



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 43rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS (ccntinued)
ORGANIZATION OF WORK

*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 DC2-750, 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.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/41/PV.43
10 December 1986
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: The ~~programme~~ of work for today will be in accordance with my announcement at yesterday afternoon's meeting. Therefore this morning the Committee will take decisions on draft resolutions listed under cluster 10 of the informal paper distributed to the Committee, namely, **A/C.1/41/L.8**, L.35, **L.61**, L-67 and L.72.

Since no delegation wishes to introduce draft resolutions, I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make Statements on the draft resolutions in **cluster 10**.

Mr. TEJA (India): I have asked to **speak** on the cluster of draft resolutions on the question of a nuclear-test ban, in documents **A/C.1/41/L.8**, L.35, **L.67** and L.72.

The question ~~of~~ a treaty on a nuclear-test ban has been a priority item of all multilateral disarmament forums for over a quarter of a century. In ~~the~~ view of the Indian delegation, the objective of such a ban ~~corresponds~~ to what was stated in the **preamble** of the **1963** partial test-ban **Treaty**, according to which the aim of any agreement on a **comprehensive** test ban had to be:

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

My delegation will therefore vote in favour of draft resolution **A/C.1/41/L.8** ~~whose~~ manifest goal, clearly stated in its title, corresponds to the approach laid down in the preamble of the partial **test-ban** Treaty.

My delegation will also vote in favour of draft resolution **A/C.1/41/L.35**, since we agree with the main purpose of that draft resolution of giving the Conference on Disarmament an **unambiguous** mandate on how it should proceed With

(Mr. Toja, India)

regard to the first and win Item on its agenda, that is, a nuclear-test ban. We support the draft resolution because we believe that it is the urgent and overriding responsibility of the Conference on Disarmament to begin negotiations on a treaty on a nuclear-test ban immediately. My delegation notes, however, that the scope of the Treaty as envisaged in draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.35 is at variance with the generally accepted scope for such a treaty for the past quarter century. Our vote on the draft resolution is therefore without prejudice to our position in the Conference on Disarmament regarding the organization of the programme of work by the ad hoc committee to be set up on the subject.

(Mr. Teja, India)

In the context of draft resolution **A/C.1/41/L.8** and **L.35**, we would **also** like to note that India cannot accept the **linkage** that has been suggested between a comprehensive **test** ban and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear **Weapons**. The international community has solemnly and **repeatedly** declared the **objective** of a **comprehensive test** ban as a matter of highest priority on **its** own **intrinsic** merits. There can be no dilution of **such** an unequivocal position by linking it to any other issues.

My delegation would **also** like to place on record its view that, pending the conclusion of a treaty, **all nuclear-weapon States**, and not only the depositaries of the partial test-ban Treaty" should suspend the testing of nuclear weapons in order to **facilitate** negotiations on a nuclear-weapon-test **ban**.

My delegation will not be able to support draft resolutions **L.67** and **L.72** on the notification of nuclear tests and the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban **treaty**. We are not convinced that the notification of nuclear tests serves any useful purpose in the context of seeking nuclear **disarmament**. With reference to draft **resolution** **L.72**, my delegation has some **reservations**, particularly on its operative paragraph 2, which limits the mandate of the Conference on **Disarmament** in dealing effectively with this subject. The mandate of the Conference should focus on the need to commence negotiations on a comprehensive test ban.

Mr. CAMBORA (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina wishes to state that it will vote in favour of draft resolutions **L.8** and **L.35** on the cessation of nuclear tests in the present wording, bearing in **mind** the clarity of the mandate entrusted to the Conference on **Disarmament** to initiate negotiations to that end.

(Mr. Campora, Argentina)

The delegation of Argentina will also vote in favour of draft resolution L.61, which **proposes** the consideration of **amendments** to the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear **Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water . . This Treaty was** ratified by Argentina this year. **From** among the two **courses** that are proposed, we would prefer the multilateral framework offered by the Conference on Disarmament **for** the elaboration of a treaty on the **cessation** of nuclear-weapon tests, since the five nuclear-weapon **States are** represented in the Conference on Disarmament, something that **does not obtain** with regard to the States parties to the 1963 Treaty.

We shall vote in **favour** of draft resolution L.67 on notification of nuclear tests, bearing in **mind** that it will help to provide the United **Nations with** very important information.

As for draft **resolution** L.72, the delegation of Argentina will **abstain in the** vote, since that **draft does not explicitly refer to the immediate** conduct of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament with a view to the banning of nuclear-weapon tests.

Mr. AGSTNER (Austria): The Austrian delegation **is** on record for having, over the **years**, voted for all **realistic** initiatives aiming at an end of nuclear **testing** and the earliest **possible conclusion of a comprehensive** test-ban treaty. At this session my delegation will continue **this** tradition and will vote in **favour** of draft resolutions L.8, **L.35**, L.67 **and** L.72.

My delegation **has already** spoken at length on the **issue** of a nuclear-test ban and expressed **its** full support **for the proposals** outlined in the Mexico Declaration by the **Heads of State or Government** of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and the United Republic of Tanzania. We therefore **welcome** references to **this** Declaration in the preambular parts of draft **resolutions** L.8, **L.35** and L.72.

(Mr. Agatner, Austria)

We note with pleasure the invitation extended, in operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution L.8, to all interested States "to establish an international network for monitoring and verifying compliance with such a moratorium joined by other nuclear-weapon States".

Austria, having actively participated in the world-wide level 1 data transmission test in 1984 under the auspices of the Ad Hoc Expert Group of the Conference on Disarmament, is prepared to join in such an international network. To this end my country has set up an inter-ministerial working group to examine the necessary financial as well as local pre-conditions of such participation and to accelerate the creation of scientific expertise in this field.

As far as draft resolution L.61 is concerned, Austria will abstain in the vote, since we do not believe that amending the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water to be the appropriate way to arrive at a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Austria co-sponsored and will vote in favour of draft resolution L.67 on notification of nuclear tests on the understanding that the measure envisaged does not serve as an excuse for further delaying the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Cuba has always attached the greatest importance to the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests by all States in all environments for all time. Therefore, we shall vote in favour of draft resolution L.35 and L.61.

However, we shall be unable to support draft resolution L.67 because what is necessary now is not a notification about when nuclear tests are going to be carried out but what we should do to put an end to those tests.

(Mr. Nuñez Wosquera, Cuba)

For the same reasons we shall be unable to support draft resolution L.72 because, to begin with, we think that we must clearly ask the Conference on Disarmament to initiate urgently the negotiation of a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and, secondly, because we believe that the proposal for the establishment of an international seismic monitoring network would only have meaning within the context of a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests, something that does not exist at present.

