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ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ARMS RACE AND ITS EXTREMELY HARMFUL EFFECTS ON WORLD PEACE AND SECURITY (A/C.1/L.656)
URGENT NEED FOR SUSPENSION OF NUCLEAR AND THERMONUCLEAR TESTS (A/C.1/L.651, L.652/Rev.1)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has before it three draft resolutions on which it is to vote today: under agenda item 29, the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.656; and under agenda item 36, the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.651 and L.652/Rev.1.

I should like to inform members of the Committee that Singapore has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.656 and that Nigeria has become a co-sponsor of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.

We shall turn first to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.656 on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security. Does any member wish to explain his vote before the voting?

As that appears not to be the case, I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution without objection.

The draft resolution was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. GUERRITO (Brazil): I wish to make a brief remark for the record. When the resolution on the first report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security was adopted, the Brazilian delegation abstained. At that time we made many comments on the report. Therefore we have participated in the adoption of the present draft resolution by consensus with reservations regarding operative paragraphs 1 and 2, since they pursue the same initiative of distributing and giving special emphasis to that first report.

We said at the time that we considered the initiative of having that kind of report prepared very constructive. We hope that future reports will be better than
the first. We appreciate very much the emphasis given in the draft resolution the Committee has now adopted to certain particular aspects, especially relating to the strongly armed countries and to the nuclear arms race.

Mr. HAINWORTH (United Kingdom): My delegation has just joined in the consensus and voted for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.656. My delegation has noted that that resolution gave rise to no statement of financial implications. I should none the less like to record that my delegation's positive vote was cast on the understanding that operative paragraph 6 will not be taken as a request for a further substantive document on the subject.
Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation was happy to give its support to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.656 that has just been adopted by the Committee. My country is aware -- as we have very often stated -- of the imperative need to stem the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, in order to lessen the burden that it imposes on peoples all over the world, particularly the developing nations which, concerned over improving the welfare and the standard of living of their populations, are nevertheless constrained, because of the lack of progress in the field of true disarmament, to devote a part of their basic resources to defence.

But we should like to stress one point regarding the significance that we attach to the vote that we have just cast. The resolution that was just adopted calls, in general terms, for a reduction in the military budgets of the great Powers. In the past, France itself proposed this type of reduction; we continue to believe that this is a most excellent principle which may lead to progress in disarmament. However, in view of the fact that new proposals on that specific question are included in the agenda of the General Assembly, my delegation wishes to state that we reserve our position on the modalities and the procedures that will be considered in due course. We shall then make known our position more specifically and in greater detail on the subject and we shall explain what we consider to be the conditions under which such a draft can be considered.

My delegation wishes to congratulate the Romanian delegation for its initiative and also for the constructive and generous spirit it has shown in the presentation of that draft resolution.
The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our deliberations on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.656.

We shall now turn to the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.651 and A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.

Although these draft resolutions deal with the same problem, they must as far as possible be dealt with separately. Therefore, explanations of vote before or after the vote should be addressed to the particular draft resolution that is up for vote.

May I take it that there are no more speakers who want to address themselves to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 before we begin the vote?

Mr. AKHRUND (Fakistan): Mr. Chairman, was I correct in understanding you to say that the explanation of vote for the draft resolution in documents A/C.1/L.651 and A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 must be made separately?

The CHAIRMAN: I believe that it follows from rule 130 of the rules of procedure that they ought to be made separately. I shall not, by enforcing that rule too strictly, create difficulties for representatives who have prepared statements in explanation of vote. Therefore, I said that as far as possible I would urge members to address themselves to the draft resolutions as they come up.

Mr. AKHRUND (Fakistan): In that case, I would seek your indulgence, Sir, in allowing me to make a very brief statement on my delegation's position on both draft resolutions.

I do not think that I have to say that my delegation is in full support of the idea that all nuclear tests in all environments must cease. That has been our position throughout. Therefore, we are in entire sympathy with the purposes which have animated the co-sponsors of the two draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.651 and in A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.
We are in sympathy with their intentions which we respect and which we share. However, we do feel that we have to reckon with the fact that now it has been 10 years since the partial test-ban Treaty was adopted and we have year after year adopted resolutions reflecting varying degrees of strength of feeling, urging on the Powers concerned to be good enough to stop those tests. One would wish that they would do so. My delegation is somewhat doubtful that strong language is necessarily going to have an effect on the Powers concerned.

As far as the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 is concerned, we are prepared to support it as it stands. But we should like to request a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 because here we feel that our efforts should really be aimed at creating a situation in which agreement among the parties concerned, namely the five nuclear Powers, would be facilitated, and I do not think we are going to help that process by condemning them at the outset. We know that this is a reflection of the impatience that all of us non-nuclear States feel at the fact that nuclear tests in all environments are going on. None the less, we feel that this particular language is not really appropriate. Therefore, we request a separate vote on operative paragraph 1.

With your indulgence, may I just say one word or two about the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1. We have no quarrel with this draft resolution. We find that it is a little elaborate for the occasion. We heard with great interest and sympathy the explanations offered here by the representatives who have co-sponsored this draft resolution.

