8 on nuclear-torting limitationa.

We attach great importance to the joint verification ● xperimont ● ucaeaafully concluded in the months of Auguat and September 1988. We hope that the process thua under way will croon lead to the ratification of the thraahold teat-ban Treaty of 1974 and the prrceful nuclear explosions Treaty of 1.976. We are confident that this first rtep will consequently lead to further steps in the direction of achieving the final. objective of those nagotiationa. One ● hould not, however, mistake a oeanation of test:ng or intermediate measures in the direction of a comprehensive teat ban am being a substitute x□□ ● uhatantial reductions of existing nuclear arsenals.

For my Govrrnment, reliable verification or any cessation of testing, including a limited or an intermediate one, is a conditio ● ino qua non for much a

(Mr. Peters, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

measure. We are convinced that the **technical problems** related to such verification can be solved, the necessary technologies being currently developed.

An important element in this process will be a global seismic monitoring system. In 1985 we proposed its establishment in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. In March 1986 we demonstrated in Geneva the capabilities of the Seismic Data Centre established at Qraefenberg near the city of Nürnberg to delegations of seismic experts of the Conference on Disarmament. We have, furthermore, this year furnished information obtained from that Centre on the test explosion conducted under the joint verification experiment agreement. One of the key features of this system is its free accessibility from everywhere in the world via dedicated public network data links enabling any scientific entity elsewhere on the globe to retrieve stored seismic data of the Qraefenberg station for a period of 15 days backward from the date of request. In this context we interpret operative Paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.51 as an invitation already fulfilled by the above-mentioned government-financed data centre. We will continue to contribute to the speedy development and installation of a global seismic verification network. It is in the context of the establishment of such a system that my Government will be able actively to communicate seismic data related to possible nuclear explosions to the Secretary-General via diplomatic channels.

We do not support, however, hastening into full-fledged multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test ban or projects aimed at widening the scope of the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 to become a comprehensive test-ban treaty without the necessary groundwork having been laid in the field of verification. We, therefore, did not vote for those draft resolutions which favoured those approaches. What we advocate are legally binding, reliably verifiable undertakings of interested parties; a step-by-step approach, ultimately leading to a complete

(Mr. Peters, Federal  
Republic of Germany)

cessation of all nuclear testing is, as far as we understand the formulations contained in operative paragraph 2 (c) of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.51, within the range of solutions envisaged in that draft resolution, on which we voted favourably,

Mr. MEERBURG (Netherlands): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.51 on the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. However, we have some observations to make. The promising developments that have taken place on the issue of nuclear testing in recent years prove that this matter cannot be viewed in isolation from the broader nuclear issues. The joint communiqué of the United States and the Soviet Union of 17 September 1987 marked the process of full-scale stage-by-stage negotiations as a means of achieving the ultimate goal of the complete cessation of nuclear testing as part of an effective disarmament process. There are prospects that, as a first step, the United States and the Soviet Union will soon reach agreement on a set of effective verification measures, which would make it possible to ratify the threshold test-ban Treaties of 1974 and 1976.

(Mr. Meerburg, Nether lands)

These developments have confirmed our belief that at this juncture the nuclear testing issue is best served by a stage-by-stage approach linking reductions in nuclear weapons to reductions in the number and result of tests. Now that the direct approach of substantially reducing nuclear weapons is beginning to bear fruit, we might ask ourselves whether the indirect strategy of suffocation of the nuclear arms race has not lost much of its relevance. In our view, the stage-by-stage approach, which has my Government's full support, has been insufficiently reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 31, which therefore became less balanced and realistic than we would have wished. As a result, the Netherlands was not in a position to sponsor this year's draft resolution. However, we voted in favour because of the importance that my Government attaches to the issue as such.

My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13. In that draft, the more balanced and realistic approach, along the lines I have just mentioned, is even less in evidence. Moreover, the appeal to member States of the Conference on Disarmament to promote, in 1989, the establishment of an ad hoc committee with a negotiating mandate for a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear test explosions, as outlined in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, cannot, for the reasons I have just mentioned, be supported by my Government.

We abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 23 because we feel that convening a special conference with the aim of amending the limited test-ban Treaty of 1963 to bring about a comprehensive test ban, is not an adequate way of dealing with the issue. Moreover, draft resolution A/C.1/43/L. 23 does not in any way do justice to recent important and promising developments leading to a step-by-step approach in which the test-ban issue becomes part of a broader effective disarmament process.

(Mr. ~~.....~~ burg, Nether lands)

As I said in my statement on 31 October 1987, the time is not yet ripe for a comprehensive test ban. There is no alternative to our effort in the Conference on Disarmament to try and achieve progress on a number of practical aspects of nuclear testing. In our view, the Conference on Disarmament should take up its work on such concrete matters as the verification provisions for the multilateral test ban Treaty taking into account the commitments undertaken by the nuclear Powers in the limited test-ban Treaty of 1963 and the non-proliferation Treaty of 1966.