As for draft resolution L.8, my delegation wishes to recall that, at the recent Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare, from 1 to 6 September, the Heads of State or Government pointed out:

“The continuance of nuclear-weapon testing fuels the nuclear-arms race and increases the danger of nuclear war. In this regard, the Heads of State or Government emphasized the pressing need to negotiate and conclude a comprehensive multilateral nuclear-test-ban treaty prohibiting all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments for all time.” (A/41/697)

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

In that light, my delegation wishes to ~~propose~~ an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8: the insertion of a new paragraph as the third preambular paragraph, to read as follows:

(spoke in English)

"**Emphasizing the pressing need to negotiatr and conclude a comprehensive multilateral nuclear-test-ban treaty prohibiting all nuclear-weapon tests by all States in all environments for all time**".

(continued in Spanish)

That text is taken from paragraph 44 of the Political Declaration of the eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Ron-Aligned Countries (A/41/697).

Mr. MEISZTER (Hungary) : I am speaking as a **sponsor** of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8. Yesterday, towards the end of our afternoon meeting, the representative of Ireland introduced an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8, and just a moment ago a new proposal was ~~made~~ by the representative of Cuba, **suggesting** a new preambular paragraph. Owing to the ~~lack~~ of time I have naturally not had the opportunity to conduct the **necessary** consultations with all the sponsors of these proposals.

Therefore, I wish to say in the name of my delegation, first, that we would prefer to have our draft resolution adopted by the First Committee in its Original wording, but if the two delegations wish to retain the ideas contained in their amendments, and if that is the wish of the Committee, my delegation can accept those amendments. My delegations would do this on the understanding that the delegations of Ireland and Cuba put forward their amendments in the desire to be able to support draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8.

Mr. CLERCKX (Belgium) (interpretation from French) : The Belgian delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.67 and L.72.

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.67 calls on States conducting nuclear tests to give notice of them, to provide systematic information on them, and to provide data about each test. This is an interesting initiative. The systematic provision to other States of concrete data, specifically about the location, characteristics and yield of these explosions would contribute to advancing candour and transparency, in an area which has a vital impact on any effort to achieve disarmament or any nuclear-arms limitation. We see that as a good, concrete opening, of which full advantage should be taken.

Of course, the transparency of such a procedure would be all the greater were the data to be provided by States examined and interpreted by an independent body of competent specialists. We are thinking here of the Conference on Disarmament's Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts to Consider International Co-operative Measures to Detect and Identify Seismic Events. That Group could be useful were the data made available to it, for example, through the international programme on the exchange of seismic data. The Ad Hoc Group's work would be greatly encouraged, and made more effective and credible, were nuclear Powers to proceed in that way, demonstrating their interest in this matter.

My delegation thinks this proposal might be developed further at a later stage. We feel too that - within the framework also of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72 on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban - we should use the concept of limiting the overall number of nuclear tests by nuclear Powers, beginning with the two major Powers, under an agreement to limit those tests to a strict minimum.

(Mr. Clerckx, Belgium)

That **agreement** would be accompanied, of course, by appropriate verification measures and by an undertaking to provide all the data necessary for that verification.

The Foreign Minister of Belgium put that idea forward early in this session of the General Assembly in the context of a gradual reduction in nuclear arsenals. We believe this would be a first step in the right direction that would make it possible from the outset to reconcile the quest for a total halt to nuclear tests with the security needs that can compel States to carry out such tests for the foreseeable future. We view this as an interim solution, within the framework of a gradual and realistic approach. We are aware that in the current circumstances a total halt to nuclear tests is not really likely in the short term.

Having put forward those ideas, and having put our position in context, I wish to say that my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.67 and L.72, with a view to moving towards the goal of a total prohibition of nuclear tests, first of all through limited, but still concrete and realistic, measures.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation will vote in favour of all the draft resolutions in cluster 10. In our view, the most effective way to bring about the cessation of nuclear tests is through negotiation of a treaty, with the participation of all States, especially those with the capability of conducting such tests and those on a level of technological development placing them on the threshold of that capability. We consider that the cessation of nuclear tests is the most effective step that could be taken immediately to contribute to making existing nuclear weapons obsolete, to halting the development of such weapons, to reducing the danger of horizontal proliferation and to preventing the development of new weapons, based on new technologies, which could be used in strategic defensive systems.

(Mr. Taylhardat, Venezuela)

A key reason for putting an end to all nuclear-weapon tests - and not only nuclear-weapon tests - is that such tests are being used to develop new kinds of weapons, such as laser weapons, and in particular the so-called X-ray laser weapons, fundamental elements of the projected strategic defence system.

Venezuela will vote in favour of draft resolution L.72 although we are not entirely satisfied with its approach to the activities to be carried out by the Conference on Disarmament in connection with the prohibition of nuclear tests.

According to paragraph 2 (a), the Conference on Disarmament should commence practical work on a nuclear-test-ban treaty on the prohibition of all nuclear tests. In our view, however, the only activity that should be undertaken by the Conference is the commencement as soon as possible of substantive negotiations on the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests.

Similarly, we have doubts regarding the activities requested of the Conference on Disarmament in paragraphs 3 (a) and (c), which do not appear to be in keeping with its function as a negotiating body.

However, following its traditional support for all initiatives and efforts aimed at the speedy achievement of the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, Venezuela will vote in favour of draft resolution L.72 and the other draft resolutions on the same subject in cluster 10.

Mr. OBEO (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French) : Any reduction or limitation of armaments, if it is to be lasting, must be brought about through seriously negotiated agreements that are mutually accepted and properly respected. Therefore, instead of unilateral proclamations, particularly with regard to disarmament, my country favours something that should be given high priority, namely the conclusion of treaties, particularly with a view to halting and prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests. Formerly, of course, in a period of entente and

(Mr. Oboe, Côte d'Ivoire)

détente, unilateral decisions could for a time curb or even halt the growth of certain armaments. But today, in the current climate of mistrust, any unilateral decisions such as those in paragrapha 3 and 4 of draft resolution L.8, which certain delegations have considered an important step in the process of disarmament, are in our view unlikely to contribute substantially to the cessation or immediate prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests.

In the circumstances, my delegation will abstain when the Committee votes on draft resolution L.8.

Mr. MacPHIONNBHAIRR (Ireland) : At our last meeting my delegation introduced amendments to the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/41/L.8, which have been reproduced in A/C.1/41/L.82. I note that the sponsors of L.8 find those amendments acceptable. It is the view of my delegation that our slight amendments on the question of scope, which were made in a constructive spirit aimed at convergence in the way in which the Committee presents the goal of achieving a halt to all test explosions, will contribute to the call upon those States which continue to refuse to negotiate on the conclusion of the test-ban treaty.

We believe that the neutral formulations which we have proposed contribute in that direction and will increase the possibilities for a common approach on that question on which we will be able to build further in the future both in this Committee and in the multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament.

I should also like to refer to the amendment which has been proposed orally by the delegation of Cuba. The language proposed in that amendment would in fact return the text to the earlier version contained in L.8. I pointed out yesterday, and do so again, that the language the delegation of Cuba has now proposed in fact is drawn from paragraph 44 of the Harare Declaration of the non-aligned countries.