(Mr. Akhund, Pakistan)
We were particularly impressed by the statement of the representative of Canada that his delegation is animated by a constructive, positive and realistic spirit. On that very account we do not think that this draft resolution passes muster because we say in paragraph 3 that the General Assembly:

"Insists that the nuclear-weapon States which have been carrying out nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere discontinue such tests forthwith;". We have heard from representatives of countries which are carrying out such tests. We must really take into account and bear in mind what they have said. Frankly, we do not think that adoption of this kind of draft is calculated to induce them to take the sort of action that we have in mind.

We have been patient, of course, but we would like not to give up at this time when a review conference is in the offing. We should like to urge them to consider the strength of feeling here. We would not like them to feel that the Committee has acted -- I do not like to say in a partisan way because that is a strong word -- but that it has used language which can be interpreted as discriminatory. We do not want them to think or to say that these draft resolutions are pieces of literature.

For that reason we shall abstain from voting on operative paragraph 3, on which, I understand, a separate vote has already been requested. If this paragraph remains in the draft resolution we shall, much to our regret, be obliged to abstain from voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): I should like to address myself only to draft resolution A/C.1/L.651; I have already spoken enough on draft resolution A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.

I wish to state that I share the sentiment expressed by the representative of Pakistan on this condemnation "once again with the utmost vigour". I do not like the rhetoric. I thought condemnation was enough. I did not know that there were different degrees of condemnation. But I wish our affirmative vote on this draft resolution to be read in conjunction with the statement which we made that if we condemn all testing we also condemn it in the hope that the four-point programme which we set out in our statement would be carried out at an early date.
The representative of Pakistan said that he was patient. I am afraid that I am not as patient as he; I am perhaps an old man in a hurry. I should like to see all nuclear weapon tests stopped at once, and also the other three steps that we outlined in our statement taken. It is that understanding that we shall cast an affirmative vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651.

With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, I have asked for a separate vote on operative paragraph 3. I think that towards the end of our meeting this morning I said that I had my doubts about my request; but I adhere to it. I wish to have a separate vote taken on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1. We shall abstain from voting on that paragraph, but we shall vote in favour of the entire draft resolution.

Mr. Chuang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Before the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.651 and A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 on the banning of nuclear tests are put to a vote, the Chinese delegation would like to explain our position.

In recent years, the question of nuclear weapons has been a matter of general concern, on which there have been various kinds of viewpoints and suggestions. But it should be noted that their motives and points of departure are quite different. In order to defend world peace and oppose the super-Powers' frenzied nuclear arms race, the numerous small and medium-size countries demand the banning of nuclear tests. Such a good desire is fully understandable. However, the so-called nuclear disarmament and nuclear test-ban propagated by the super-Powers are entirely another matter. In their contention for world hegemony, they have always used the so-called nuclear test ban to maintain their nuclear monopoly, seize nuclear supremacy and prevent other countries from possessing nuclear weapons. They themselves, however, have been desperately engaged in the development of nuclear power and in an uncontrollable nuclear arms race. In these circumstances, how can one talk about nuclear disarmament?

To be frank, the halt of nuclear tests alone does not in the least affect the colossal nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers, nor can it prevent them from continuing to improve and develop nuclear weapons, still less prohibit
them from using nuclear weapons. Not only are the super-Powers unwilling to undertake the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, but they evade the mention of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and, instead, advertise the so-called halt to nuclear tests. Is this not for the purpose of deception?

The Soviet Union, as a super-Power, is particularly energetic in this regard. When they had a need for atmospheric nuclear tests, they desperately went in for such tests; when they considered that they had conducted enough of them, they clamoured about the ban on such tests. When they are about to have conducted enough underground tests, they talk about a complete ban on all nuclear tests. Obviously, their purpose it to prevent the non-nuclear countries and countries with few nuclear weapons to possess and develop their own nuclear weapons for self-defence, and to intimidate the people of various countries into submission under their nuclear threat. This, of course, is sheer wishful thinking.

In our opinion, the proposal -- no matter who makes it and what motive he has in mind -- for an isolated ban on nuclear tests, either partial or complete, temporary or permanent, will not be a genuine measure for nuclear disarmament and can solve no problems at all, if it is not linked with the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. It can only lead into the deceptive trap set by the super-Powers.

The Soviet Union and the United States concocted in 1963 the notorious partial nuclear test ban Treaty. The Soviet Union has lauded it to the skies, describing it as "the first step towards the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons", "an important milestone on the road of freeing mankind from the threat of nuclear war" and "the first cornerstone in the edifice of universal peace and security".
That reminds us of an old Chinese saying: "A quack doctor has no good remedies." Now that a decade has elapsed, have the super-Powers reduced or increased the nuclear weapons in their possession? As is known to all, the various types of nuclear weapons in their possession have not only increased tremendously in quantity but have also been greatly improved in quality. It is reported that in the past decade they have continued to carry out hundreds of nuclear tests. The only difference is that they have switched the test site from the atmosphere to the underground. During this period, the Soviet Union has also conducted a great number of tests on various types of missiles to improve the quality of its ICBMs, and the launching of missiles to the high seas of the Pacific alone has taken place on dozens of occasions. This is a forceful refutation of the lies of the super-Powers. As some have pointed out, "The partial nuclear test ban treaty has failed to produce any restrictive effect on the development of nuclear weapons by the super-Powers and the number of their nuclear tests", and the conclusion of that treaty is "a political error". In its statement issued at the time, the Chinese Government clearly pointed out that this treaty is "a big fraud to fool the people of the world" and that by this treaty the super-Powers "attempt to consolidate their nuclear monopoly and bind the hands of all the peace-loving countries subjected to the nuclear threat".