Mr. CAPPAGLI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The Argentine delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13 on the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions in view of the clarity of the mandate given to the Conference on Disarmament to initiate negotiations to that end.

My delegation also voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.23, whose objective is to amend the Treaty of 1963 which prohibits nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water.

However, I should like to record our well-known position with regard to the Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, to which Argentina is not a party. I should also like to repeat that between the two paths proposed, we prefer the multilateral environment offered by the Conference on Disarmament for the preparation of a treaty on the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests because the five nuclear-weapon Powers are represented there.

The positions taken in the Conference on Disarmament fully justify that alternative.

In spite of the improvements made in draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.51, we abstained in the vote on it because it still does not refer explicitly to negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament aimed at ending nuclear-weapon tests.

**Ms. SECRET (France) (interpretation from French):** I should like to explain the negative vote of the French delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.13, A/C.1/43/L.23 and A/C.1/43/L.51 relating to the question of nuclear tests. In our view those texts do not deal appropriately with the question of nuclear tests. The prohibition of nuclear tests should be placed within the framework of an effective process of nuclear disarmament. The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (1978) notes this in paragraph 51. This can only happen when progress towards disarmament has made it possible, without calling into question the foundations of international security. It therefore cannot be a pre-condition for the substantial reduction of their nuclear arsenals by the most heavily armed nuclear Powers. France is conducting nuclear tests to maintain its deterrent force at the minimum level of credibility necessary for its security.

**Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish) :** Venezuela supports the cessation of all nuclear tests by all States in all environments and for all time. That position is reflected by the participation of Venezuela in the Treaty on the partial prohibition of nuclear tests as well as in the proposal which, together with 5 other member States of the United Nations, it has put forward with a view to amending that Treaty.

Without any doubt the best way to secure the cessation of the nuclear-arms race, is by means of working together for a comprehensive Treaty on the cessation of tests, whose application would involve all States, those which have the capacity to carry out tests, those which have achieved a degree of technological development which places them on the threshold of achieving such capacity and all the others, whatever the degree or level of their use of nuclear energy.

(Mr. Taylor, Venezuela)

We consider that the cessation of nuclear tests is the most important step which can be taken immediately to contribute to rendering obsolete nuclear weapons, to curb the increasing sophistication of such weapons, to reduce the risk of horizontal proliferation, to prevent the development of new arms based on new technologies which might be used in defensive systems and to prevent the replacement of arms which are being or will be eliminated as a result of agreements concluded, or to be concluded, between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Venezuela voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.51 in spite of the fact that we are not entirely satisfied with its approach to the work which should be done by the Conference on Disarmament in connection with the prohibition of nuclear tests.

In our view, the only activity which should be carried out by the Conference should be to initiate, as soon as possible, substantive negotiations to work out a comprehensive treaty banning nuclear tests.

Operative paragraph 2 of the resolution limits itself to requesting the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its examination of that item, although in recent years it has not received proper consideration by the Conference. It requests substantive work to be undertaken when, in our view, what the Conference should be doing is initiate negotiations as soon as possible.

Mr. MASHHADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) : The Islamic Republic of Iran voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/43/L.13. In explanation of our vote I should like to say again that we believe that the cessation of all nuclear-  
 ● exploration is a first step toward disarmament measures. In addition to their  
 ● diversion ● efforts on the process of disarmament negotiations and, consequently, on  
 the international atmosphere, these tests, ● according to documented evidence and  
 substantiated reports, have a deleterious ● effect on the ● environmental balance.  
 Such ● exploration must be stopped completely.

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish) : Uruguay voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/43/L.23, as it had done on similar texts in previous years.

We have continued to support the principle of the prohibition of all nuclear  
 transfer through a multilateral juridical instrument. As a matter of principle,  
 Uruguay did not oppose recourse to a procedure for which the Treaty of 1963 on this  
 subject makes specific provision. However, our delegation would like to make clear  
 its view that in order to ensure a viable, realistic and ● effective solution we must  
 prevent this question from becoming a matter of diplomatic confrontation, and it is  
 essential to gain the support of States with the greatest influence and  
 decision-making capacity in nuclear matters by means of negotiations at the level  
 of the Conference on Disarmament.

It is our hope that the message contained in the draft resolution that has  
 been adopted will be added to draft resolutions A/C.1/43/L.13 and A/C.1/43/L.51 and  
 will serve as a stimulus to the remotivation of these negotiations in the  
 Conference on Disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded action on cluster 7.

At our meeting this afternoon we will take up the following resolutions: in cluster 2, A/C.1/43/L.45; in cluster 6, A/C.1/43/L.11/Rev.1; in cluster 10, A/C.1/43/L.10/Rev.1 and A/C.1/43/L.15; in cluster 11, A/C.1/43/L.49.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.