(Mr. MacPhionnbhairr, Ireland)

As I pointed out yesterday, this is a Committee of the whole in which we are attempting to build consensus, and the formulation contained in that declaration will not necessarily contribute to that consensus.

Yesterday I quoted from two documents. The first was the non-proliferation Treaty, with its 132 members from all socio-economic groups and all regions of the world, which calls for a multilateral test-ban treaty banning all nuclear tests by all States in all environments for all time. The second was the five-continent disarmament initiative undertaken by the Heads of State or Government of Argentina, Greece, Mexico, India, the United Republic of Tanzania and Sweden, which called for the urgent and crucial cessation of all nuclear tests.

I believe that those neutral formulations from forums representing all parts of the world and all groups of countries, which are reflected in our amendments, will build towards convergence. However, I am quite certain that the Cuban amendment will not do so. It will only divide one very large group from other groups within this Committee.

(Mr. MacFhionnbhairr, Ireland)

I would therefore **request** the Cuban delegation to reflect on this **question** and to understand that the **nature** of our **amendments** conduces to a **convergence between one draft resolution and another on this subject**. I would hope that our amendments to draft resolution L.8 are **acceptable** to the • ponaora as a constructive contribution and that he will therefore withdraw **his** amendment.

Mr. MEISZTER (Hungary)! I should like to make a very short addition to my previous statement, namely that in the meantime we have consulted the sponsors of draft resolution L.8 and I am now in a position to announce on their **behalf** also that we can go along with the amendments **proposed** by the representatives of Ireland and Cuba.

Mr. GYI (Burma): The prohibition of nuclear-test explosions for all time **has been** a subject of common concern to the international community for over three decades. The **number of resolutions** on this item exceeds that on all other disarmament items. In **this** period the General Assembly has adopted over 70 resolutions.

The **delegation** of **Burma**, both here in the United Nations and in the Conference on Disarmament, has given **earnest** support to **all** efforts on the complete cessation of Nuclear-test explosions. **To** achieve this **objective** we have joined in all endeavours being made in the Conference on Disarmament directed at **multilateral negotiations** on the test-ban Treaty.

My delegation believes that here in this Committee there is a general convergence of approaches on the draft resolutions on this **subject**, and **that** they are directed towards the achievement of a comprehensive treaty on the **prohibition** of nuclear **tests**.

The Committee now has before it five draft resolutions. We consider it **necessary** to explain our position before casting our votes on them.

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

My delegation will support draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 40/88 on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests". In voting for that draft resolution we will be consistent with our long-standing position that, pending achievement of a comprehensive treaty on the prohibition of all nuclear-test explosions, there should be a suspension of all test explosions.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.25, on the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions, we also supported as the main objective of the draft the promotion of the establishment by the Conference at the beginning of its 1987 session of an ad hoc committee with the objective of carrying out multilateral negotiations on a treaty on the complete cessation of nuclear-test explosions. However, my delegation is unable to associate itself with relevant texts relating to the non-proliferation Treaty as we are not a party thereto.

My delegation will vote for draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.61, on the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions. However, we believe that there are certain ambiguities with regard to the formulation of the text of paragraph 1 of this draft resolution. We would also state that we do not wish to prejudge the outcome of the practical steps to be taken with regard to the convening of a conference of States parties to the partial test-ban Treaty.

My delegation will support draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.67, relating to notification of nuclear tests as we believe that, as stated in that draft, compliance by all States, which it urges, would facilitate the early conclusion of a valuable treaty on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban.

The delegation of Burma will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72, concerning the urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. However,

(Mr. Gyi, Burma)

we note that there is a lack of specificity in paragraph 2 in urging the Conference on Disarmament, the only multilateral negotiating forum, to commence practical work on a nuclear-arms-ban treaty at the beginning of its 1987 session.

Mr. CURBELO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation has proposed an amendment to draft resolution L.8, quoting, in fact, a text taken from the Declaration of the recent Conference in Harare.

The representative of Ireland has commented on that amendment, and I appreciate his remarks, as I also appreciate the spirit in which his delegation has made its proposal. It is understood that he is trying to achieve as general a point of view as possible while at the same time seeking consensus in this Committee.

I should like to recall that the Harare Declaration of the non-aligned countries is a recent expression of opinion by a group of countries that is important in international relations. I do not think there is any contradiction between what has been said by the representative of Ireland and my own proposal. I should like to recall that some of the signatories of the document mentioned by the representative of Ireland are also signatories of the Harare Declaration. That fact is in itself representative of the agreement the representative of Ireland seeks. Thus we support that view with our own proposal.

Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) (interpretation from **Spanish**) : Among the draft resolutions **on which we are about** to vote is one on the key **question** of the cessation of nuclear tests. **It is my delegation's understanding** that small countries with no great power and outside the nuclear confrontation are in no **position** to **prejudge** or even truly assess the value **that** measures adopted by the super-powers may have in the **strategic** nuclear field. We do not have the technological means or the specialized data enabling us to make a **conclusive** assessment. **Hence** we could hardly **place** ourselves in the **position** of one or the other parties in the confrontation.

At the same **time**, we cannot **disregard developments** in keeping with the aspirations and the demands of the international community on the cessation of nuclear tests. **For** this reason, and as stated recently in the Declaration by the **six** statesmen in **Mexico**, in taking **account** of those **developments we** lay **emphasis** upon **the** aspiration that a unilateral moratorium will **become** a bilateral, mutual moratorium between the super-Powers, and that this will **be** the point of departure for a multilateral treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests. My delegation's vote will **be based** on this **criterion**.

Mr. MacPHIONNBHAIR (Ireland) : My delegation has listened to the statement made by the delegation of Cuba **proposing** an amendment to the **draft resolution** contained in document **A/C.1/41/L.8**. **Indeed**, as he and I have recalled, the **language** he has **proposed**, in addition to the language I have proposed, is contained in the **Harare** Declaration, which states:

"The **Heads** of State or Government **emphasized** the pressing need to negotiate and conclude a comprehensive multilateral **nuclear-test-ban** treaty **prohibiting** all nuclear-weapon tests **by** all States in all environments **for all time**".

/A/41/697, para. 44)

(Mr. MacPhionnbhairr, Ireland)

The language in this proposed amendment is of course in large measure language to which we all subscribe. There is in fact only one word in that amendment - drawn accurately as it is from the Harare Declaration - which will not secure the kind of support my delegation wishes to achieve in the Committee, and that word is "weapon". That is the word which will impede the achievement of the kind of convergence my delegation is attempting to reach here.

So my delegation would now like to propose an amendment to the Cuban proposal, which is merely to take out one word, the word which will divide rather than bring us together, and that is the word "weapon" before the word "tests". Instead of "all nuclear-weapon tests" as in the Harare Declaration, it would be "all nuclear tests" or "test explosions". Then I think that, since the sponsors of document A/C.1/41/L.8 are content to accept both the Irish and the Cuban amendments, if we remove that word, we would indeed be building consensus in the Committee.