Over the past decade history has borne out the correctness of our views. The Soviet representative accused China of negativism and lack of interest in the so-called disarmament proposal of the Soviet Union. You are right on that score. We are resolved to expose your fraud and oppose your manoeuvres and tricks of various descriptions. Failing to do so will be a disservice to the people of the world, including the Soviet people. You think that with a few slanderous labels you can muzzle us and prevent us from telling the truth. In that you will never succeed. Soviet gentlemen, you have misjudged your opponent and miscalculated.

China conducts its nuclear tests and develops its nuclear weapons entirely for the purpose of self-defence, for breaking the super-Power nuclear monopoly and for ultimately eliminating nuclear weapons in the world. Chira has been
compelled to conduct nuclear tests, which are limited in number and have been carried out in the deep interior of the country. The weather, wind direction and other conditions have been taken into full consideration, and effective measures have been adopted to prevent contamination. We have also repeatedly stated that at no time and in no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons. China is not and will never be a super-Power pursuing the policy of nuclear threat and nuclear blackmail.

China is ready at all times to stop nuclear tests, but never before the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons by the super-Powers and all the nuclear countries. Without the fulfilment of this condition, no one can possibly force us to stop the nuclear tests. In the present circumstances, in which the two super-Powers are contending for nuclear superiority and trying to divide spheres of influence by extending their nuclear umbrellas in an attempt to dominate the world, the indiscriminate and sweeping accusation of nuclear tests without differentiating their nature in effect only benefits the super-Powers' nuclear monopoly and nuclear blackmail to the detriment of the people of the world. At present, the halting of all nuclear tests without the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons can only result in preventing the non-nuclear countries and countries with few nuclear weapons from developing their own nuclear defence capabilities and will not do the slightest harm to the nuclear hegemony of the super-Powers. China has been compelled to develop nuclear weapons and conduct nuclear tests solely for the purpose of self-defence and for breaking the nuclear monopoly of the super-Powers. The Chinese Government and people are ready to work together with the people of the whole world to oppose the super-Power policies of nuclear monopoly, nuclear threat and nuclear blackmail and to attain the goal of complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

Basing itself on the above position, the Chinese delegation will vote against the two draft resolutions (A/C.1/L.651 and A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1) before us.
Mr. FALL (Senegal) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to explain its vote first on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651, but since the Chairman was kind enough to permit the members of our Committee to explain at the same time their vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, I should like to take the opportunity to do so.

My country is against anything connected with the arms race, particularly nuclear arms, which are the most dangerous and the most lethal. On the very first day my country signed the non-proliferation Treaty which came into force in March 1970, and we signed it in good faith, without any pressure, without any constraint, in the full exercise of our sovereignty. That is why in the same good faith and with the same enthusiasm we give our unreserved support to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651, which we consider to be the most in keeping with our fundamental options.

For the same reasons we have certain deep apprehensions about the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, whose incomplete, partial nature -- I would even say it is slightly tainted with hypocrisy -- does give my delegation some difficulties. I would even go so far as to say it gives us enormous difficulties.
While operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 constitutes a somewhat important step in what my delegation considers a just formulation, it is nevertheless true that the fact of leaving it to the condominium of the super-Powers to start negotiations as they deem fit for elaborating a treaty to put an end to nuclear tests which they are presently conducting seems to me to be somewhat partial in the light of the provision in operative paragraph 3 of the same draft resolution, which insists that nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere should be discontinued forthwith, and I stress the word "forthwith". Although no country is named in the draft resolution, we are all aware of what this is all about and to whom it is addressed. That is why I spoke of a taint of hypocrisy.

The carte blanche which it is proposed that we should give to certain nuclear Powers so that they can in all sovereignty decide on the fate of the whole of mankind -- because that is what is at stake -- might be justified if those super-Powers were to say to us that they also agreed to call an immediate halt to all nuclear tests and to put an end to the arms race, and if they agreed with us clearly and firmly to set time-tables for the various necessary stages in order to bring about the total destruction of the stockpiles of all nuclear arms which exist at present.

Unfortunately, the draft resolution is far from advocating such an objective. Quite the contrary, it leaves it to the interested parties "to start negotiations for elaborating a treaty designed to achieve the objective of a comprehensive test ban". Thus they alone would be the ones to determine the ways and means of conducting their dialogue, a dialogue for which they alone would be responsible. That by no means satisfies my delegation, particularly because the super-Powers do not need our authorization in order to undertake talks. They are already holding them. But what we should bear in mind is the fact that those talks might continue for too long, and the moral sanction that would be given to them by our Committee would only serve seriously to increase our own responsibility.