Mr. van SCHAIK (Netherlands) : My delegation wishes to explain its position on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.8, L.35 and L.61, all on the subject of a nuclear-test ban.

Before doing so, I wish to inform the Committee that my country is pleased to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72.

The Netherlands will abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.8, L.35 and L.61. The situation with regard to nuclear tests has significantly changed over the last few months. Convergence of the viewpoints of the major nuclear Powers resulted in talks in Geneva earlier this year between experts of both major nuclear countries on the full range of nuclear testing issues, the third round of which is in session at this very moment. We learned that this development was confirmed at the highest level in Reykjavik. We understand that a broad measure of agreement was reached on the course to follow towards a test ban:

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

first, the threshold Treaties of 1974 and 1976 would have to be ratified, followed by discussions on further restrictions on tests linked to reductions in the nuclear arsenals.

My delegation considers this to be a useful track to follow towards a comprehensive test ban. The Netherlands look with great interest at these developments, which may bring about the breakthrough we have sought for such a long time.

Draft resolutions L.6 and L.35 do not take account of those developments. The fourth preambular paragraph of L.8 in fact goes so far as to suggest that the sponsors do not wish to reflect on the approach of reducing nuclear tests in parallel with reductions in nuclear arsenals. Furthermore, it puts emphasis on a moratorium. We do not dispute that a moratorium could have a useful effect under certain circumstances, but we cannot consider a moratorium to be a solution to the problem of how to realize a verifiable agreement on the elimination of nuclear tests. Moreover, draft resolutions L.8 and L.35 contain language that prejudices procedural decisions to be taken by the Conference on Disarmament.

For those reasons, the Netherlands will abstain in the vote on those two draft resolutions. But I wish to add that we have not failed to note certain positive developments in both. One such development is, in our view, the call made in draft resolution L.0 to work towards the establishment of an international seismic network, albeit that this idea is exclusively presented in the context of the Soviet moratorium.

(Mr. van Schaik, Netherlands)

In draft resolution L.35, we appreciate, in addition, that other changes - such as the amendment of the title and the disappearance of certain formulae in respect of verification - have been made.

Finally, a few words about draft resolution L.61. The Netherlands will abstain in the vote on this draft because we consider the idea of arriving at a comprehensive test ban via the detour of an amendment of the partial test-ban Treaty as tantamount to a denial of 25 years of the negotiating history of a comprehensive test ban. A conference for the purpose of amending this Treaty would require the participation of all the nuclear Powers concerned. We fear that this would detract from more realistic activities leading us to a test ban.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): In connection with the statement of the delegation of Ireland on the Cuban proposal, I would like to draw the attention of the representative of Ireland, and indeed of all the other members of our Committee, to the fact that, in the search for a consensus, which is proposed by the representative of Ireland, we should not forget that the language proposed by Cuba is reflected also in a consensus document, namely the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. This language may be found in paragraph 51, which reads as follows:

"The cessation of nuclear-weapon testing by all States within the framework of an effective nuclear disarmament process would be in the interest of mankind: (resolution S-10/2)

Accordingly, the Cuban proposal in no sense contradicts the possibility of achieving agreement in the Committee. Furthermore, the proposal of Ireland to remove the word "weapon" from this proposal would actually run counter to the language of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

devoted to disarmament, which was unanimously and solemnly confirmed by all states at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In the circumstance, our delegation would request the delegation of Ireland not to press its amendment to the amendment by Cuba.

Mr. ISSRARLYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian)x In connection with the votes on the draft resolution on the prohibition of nuclear tests, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement.

The Soviet Union supports the idea of the early cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, in the form of a treaty. As members will recall, the Soviet Union on 6 August 1985 introduced a moratorium on all nuclear tests, which it later extended four times. We think that a moratorium creates the sole historical possibility for progress towards the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete prohibition of nuclear tests by all States and for all time. A moratorium, initially bilateral and subsequently multilateral, would be the most effective interim measure for achieving this goal.

The Soviet side has repeatedly expressed its readiness to work for agreement on the strictest verification measures, including on-site inspection and the use of all possible data provided by seismic control.

In our delegation's view, draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.8, L.35 and L.61 all reflect the urgent need for a cessation and prohibition of nuclear tests and emphasize the significance of a possible solution to this problem for the limitation, reduction and ultimate elimination of nuclear armaments, and we will support them. The Soviet Union is convinced that, for the purposes of limiting the race in the latest types of armaments, there must be a full, total cessation and prohibition of tests of nuclear weapons.

(Mr. Israelyan, USSR)

Therefore the Soviet Union believes that what is proposed in draft resolution L.67, notification of nuclear tests, must simply precede the factual cessation of tests. It is viewed only as a temporary measure for strengthening trust in the course of appropriate negotiations.

However, in any circumstances, the major goal of negotiations in any context and in any forum must be the prohibition of nuclear tests by all nuclear Powers everywhere. Unfortunately, this does not emerge from L.67. In this regard our delegation is unable to support this draft resolution and will abstain in the vote on it.

With regard to draft resolution L.72, the Soviet delegation will vote in favour because of its general thrust in favour of an early beginning of negotiations on and the conclusion of a treaty on a comprehensive prohibition of nuclear tests. The Soviet Union is ready immediately to embark on full-scale talks on total cessation of nuclear explosions, in the course of which it would be possible to consider also questions of limiting nuclear explosions and the ratification of the 1974 and 1976 Treaties.

Mr. MUTSVANGWA (Zimbabwe) : There have been some exchanges on the wording of paragraph 44 of the Political Declaration adopted at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Harare in September. Some delegations are of the view that that particular paragraph should be amended. The Zimbabwe delegation does not hold it proper that a consensus, laboriously agreed upon by the Movement's Heads of State or Government during that summit meeting, should be amended in any way and we would strongly urge that the paragraph be retained as it is.

Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I apologize for speaking, but in the light of the amendment proposed by the representative of Ireland to my own amendment, I feel compelled to make some short comments.

To begin with, my delegation has nothing to do with the Irish amendment. If the representative of Ireland puts his amendment to the vote, my delegation could support it with no difficulty.

(Mr. **Nuflex** Moaquara, Cuba)

My delegation's proposal would **amend the preambular part of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8** in the light of the **Declaration of the Heads of State or Government of non-aligned countries, meeting at Harare.**

I must confess that I am somewhat **concerned at the debate** that has arisen this morning. If we examine the **Final Document** of the first special session of the **General Assembly** devoted to **disarmament**, adopted by **consensus** in 1978, we see a reference to the cessation of **nuclear-weapon tests**. **Two** years later, in 1980, the three **States** engaged in trilateral negotiations submitted a **report** to the Conference on **Disarmament** stating their **awareness** of the value for mankind of a prohibition of **explosions** of nuclear weapons in all **environments**. **Two** years later, in 1982, at its second special session devoted to **disarmament**, the **General Assembly** itself ratified the 1978 consensus. More recently, on 7 August 1986, the **Heads of State or Government** of the **six countries** mentioned by the representative of Ireland, **meeting in Mexico**, issued a declaration in which they stated their conviction that no **issue was** more urgent and **crucial** today than **bringing to an end all nuclear tests**, that both the **qualitative** and the **quantitative development** of nuclear **weapons** exacerbate the arms race, and that both would be halted by the complete abolition of nuclear-weapon testing.

More recently still, at the **Harare summit**, more than 100 States, **some represented at the highest level**, agreed to stress the pressing need for the negotiation and adoption of a comprehensive **multilateral** treaty on the total prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests.

Thus, our formulation has been supported by all delegations here, so I do not see the difficulty with the amendment I have proposed. I agree with our colleague from Zimbabwe that it would be going too far to ask us to put forward an amendment to a text adopted by the **Heads of State or Government** of a large number of **countries**.

(Mr. Nufiez Mosauera, Cuba)

I reiterate that my amendment has ~~nothing~~ to do with that proposed by the representative of **Ireland**, and that if he **insists** on his amendment being voted on I shall vote in favour of it. But since I see that my amendment creates ~~difficulties~~ for him, if he withdraws his amendment I shall withdraw mine.

The CHAIRMAN: I ~~would~~ ask the representative of Ireland **if**, in the light of the debate on the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8, he will **insist** on his sub-amendment to the Cuban amendment.

Mr. MacPHIONNBHAIRR (Ireland): I have listened to the **remarks** of the ~~representative~~ of Cuba and **others**, in particular **those** of the representative of **Zimbabwe**. Indeed he is perfectly correct in not **wishing** to **see** the Cuban text amended, if **it** is represented as a text from the non-aligned **summit** at **Harare**. But it is something else **to** bring a text from a forum like that of **Harare** into this Committee of the Whole.

My ~~amendments~~, contained in document A/C.1/41/L.82, come from no group. The ~~amendments~~ produced by my **delegation** are not designed to represent the view of **any** group; they arise from the principled **approach** that we should bring draft resolutions together; that we should bring delegations together to **improve** draft resolutions **in** such a way that we can reduce the number of draft resolutions and **speak** with a single voice; and **that** we should not **be** divided.

In those circumstances, I would **request** that the representative of Cuba consider whether his additional language is necessary for those purposes. As I have **indicated**, it is the view of my delegation that **it** will **not** bring us, as a Committee, together. The **Harare** Declaration, of course, represents the **view** of a large number of States, but it is the view of a **group** of States. My proposed

(Mr. MacPhionnbhairt, Ireland)

amendments are not: they are intrinsic to the text; they are aimed at improving the text; they speak for nobody but the delegation of Ireland, which is attempting to build consensus here.

The answer to your question, Mr. Chairman, is that perhaps we should have another look at this language and perhaps we should consult further on this text with the sponsors of the draft resolution, with a view to achieving the purposes my delegation set out at the outset, which are, it would appear, quite different from those which have been stated by the representative of Cuba. It is not customary in the Assembly to bring declarations representing the view of one group or another into the operative part of a draft resolution, which is intrinsically at the centre of a text. In operative paragraph one we find language which will achieve the greatest amount of consensus. One can always recall in the preambular part the Harare Declaration on this question. There would be no difficulty there. But when one moves into the intrinsic and central operative part, and tries to impose on others language that will not secure consensus, this would appear not to be conducive to the activity my delegation has embarked upon in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8.

Mr. LE HOAI TRUNG (Viet Nam) : My delegation is speaking as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8. we believe in the constructive intent that prompted the delegation of Ireland to propose an amendment to that draft resolution. That is why we agreed to accommodate the approach of the delegation of Ireland. At the same time, the amendment put forward by the representative of Cuba reflects our deep concern regarding the question of the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, a concern shared by a great number of countries. We wish to appeal to the delegation of Ireland to reflect, and to accommodate the approach of other countries, as we accommodated the approach of his delegation.

The CHAIRMAN: In order to make a final attempt to bring the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8 and the proposers of the various amendments together, taking into account the importance of the question involved, which has been reflected in the debate on the draft resolution, I propose now, if there is no objection, to suspend the meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 11.50 a.m. and resumed at 12.10 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN : The consultations have been successful and I am in a position to inform the Committee that the sponsors of the various amendment8 to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8 do not insist on them. I refer to the amendment of Ireland contained in document A/C.1/41/L.82, the oral amendment submitted by the representative of Cuha at this morning's meeting, and the sub-amendment to that amendment. Accordingly, we shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8 as it stands, in its original version.

We shall now begin the voting on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 10, beginning with A/C.1/41/L.8, entitled "Implementation of General Assembly resolution 40/88 on the immediate cessation and prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Hungary at the 29th meeting of the First Committee, on 3 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Viet Nam. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic,

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

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

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8 was adopted by 90 votes to 3, with 26 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to express my appreciation to the delegations involved in the informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8.

We now come to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.35, entitled "Cessation of all nuclear- test explosions". It was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Finland, Indonesia, Ireland, Kenya, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour : Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago,

*Subsequently the delegations of Lesotho, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zimbabwe advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of the Central African Republic had intended to abstain.

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, Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.35 was adopted by 110 votes to 3, with 14 abstentions.*

• Subsequently the delegations of the Central African Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zimbabwe advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: Next, we shall take up draft resolution A/C. 1/41/L.61, entitled "Cessation of all nuclear-test explosions". It was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 36th meeting of the First Committee, on 6 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Bolivia, Indonesia, Mexico, Peru, Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet socialist Republic, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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

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

Abstaining: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.61 was adopted by 100 votes to 3, with 25 abstentions. *

*Subsequently the delegations of the Central African Republic, the Syrian Arab Republic and Zimbabwe advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: The next draft resolution before us is A/C.1/41/L.67, entitled "**General and complete disarmament: Notification of nuclear tests**". It was introduced by the representative of **Australia** at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1986, and has the following sponsors: Australia, **Austria**, Cameroon, **Fiji**, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa and Sweden. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, **Bolivia**, **Botswana**, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, **Comoros**, Congo, Costa Rica, **Côte d'Ivoire**, **Cyprus**, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, **Israel**, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, **Lesotho**, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, **Malta**, Mauritius, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, **Oman**, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, **Peru**, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, **Samoa**, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, **Sri Lanka**, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, **Tunisia**, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, **Viet Nam**, Yemen, Yugoslavia, **Zaire**, Zambia

Against: France

Abstaining: Angola, Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Iraq, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, **Mexico**, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Poland, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, **Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.67 was adopted by 107 votes to 1, with 23 abstentions.*

*Subsequently the delegation of the Central African Republic advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegations of the Syrian Arab Republic and Zimbabwe had intended to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: The last **draft** resolution before us in cluster 10 is contained in document A/C.1/41/L.72, entitled "Urgent need for a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty". It was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 34th meeting of the First Committee, on 5 November 1986. The sponsors are Australia, Austria, Cameroon, Canada, **Denmark, Fiji**, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, **Malaysia**, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sweden, Thailand and Vanuatu.