However, I must add that the slow pace at which those super-Powers have been undertaking their negotiations in this matter of nuclear armaments is not without certain ulterior motives. Indeed, recent events have shown us that those super-Powers can proceed much faster in their discussions when their interests or their own security is at stake.
My delegation considers that operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 is isolated from the context in which it should appear, that is to say, the general prohibition of all nuclear tests, whatever their nature and in all environments. We consider that the Committee should categorically recommend that all States put an end to all nuclear tests on land, in the atmosphere, in outer space, under water, under ground and in any other environment whatsoever and, at the same time, should call for the destruction of all existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Nuclear tests do not constitute an end in themselves. Their objective is the development and production of nuclear arms. A prominent speaker in our Organization stated one day from the rostrum of the General Assembly that the two super-Powers each possessed a nuclear arsenal that could destroy our planet a hundred times over. That might have been a simple rhetorical remark. But the tragic reality is that the possibility of being able to destroy our planet just once is a danger which none of us can contemplate without the most agonizing distress. We know that this danger does exist, that powerful nations Members of our Organization possess the means of destroying our planet and it is those Powers that continue to indulge in tests -- in what they call underground tests -- in order to perfect even further weapons which are already terrifying and which they possess.

We are all aware that no one wants to have the opportunity one day of using the nuclear arms that he has embarked upon producing. But one day or another he must take the decision to destroy them and to prevent them from causing harm; otherwise those most serious threats will continue to hang over us.

That is why my delegation considers that the Committee should view the question in its comprehensive aspect and consider as an inseparable whole both the cessation of all nuclear tests in all environments and the destruction of all nuclear arms, wherever they may be found and whatever the Power that undertakes those tests.
M. YAGUIBOU (Upper Volta) (interpretation from French): I shall be extremely brief because this is not the time for lengthy analyses but rather a time to pass our final judgement. We have to speak on the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, but my country is on principle against any arms race. On principle we are also against any nuclear tests, whether they are carried out in the atmosphere, underground or under water. We are therefore consistent with our principles.

But concerning the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 we wish to say that it has certain inner flaws which may not be obvious but which we have to denounce. We wish to state that while we approve unreservedly the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.652, which is in keeping with the deepest feelings and hopes of all peace-loving nations, we will nevertheless have to abstain on the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, and we shall do so not because we have not made up our minds on the matter, nor because we have no ambitions or hopes, but solely because once again we refuse to allow any pretence in the efforts to achieve solutions in disarmament. The sponsors of the draft resolution will, I trust, forgive me, but I have to express my feelings. I am under the impression that this draft resolution is trying to set up a double set of weights and measures. There is a kind of discrimination in it.

First of all, as the representatives of Sri Lanka and Cyprus have pointed out — and my delegation endorses their comments — we must be equitable in our judgements. We must condemn with the same force and severity all those who carry out atmospheric tests and those who more frequently carry out underground tests. To condemn one while being indifferent to, or even condoning, the other would be wrong and would make us guilty of complicity. My delegation refuses to be an accomplice to this sort of action.

Moreover, following the same line of reasoning, I would add that the danger which threatens mankind is not solely and exclusively due to the nuclear tests, whether they be underground or in the atmosphere. The dangers do not lie only in the stockpiling and the development of these diabolical weapons but, above all and to a greater degree in the very possession of such weapons. Some might read into our stand a certain complacency, if not a complex of love for the French, but I think no one can accuse my country of lining up servilely behind France. Furthermore, the representative of France is able to attest to this with all
the frankness and objectivity which we know to be characteristic of him. Therefore my delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.

We are happy that its sponsors have tried to arrive at a compromise but nevertheless we find that the goals sought appear in the preamble, and we note that instead of covering nuclear tests in the atmosphere, underground and underwater -- that is, tests in all environments -- that preamble refers only to tests in the atmosphere. It is true that the sponsors have tried to take up all of them, because in operative paragraph 2 they call upon all nuclear-weapon States to seek the end of all nuclear weapon tests in all environments. But this statement, timid both in substance and in form, does not satisfy my delegation. We prefer to stand behind those who take a clearer and firmer stand.

My last comment is on the role which the States Members of the United Nations must adopt in the maintenance and preservation of peace. We believe very sincerely that the survival of mankind should not depend on the goodwill of the five permanent members of the Security Council or on the goodwill of the two super-Powers. That is what is happening in fact, and what some are trying to encourage. Recent events in the Middle East have proved to us that it is sufficient for the two super-Powers to meet for everything to fall into place -- almost. And the rest of us have but to accept the diktat of the two super-Powers. My delegation feels that such a situation is singularly shocking, and our Organization should adopt measures to avoid having peace or war rest in the hands of a restricted group of nations which deliberately and constantly violate the basic principles of our Organization.

Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (interpretation from French): The various reports on nuclear disarmament bring out clearly that certain Powers have already accumulated the means for the total destruction of our planet. In the light of this the arms race is getting worse, and means of perfection of this arms race seem to us futile, illogical and unnatural. But this is the situation which, unhappily, prevails throughout the world.

In accordance to the non-proliferation Treaty, the Government of the Republic of Mali hoped that that Treaty would not have been interpreted as an option to
to transfer technology for experiments which, even if they were held underground, in no way minimize the danger that the atomic weapon represents for our destiny. Of course those countries which are operating in the field of nuclear experiments have even more reason to draw the attention of the international community to the serious threats which they involve, but can we therefore reasonably condemn nuclear tests in the atmosphere and give a bonus to those which have been conducted underground, particularly if one bears in mind that the latter not only undermine a goal which we have set for ourselves - which is, if not the destruction of existing stockpiles, at least as an initial step, the banning of tests of whatever nature. To this end, since explanations have been offered on all sides, and since we do not want to prolong this debate, my delegation is ready to vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 because of the clarity and vigour of its language.

As I have just said, the Government of Mali acceded to the Treaty in the hope that it would put an end to all nuclear tests in whatever form. For the same reason, although we were appreciative of the reasons given us, the sponsors of the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 will find it easy to understand that we cannot proceed in the same way with regard to their text for two reasons.
I have just explained the first. The second is that, in the view of my delegation, the adoption of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.651 does in fact cover the objectives pursued in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, unless, as some delegations have pointed out, the text touches on questions which may give rise to tremendous controversy. But, for the reason I have indicated — that is to say, that we are perfectly well aware of the situation prevailing in the countries directly threatened by atmospheric nuclear tests, particularly in the Pacific Ocean — my delegation will abstain from voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1. In doing so and in the light of the explanations I have just given, I would simply like to say that I have tried to respect the principles which my Government cherishes.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before explaining our vote on the draft resolutions which are before us, I should like to make a few comments with regard to the statement of the representative of the Chinese People's Republic. The Chinese representative said that he would vote against all draft resolutions which provide for the limitation or the prohibition or the cessation of nuclear tests. That did not surprise us at all. If we look at the votes taken on the relevant draft resolutions last year, at the last session of the General Assembly, we see that the delegation of the Chinese People's Republic, along with just four other delegations, voted against all the draft resolutions without exception. Whatever explanations may be given for this here, they cannot hide the total refusal of China to co-operate in international activities on disarmament.

At one of the previous meetings I already pointed out that the representative of the Chinese People's Republic has stated that China will refuse to participate in any international activities designed to limit the arms race. Today once again it has called the Moscow partial test ban Treaty a deception. This Treaty, which more than 100 States signed and in which they participate, is an extremely important Treaty which sets limits with the object of protecting the atmosphere from noxious radioactive fall-out. The representative of the Chinese People's
Republic calls this Treaty a deception and at the same time continues, despite public opinion in the overwhelming majority of countries of the world, to carry out atmospheric tests, thus poisoning the atmosphere of the earth with radioactive fall-out, which has a very bad effect on the health of the people not only of the Chinese People's Republic but of all States of the world and primarily neighbouring States, that is, the Mongolian People's Republic, Japan, the Soviet Union, India and so on.

The Chinese People's Republic has also refused to participate in other agreements. I would mention only the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the ban on bacteriological weapons, the ban on the emplacement on the sea-bed and the ocean floor of means of mass destruction and so on. The point is -- and I should like to stress this -- that the Charter obliges Members of the Organization to co-operate in matters of arms limitation. Article 11 provides that the General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles. I must say this is one of the fundamental provisions of the Charter, and it is being totally disregarded by the leadership of the Chinese People's Republic. On every single measure which has the goal of limiting armaments or ending the arms race or finding ways of putting an end to other dangerous manifestations in connexion with the arms race -- the representative of the Chinese People's Republic, unfortunately, categorically refuses to undertake any of these actions.

At one time the Soviet Union proposed the convening of a conference of the five nuclear Powers to consider the whole complex of problems of nuclear weapons in order to seek an agreement on the limitation and cessation of the arms race and the elimination of the threat of nuclear war. I must say that the leadership of the Chinese People's Republic has disregarded those proposals and undermined that extremely important measure. It has asserted, as it has done again today, that it is a deception of States, that it is an attempt to resolve questions behind the backs of the non-nuclear countries. The Soviet Union proposed the convening of a world disarmament conference so that all States of the
world, nuclear and non-nuclear, could take part, but at the present time we come up against the extremely unsatisfactory phenomenon that from 1972 to 1973, from the last session of the General Assembly right up to this session of the General Assembly, it has not been possible to do anything in the way of making progress in the convening of a world disarmament conference. Why? Because the representative of the Chinese People's Republic has entirely refused to co-operate in this matter and has entirely refused to take steps to promote the convening of the world disarmament conference. Therefore these statements we have heard today certainly did not surprise us and I should like to stress that all these statements and the whole conduct of the Chinese People's Republic in the matter of disarmament are not in keeping with the most important principle of the Charter, that is to say, international co-operation in the search for ways and means of disarmament and limiting the arms race. What we come up against here is obstruction. We come up against a negative attitude and we come up against what is in substance sabotage of a measure whose purpose is to find a solution for one of the most important problems, that of limiting the arms race and of disarmament.