Separate, recorded votes on operative paragraphs 2 and 3 have been requested.

We shall vote first on operative paragraph 2.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, **Bahrain**, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei **Darussalam**, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, **Comoros**, Costa Rica, **Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia**, Denmark, Djibouti, **Ecuador, Fiji**, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, **Maldives**, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, **Oman**, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, **Singapore**, Somalia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, **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**, Uruguay, Yemen, Zaire

Against: France

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burma, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, ~~Egypt~~, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, India, Indonesia, Israel, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan, United States of America, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslav is, Zambia

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72 was adopted by 96 votes to 1, with 35 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen, Zaire

Against: none

*Subsequently the delegations of the Central African Republic and the Syrian Arab Republic advised the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain.

Abstentions: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burma, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72 was adopted by 101 votes to none, with 30 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire

● Subsequently the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of the Central African Republic had intended to abstain.

Against: France

Abstaining: Argentina, Benin, Brazil, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Israel, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam, Zambia

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.72, as a whole, was adopted by 117 votes to 1, with 16 abstentions.*

*Subsequently the delegations of the Central African Republic and the Syrian Arab Republic advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Zimbabwe had intended to abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on delegations wishing to speak in

explanation of vote after the voting on draft resolutions in cluster 10.

Mr. SALLES (Brazil): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on the draft resolutions in cluster 10. First of all, it is to be regretted that there should be so many proposals addressing essentially the same subject. The proliferation of often conflicting texts does not contribute either to conceptual improvement or to procedural progress in the recommendations we should make to the Conference on Disarmament on such an important issue. Unfortunately, as was the case last year, my delegation was not able to support most of the draft resolutions which have just been voted upon.

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8 is a successor to other texts that drew our affirmative vote in the past because they objectively addressed in a balanced manner the negotiation proper, in the appropriate body, of a comprehensive test ban. As from last year, however, this initiative began to highlight views which constitute a departure from the previous path. As a consequence we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.35 contains some positive elements such as the recommendation that an ad hoc committee be established in the Conference on Disarmament for the multilateral negotiation of a test-ban treaty. Yet it also favours linkages and assumptions not in line with my Government's view on the matter. Therefore, we could not support this draft resolution either.

As for draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.67 and L.72, while the latter no longer even contemplates a negotiating mandate for the Conference on Disarmament, contenting itself instead with collateral measures, the former would seemingly further legitimize the tests that are being carried out by nuclear-weapon Powers by establishing a body whose task would be to monitor rather than curb those tests.

(Mr. Salles, Brazil)

Regarding the remaining text in the cluster, we supported draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.61, on the conversion of the partial test-ban Treaty into a comprehensive test-ban treaty, in the hope that it will encourage compliance with commitments undertaken by the nuclear-weapon Powers under that instrument. I would add that my Government, as we have stated time and again, is deeply committed to the multilateral negotiation of a non-discriminatory universal nuclear-weapon-test ban.

Mr. HALACHEV (Bulgaria): The Bulgarian delegation would like to explain its vote on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/41/L.35, L.61 and L.72, all of which relate to the question of nuclear tests.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches great importance to the immediate cessation and general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon testing and accordingly to the formulation and conclusion of a treaty on that subject without delay. Proceeding from that position, we agree with the main thrust of these draft resolutions and voted in favour of all of them. However, it is a matter of regret and disappointment for my delegation that none of these draft resolutions, or draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.67, reflects a hard fact that, in our view, is of great significance: that for more than a year the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has been abiding by a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. In our opinion, that step by the Soviet Union is extremely important and merits much greater attention in draft resolutions on the subject of a comprehensive test ban.

It is our strong feeling that if the other major nuclear Power joined in that moratorium we would have the necessary basis for the formulation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In our view, this is a notion that could have found a place in the language of the draft resolutions.

(Mr. Halaehov, Bulgaria)

As for draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.67, my delegation would like to express its sincere regret that we were unable to support it. In our view, the draft resolution left considerable room for unprejudiced doubt as to whether the proposed notification procedures, as formulated in the text, would not misdirect the efforts of Member States into the unproductive task of ● imply registering nuclear tests without taking action actually to stop or prohibit them.

Mr. LUNDBO (Norway): I am speaking to explain Norway's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.35, L.8, L.61 and L.67. A comprehensive test ban is an important issue on the international disarmament agenda. Efforts should be intensified with a view to concluding a test-ban treaty at an early date. A test ban must be comprehensive. It must prohibit both nuclear-weapon tests and nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. It should also be applicable to all States in all environments on a permanent basis. Such a treaty would represent a significant contribution to the aims of preventing further proliferation of nuclear weapons and of halting the nuclear-arms race.

(Mr. Lundbo, Norway)

Against that background Norway welcomed the initiation of talks between the United States and the Soviet Union on the entire scope of nuclear testing issues. Norway has further supported initiatives that would enable the Conference on Disarmament to resume its practical work on test-ban issues, in particular scope, verification and compliance.

Draft resolution L.35, introduced by Mexico, on the cessation of all nuclear-test explosions, is based on a comprehensive scope. Furthermore, it specifies concrete questions that should be dealt with at the Conference on Disarmament. We have noted with satisfaction that that draft resolution contains significant changes compared with the similar resolution adopted at the fortieth session of the General Assembly. Those changes have brought the draft resolution closer to the concept of draft resolution L.72 sponsored, among others, by Norway. For those reasons Norway voted in favour of draft resolution L.35. The draft resolution refers, however, only to the three depositary powers of the partial test-ban Treaty and omits any mention of the other two nuclear powers.

Norway has abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.8, introduced by Hungary. That draft resolution requests the Conference on Disarmament to prepare a draft treaty banning test explosions of nuclear weapons. According to that draft resolution, the treaty is supposed to contain provisions acceptable to all, preventing the circumvention of this ban by means of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

In the opinion of the Norwegian Government, it would however, in practice be impossible to work out an arrangement for undertaking nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes that would preclude the acquisition of military benefits. As regards moratoria on nuclear explosions, Norway is of the opinion that such interim

(Mr. Lundbc, Norway)

measures should be verifiable and agreed between the parties concerned and thereby contribute to the advancement of the work towards a test-ban treaty. In the opinion of the Norwegian Government a global seismological network should apply not only to a moratorium but also to a comprehensive test ban.

Norway has also abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.61, introduced by Mexico. Norway considers that it would not be feasible to consider amendments to the partial test-ban Treaty with a view to converting it into a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It would be more productive to devote all efforts to advance practical work towards resolving the outstanding issues in connection with a comprehensive test ban.