That concludes my comments on the statement of the representative of the Chinese People's Republic. Now, with your permission, Sir, I should like to give an explanation of the position of the Soviet Union on the question of the halting of nuclear tests, in connexion with the forthcoming vote on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.651 and L.652/Rev.1.

The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the question of prohibiting nuclear weapons. As we have already pointed out in our statement in the Committee on 26 October this year, the Soviet Union defends the demands for the cessation everywhere and by everyone of nuclear tests, including underground tests. The Soviet Union has expressed its readiness to participate in agreements on this problem, bearing in mind that the necessary control over the observance of such a cessation under the agreement would be carried out by national means of detection and identification. We have pointed out also that in order to create full guarantees for the effectiveness of an agreement on the cessation of all nuclear tests, including underground tests, the Soviet Union is ready to co-operate in an exchange of seismological data within the framework of an agreement and with the observance of certain conditions for such an exchange.
In striving to achieve the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons, the USSR supported at the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly a resolution containing an appeal to all nuclear Powers to halt testing of such weapons in all environments. This proposal was submitted by the representative of Saudi Arabia, Ambassador Baroody, who is here among us. However, a solution to this problem is being complicated by the reluctance of certain Powers to take a decision on this question.

In the draft resolution submitted to the Committee by the seven Powers (A/C.1/L.651), we find an appeal to the nuclear Powers to call a halt to the testing of nuclear weapons by means of an agreement, either through a unilateral or agreed moratorium.

The Soviet Union considers that by means of a moratorium, and particularly a unilateral moratorium, we cannot possibly solve this problem. This kind of decision would lead only to the granting of one-sided benefits to the advantage of certain States, and to the detriment of others, as a result of which there would be a violation of the principle of equal security of States. Therefore, the Soviet delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651, as indeed it abstained in the voting on what was essentially a similar resolution -- resolution 2934 (XXVII) of the last session of the General Assembly. We shall also abstain on the draft resolution of the 16 Powers (A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1).

In connexion with that draft resolution, we would like to point out that the Soviet Union fully shares the concern expressed by its sponsors with regard to the continuing tests of nuclear weapons, particularly in the atmosphere, and we express our full solidarity with the aspiration to ensure the adherence of all nuclear States to the Moscow partial test-ban Treaty. We also share in the appeal in this draft resolution for the immediate cessation of the testing of nuclear weapons in all environments.

At the same time, we find in the draft resolution a number of provisions which in essence amount to attempts to impose responsibility for the lack of progress in calling a halt to nuclear testing upon the Soviet Union as well. The Soviet Union cannot agree with this approach and therefore, as I have already indicated, we cannot approve the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.
Mr. KAMARAHE (Sierra Leone): The delegation of Sierra Leone will make a few remarks on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651. As far as my delegation is concerned, I do not think we have any problem with this draft resolution including the form of words used. In relation to operative paragraph 1, which condemns vigorously or with utmost vigour -- whatever one may wish to make of it -- I think the important thing is that we are condemning. Whether it would be "utmost vigour" or "vigorously", or whatever words may be used, I think it is just a form of words. But the fact is that we condemn, and we shall continue to condemn, until our aim is achieved.

With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, as far as the Sierra Leone delegation is concerned there are three paragraphs that are controversial, more particularly operative paragraph 3. But let me read paragraphs 1 and 2 and then make a few assumptions and see how we can relate this to paragraph 3. I regret having to take up the time of the Committee, but I want to make sure that we all understand what we are talking about. When you accuse somebody of being a hypocrite or impartial, you have to find out the aspect of impartiality or hypocrisy. Operative paragraph 1 states the following:

"Emphasizes its deep concern at the continuance of nuclear weapon tests, both in the atmosphere and underground" -- this is important -- "and at the lack of progress towards a comprehensive test ban agreement;". This actually shows that in the first place we are generalizing. We are condemning generally the tests in the atmosphere and underground, whoever may be responsible for them. We condemn all those tests. Then, coming to operative paragraph 2, it reads as follows:

"Calls anew upon all nuclear-weapon States to seek, as a matter of urgency, the end of all nuclear weapon tests in all environments;".

What more can we say? I ask those who object to this draft resolution what interpretation they place on "all environments"?

Now we come to the specifics, and this is what strikes us most because in condemning the other nuclear Powers, they thought that it was a bit decent to go underground. If you cannot fight somebody out in the open, that is why they say you have underground movements. You have some people who are engaged in underworld affairs. They decided to go underground. At least this would not be as dangerous as tests in the atmosphere.
So we insist that the nuclear-weapon States -- not accusing any one State -- which have been carrying out nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere discontinue such tests forthwith. It is as simple as that. We condemn all nuclear weapon tests, both underground and in the atmosphere. We condemn all nuclear weapon tests in all environments. But this touches us most because they are polluting the air. The pollution which the capitals of developed nations are already producing is enough to create severe headaches and cancer, and all the rest. These nuclear Powers which are sending their weapons into the atmosphere create more difficulty for the human environment. That is all we wanted and that is what we have stated. We are not pointing an accusing finger at anybody.

This reminds me of an African proverb which says: There were animals in a particular room. They were all thirsty and they wanted to drink some water. And somebody made a suggestions: let the ugliest go for water outside. And the chimpanzee started crying because he knew he was the ugliest. This is the position in which we find ourselves.

We are not accusing anybody, but we find that those who are responsible or who are guilty have taken offence. Now, let me remind the Committee of the resolutions that were adopted during the time that a particular nation -- I do not want to name the particular nation -- was carrying out tests in the atmosphere in the Sahara. This was in Africa and that particular nation was far away from Africa. This affected the Africans and we shouted, protested, adopted resolutions and condemned. But then this was not hypocrisy; this was not discriminatory. Now, just because this does not affect us directly, or affects particular nations directly, they think that this is discriminatory.

I think there must be some realism in committees. If we condemn one thing today because it affects us, and if the same thing comes in tomorrow and affects another person, let us condemn it. Let us be frank in whatever we do and not be part of, or guided by, world Powers or intimidated into taking certain actions which within ourselves we know are not right.
So, then, if in those years we could condemn a particular nation for testing in the atmosphere in the Sahara, why cannot we condemn that nation for testing in the atmosphere in the Pacific or Indian Ocean, or wherever it may be testing? We are not accusing Senegal or Singapore, or whatever country it may be; we are accusing whoever is responsible for testing in the atmosphere. This is what the co-sponsors of this draft resolution have sought; this is what we want.

M. OBAHÉ (Gabon) (interpretation from French): I believe it necessary to explain the meaning of the vote that my delegation intends to cast on the two draft resolutions before us. I should therefore immediately state that in its thinking Gabon associates itself with the concerns of the co-sponsors of the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.651 and A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 concerning the urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. As a matter of fact, these two texts are a valuable addition to the general efforts thus far undertaken for the purpose of saving our world from the many aspects of nuclear and thermonuclear danger.

However, my delegation cannot disguise its disappointment at noting how incomplete these drafts are, and because of this fact we find ourselves, unfortunately, constrained to vote against them.

The role entrusted to the Committee is that of seeking ways and means of saving mankind from any nuclear or thermonuclear catastrophe. To achieve that aim, it seems to us perfectly clear that the United Nations in general, and the atomic Powers in particular, have available to them a single solution that can be summarized as follows:
First, to sweep the world clear of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons by carrying out a systematic destruction, under international control, of all stockpiles accumulated since the Second World War;

Second, to prohibit, immediately and collectively, any new tests that would risk the return in our society of a danger that is supposed to have been banished.

Gabon feels that, considered thus, the draft resolutions before us could have had the double advantage of showing that our profoundest wish is to continue to live in a world at one and the same time free from the fear of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and certain that such weapons would never again appear.

For we believe that to live surrounded by arsenals of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons that can be used at any moment and at any place without our advice being sought, is far more dangerous than the simple fear of one day, perhaps, drawing a breath of contaminated air.

We are all adults in this room, and we all know full well that a nuclear or thermonuclear conflagration capable of destroying the world cannot come from any experimental testing range, but that rather it will be the result of the use and stockpiling of such weapons by the various general staffs throughout the world.

From the foregoing, my delegation considers that to vote in favour of the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.651 and A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 would imply merely that we are arrogating to ourselves the power to endorse the division of the world in which we live into two blocs: the bloc of the privileged nations entitled to possess at all times nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, and the other bloc, comprising all the rest of mankind, whose life expectancy would thus depend exclusively on the mere whims of a minority of States.

Therefore, since we have not been given any such broad mandate, my delegation will vote against the above-mentioned draft resolutions.
Mr. CREMIN (Ireland): In explaining the vote of my delegation on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.651 and A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, I would recall the attitude we have consistently adopted over the years in relation to the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons and the cessation of all forms of nuclear tests in all environments.

As long ago as 1958 the Irish delegation, acting alone, put forward a proposal to confine nuclear weapons to the then nuclear-weapon States, a proposal which was in fact adopted 10 years later in the non-proliferation Treaty. In those earlier years we also pleaded for the cessation of all nuclear tests, and we warmly welcomed the partial test-ban Treaty concluded in Moscow in 1963. Since then, we have voiced serious concern at the delay in arriving at a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

However, for the first time in very many years we have felt unable to join in co-sponsoring a draft resolution calling for the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. We have not done so because we do not like the terms in which these texts are couched. In particular we do not like operative paragraph 3 of the draft contained in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.

In the first place we consider the language too peremptory. Secondly, the content of this paragraph is clearly embraced in operative 2 and the paragraph is therefore redundant. Moreover, we share the view expressed by the representative of Sri Lanka on 12 November that the provisions of operative paragraph 3 are discriminatory. And we have also been impressed by his contention that, by contrast with operative paragraph 2, operative paragraph 3 lays undue stress on tests in the atmosphere as compared with underground tests.