Finally, Norway voted in favour of draft resolution L.67, introduced by Australia. That draft resolution calls on all States concerned to provide to the Secretary-General relevant information concerning each nuclear explosion. In addition the Secretary-General is requested to issue an annual register of all notified test explosions. Through the Norwegian Seismic Array (NORSAR), which is one of the world's largest seismological observatories, Norway has special competence in this field. In fact, NORSAR publishes a monthly bulletin containing data concerning detected and located seismic events. At present this bulletin is distributed to seismological institutions in more than 30 countries.

Mr. KORSGAARD-PEDERSEN (Denmark) : I should like to explain my delegation's votes on draft resolutions L. 35, L.61, L.67 and L.72, all concerning the test-ban issue. The nuclear-test ban issue remains a vital question in international arms control. Agreement on a comprehensive test ban would play a key role in the prevention of further development and proliferation of nuclear weapons. Therefore we support the earliest possible conclusion of a treaty banning

(Mr. Korssgaard-Pedersen, Denmark)

all nuclear testing by all States in all environments and for all time. Those are four basic conditions a test-ban treaty must meet. A comprehensive test ban must deal in a satisfactory way with the questions of scope, verification and compliance. Denmark has therefore over the years not only voted in favour of but also co-sponsored the Australian-New Zealand draft resolution. This year it was submitted in t.72, which, in our view, offers the most constructive and realistic approach towards the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

The Swedish-Mexican draft resolution, L.35, this year has undergone certain positive developments. Although it still contains elements to which we do not subscribe fully, we have none the less voted in favour of L. 35, as we find it to be movement in the right direction. It is our hope that that development will also be reflected in the negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament and that it will be possible to establish an ad hoc committee on the question of a comprehensive test ban at the beginning of next year's session.

Denmark also cast a positive vote on L 67, the draft resolution on notification. We did that because we shared the viewpoint of the representative of Australia when he introduced the draft resolution. Of course we share the final goal of a comprehensive test ban also envisaged in draft resolution L.61, although in present circumstances we do not find that the approach suggested would be the right way forward, and we therefore abstained in the vote on it.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): The early conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is an objective of primary importance to the Australian Government. For that reason we have worked energetically at the Conference on Disarmament and elsewhere for a hard-headed and practical approach to addressing the remaining difficulties, namely, those of scope, verification and compliance.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Because the issue of a comprehensive test-ban treaty is of such universal importance we have been working towards bringing about convergence between the main approaches that have been taken on the issue as well as seeking where possible support for our own approach. In particular we have worked towards convergence between the General Assembly resolutions on A comprehensive test-ban treaty, especially between the Australia-New Zealand text and the neutral, non-aligned text, on which Mexico and Sweden have taken the lead. It is a matter of considerable gratification to us that at the current session of the General Assembly such convergence has taken a strong step forward because a number of Member States identified with each of those two draft resolutions have been able to vote positively on each other's draft resolutions.

We have particularly appreciated in this context the enormously significant role that has been played by the Ambassador of Mexico, Ambassador Al Coneo Garcia Robles, toward securing this most positive development. Having made this very important point, I am bound to explain our attitude toward one aspect of the draft resolution the text of which was given in document L. 35. This is a question of a call for a joint or separate moratorium pending the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. In other words, the terms of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution in document L. 35.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

Australia believes that there is no substitute for tackling head on the issues that have to be resolved before we can conclude a legally binding, effectively verifiable and consequently durable comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty that would bring all nuclear testing by all States to an end for all time.

Australia would be delighted if all the nuclear-weapon States separately decided to suspend their nuclear-test programmes while they negotiated, and then implemented, a régime formally and permanently to put an end to such tests - that is, if they negotiated, signed and ratified a comprehensively nuclear-test-ban treaty.

However, this is not an approach that we are prepared to advocate even though, for example, there was yesterday another nuclear test by France in the south Pacific - the fifth test that that State has conducted this year.

Our attitude of ours towards a moratorium rests on two grounds.

First, a moratorium is by definition unilateral, impermanent and not inherently verifiable. If one begins to speak of collaborative and verifiable arrangements between two or more nuclear-weapon States, the term "moratorium" becomes inappropriate. One is then speaking of working towards a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, and the draft resolution of Australia and New Zealand in L.72, and indeed the thrust of L.35, for which we voted, describes how we think we should proceed towards this objective.

Secondly, Australia considers it particularly important to find ways of securing practical progress towards a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, and it is an observable fact that most nuclear-weapon States are not attracted to declaring moratoria on nuclear testing.

With regard to draft resolution L.8, the text sponsored by some socialist countries, we abstained in the vote because, though the draft resolution given

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

considerable prominence to moratoria on nuclear testing, and for the reasons I have just described, in addition the operative part of L.8 invites the United States and other nuclear-weapon State to join a moratorium, and subsequent to doing so to set about establishing a régime to verify compliance.

Now, Australia regards confidence in the ability to verify compliance as central to arms-control and disarmament arrangements. The verification régime can be agreed before or together with the substantive limitations at issue, but not afterwards,

Secondly, L.8 refers throughout to nuclear-weapon tests. We acknowledge that paragraph 1 calls for a regime for peaceful nuclear explosions that precludes circumvention of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. But I can only reiterate that Australia's strong preference and policy objective is a treaty that bans all nuclear explosions in all environments for all time.

With regard to draft resolution L.61, containing the so-called conversion proposal, Australia abstained in the vote because of our preference to proceed towards a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty in the manner reflected by the terms of the draft resolution of which Australia was a sponsor, that is L.72. Nevertheless I should like to make it very clear that we recognize the real potential of the proposal referred to in L.61, and we certainly appreciate the work being done on it by the parliamentarians' global action.

Finally, and in conclusion, may I express the appreciation of my delegation for the votes given today on the draft resolutions Australia co-sponsored under cluster 10.

Mr. PETERS (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation would like to explain its votes on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 10, on which the committee has just taken action.

(Mr. Peters, Federal Republic of Germany)

We voted in favour of draft resolutions L.67 and L.72 to emphasize our interest in the realization of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, which we would like to see materialize at the earliest possible date. The head of the Federal Government, Chancellor Kohl, expressed this firm opinion in his letter to the six Heads of State or Government when they met in Mexico City in August of this year. What the Federal Republic of Germany advocates is a step-by-step approach. We read encouraging signs of a similar interest in this approach in the speech which the President of the United States gave before the General Assembly this autumn.

One should not mistake such a test of our intermediate measures in the direction of a comprehensive test-ban treaty as being a substitute for substantial reductions of existing nuclear arsenals. For my Government, reliable verification of any test stop, also of a limited or intermediate one, is a sine qua non for such a measure. We are convinced that the technical problems related to such verification can be solved, the necessary techniques being on the way to successful development.

An important element in this process will be a global seismic monitoring system. My delegation proposed its establishment last year in the conference on Disarmament in Geneva. We will continue to contribute to the speedy development and installation of such a system.

What we do not support, however, is the establishment of unilateral test moratoria. They compel nobody to comply, and for that reason they are not a healthy basis for a solution of the problem. We therefore did not vote for those draft resolutions that favour test moratoria of various kinds. What we advocate are legally binding, reliably verifiable undertakings of interested parties, and nothing less.

It is not of highest priority to talk or negotiate about the comprehensive test ban tomorrow, but to lay the legal and technical groundwork so that a

(Mr. Peters, Federal Republic of Germany)

comprehensive test ban can safely and swiftly be agreed upon when the essential decisions to reduce nuclear arsenals are made.

Mr. YAMADA (Japan): With respect to the draft resolution on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban, my delegation voted in favour of those in document L.72 and abstained on those in documents L.8 and L.35.

I wish to place on record the following position of Japan on the question of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban.

In the field of nuclear disarmament, the Government of Japan has always placed the highest priority on the issue of a nuclear-test ban, and has been one of the most active participants in efforts to achieve this objective in the Conference on Disarmament and elsewhere. Recognizing that a comprehensive nuclear-test ban would directly affect the national security of States, we have attached the importance of resolving the verification issue, including on-site inspection, as a prerequisite for compliance with treaty obligations.

It was from that perspective that Japan made a step-by-step proposal at the Conference on Disarmament in 1984. To follow up on that proposal, Japan proposed developing a system as part of an international seismic data exchange through which more accurate data on seismic waveforms could be shared in order to improve verification capabilities. Together with other interested countries, Japan intends to begin an exchange of such data on an experimental basis next month.

We regret that the Conference on Disarmament has for the last three years been unable to establish an ad hoc committee on a nuclear-test ban because of disagreement over its mandate. In view of the urgency of the issue, Japan sincerely hopes that the States concerned will be able to overcome their differences regarding the mandate so that we can reach early agreement on a framework for conducting substantive work on a nuclear-test ban at the coming spring session of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr McDOWELL (New Zealand) : New Zealand voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.35 that was introduced by the representative of Mexico. I am pleased to note that the delegation of Mexico and several other co-sponsors also voted for the draft resolution sponsored by Australia and New Zealand, contained in document A/C.1/41/L.74. This reciprocal support by the sponsors of the two draft resolutions is recognition of a common interest we have long shared in promoting the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We are grateful to the delegation of Mexico for modifying some elements of the draft resolution it sponsored that had prevented us from supporting similar resolutions in recent years. That was at the same time a gracious and a substantive gesture. We hope that this spirit of co-operation between the sponsors of those draft resolutions on nuclear testing will continue and be expanded next year.

Ideally the Assembly should adopt a single resolution, dealing with this vital question. On an issue as important as nuclear testing, or stopping nuclear testing, the overriding need is for co-operation within the United Nations and in the Conference on Disarmament, rather than separate votes on two or three different texts.

New Zealand wishes to say that we would have preferred the call for a moratorium on nuclear testing in operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.35 to have been more comprehensive. New Zealand recognizes that there may be more than one route to a comprehensive test ban. That draft we sponsored in document A/C.1/41/L.72 makes that clear. A moratorium can give valuable time for negotiation and can delay the danger of escalation. We believe, however, that a general call for a moratorium should apply to all five of the declared nuclear-weapon States. That belief is only reinforced by the regrettable news that

(Mr. McDowell, New Zealand)

Prance has within the last 24 hours undertaken yet another nuclear test at Mururoa Atoll.

New Zealand abstained in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.8 because, notwithstanding some improvements on the question of scope, the draft still focuses on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and does not take sufficient account of the need to ensure that a test-ban treaty is not circumvented through resort to peaceful nuclear explosions. We also have reservations about operative paragraph 5 of that draft, proposing the establishment of a seismic monitoring network following - not preceding - an agreed moratorium by all nuclear-weapon States. We do not believe that the establishment of such a network need await an actual end to testing. As is clear from operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution New Zealand sponsored, we believe that a network can be set up in advance of a test halt. At the same time, we welcome the support of most sponsors of 'draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.8 for our own draft resolution and we look forward, as I said before, to a single text next year on this vital subject.

New Zealand was unable to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.61, proposing the conversion of the partial test-ban Treaty into a comprehensive test-ban treaty. We recognize the sincerity of the sponsors; we acknowledge that this suggestion has appeal. But we do not believe that a conference to convert the partial test-ban Treaty is a realistic option at this stage. We believe that multilateral efforts to achieve a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be devoted to getting down quickly to practical work at the Conference on Disarmament. The broad support given today to the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/41/L.35 and L.72 indicates that such work is indeed possible. We are greatly encouraged by this development.

The CHAIRMAN: There are still a number of representatives wishing to speak in explanation vote after the voting on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 10: France, Sri Lanka, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Canada, Lesotho and Zimbabwe. We have an extension of only 15 minutes for this morning's meeting and I intend to adjourn after the statement by the representative of France. We shall start this afternoon with the continuation of explanations of vote after the voting on cluster 10 with Sri Lanka and requests for explanation of vote are still coming in, Mexico having already been noted.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French): I should like briefly to explain the negative vote of the French delegation on all draft resolutions relating to the question of nuclear tests in cluster 10. These various texts do not reflect, in our view, appropriate treatment of the question of nuclear tests.

The banning of nuclear tests should be within the framework of an effective process of nuclear disarmament, and this is indeed noted in paragraph 51 of the Final Document of the special session of 1978. This can only come about when progress in disarmament has made possible the laying down of the foundation of international security. It must therefore not be seen as a pre-condition nor be given priority over a very substantial reduction of the nuclear arsenals of the two most heavily armed Powers.

France, for its part, is conducting nuclear tests to maintain its deterrent force at the minimum level of credibility indispensable for its security. My delegation had occasion yesterday to recall the conditions under which France could associate itself with negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Those conditions apply, obviously, to any commitment relating to nuclear tests.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform members that, as I have already said, we shall continue at the beginning of the afternoon's meeting with explanations of vote after the voting on draft resolutions listed under cluster **10**. Then we shall hear the introduction of draft resolution **A/C.1/41/L.68/Rev.1**, listed in cluster 5, by the representative of Peru and, it is to be hoped, take a decision **on it**.

Next we shall take up draft resolutions listed under cluster 6: **A/C.1/41/L.17**, L.29, **L.66/Rev.1** and L.26. We shall go on to draft resolutions under cluster 12: **A/C.1/41/L.46/Rev.1** and L.51, to be followed by the draft resolution on the Indian Ocean contained in document **A/C.1/41/29**. Next will come cluster 9: draft resolutions **A/C.1/41/L.3** and **L.52**; and the decision proposed by the Chairman, contained in document **A/C.1/41/L.78**.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I wish to announce that Guatemala has joined the sponsors of draft resolution **A/C.1/41/L.68/Rev.1**.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.