For those reasons the Irish delegation will oppose this paragraph in a separate vote.
Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (interpretation from French): As can be seen in the records of our debate at this session and the debate during the last session of the General Assembly, my delegation opposes nuclear testing of whatever nature and in whatever environment. For that reason my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651. This, however, does not mean that we entirely endorse its language.

With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, if I understand correctly a separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 3. In that separate vote my delegation will abstain. It is our view that operative paragraph 2 of that draft, with regard to all nuclear tests, makes operative paragraph 3 superfluous, and that this is only detrimental to the rest of the draft resolution as a whole. We shall therefore abstain in the vote on operative paragraph 3.
Mr. MISHRA (India): If there had not been a request for a separate vote on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 there would have been no need for me to explain our vote this afternoon. Since such a proposal has been made it is necessary for me to say a few words.

Speaking in this Committee on 8 November 1973 I explained our position on a comprehensive test ban in these words:

"In the first instance, the provisions of the partial test-ban Treaty should be fully observed, and those nuclear-weapon States which have not yet adhered to that Treaty should do so without any further excuse or delay. Second, whatever be the differences on the issue of verification of a ban on underground nuclear weapon tests, and notwithstanding any other considerations, all testing of nuclear weapons in all environments must be immediately suspended. Third, a comprehensive test ban has two aspects: first, all nuclear-weapons tests in all environments should be prohibited; and second, all nuclear-weapon States should be parties to it." (1953rd meeting, pp. 41 and 42)

There are some other sentences in my statement of 8 November on the comprehensive test ban but they are not relevant in the context in which I am speaking today.

In view of what I have just reiterated, we find acceptable the ideas contained in operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 and operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1; therefore we will support both draft resolutions.

However, operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 tends to weaken our position; therefore we shall abstain on that paragraph. It is not that we do not want all nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere to be stopped immediately -- India's position could hardly be that -- but that we want all tests in all environments to be stopped forthwith.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): I too shall have to ask the Chairman's indulgence, since I shall be addressing myself to both draft resolutions at the same time.

My delegation agrees with the sense of both draft resolutions (A/C.1/L.651 and L.652/Rev.1) in so far as they stress the need for progress towards a comprehensive test ban. We therefore regret that we cannot vote in favour of either.
With respect to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651, we consider that the assertion in operative paragraph 2 is not compatible with our position that the question of verification is central to and inseparable from the consideration of the test-ban issue. The draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 seems to imply in operative paragraph 5 that negotiations on a comprehensive test ban should take place regardless of whether a proper foundation for agreement exists. We believe that such pressures to start elaborating a treaty while deadlock remains over the complex verification issue could lead only to an empty diplomatic exercise, without advancing the cause of a comprehensive test ban.

In this connexion I should like to emphasize that, while we seek a basis for negotiating a comprehensive test ban, my Government continues to place the highest value on the limited test ban Treaty of 1963, banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. We subscribe wholeheartedly to operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, urging States which have not yet adhered to the Treaty to do so without further delay.

Although the United States is unable to support these draft resolutions, we fully appreciate the sincerity of the many delegations that are working towards our common objective of a comprehensive test ban treaty. I wish to reaffirm my country's long-standing commitment to work towards the cessation of all nuclear weapon tests, pursuant to an adequately verified treaty -- a commitment which was recently restated in President Nixon's 1973 report to the Congress on United States foreign policy.

Mr. ADJIBADE (Dahomey) (interpretation from French): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651, since the ideas therein expressed follow the lines of the principle to which my Government attaches great importance, namely, the condemnation of any nuclear weapon tests, regardless of where they take place and regardless of the nation carrying out such tests. We believe also that it is imperative to put an end immediately to all nuclear weapon tests. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution. However, that vote should not be taken as indicating any hostility towards any country but merely as the expression of a principle that we hold very dear.
With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, we feel, like other delegations, that operative paragraph 3 is discriminatory and we should have preferred the wording of the paragraph to be improved. But since we cannot arrive at a better wording, for matters of principle it is difficult for my delegation not to support the draft resolution. Hence, although paragraph 3 is not entirely satisfactory to my delegation, we shall nevertheless vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. RIVERO (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): As members of the Committee are aware, Peru has consistently maintained a clear stand on this matter: opposition to any type of nuclear testing, regardless of the environment in which it is carried out, and thus my delegation has consistently supported the resolutions of the General Assembly calling for the immediate cessation of such tests.

My delegation agrees with the views expressed by others that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 is balanced and in no way discriminatory. It refers to all types of tests. It is realistic for, instead of discriminating, it rather highlights the immediate cessation of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere. That is a well-founded approach because, from many reports that have been submitted by scientific authorities all over the world, including the United Nations Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, it is common knowledge that the historic radioactive accumulation and fall-out are specific dangers that must be urgently avoided.
Lately it has been argued that radio-active fall-out in small doses is not a danger. But this is still a hypothetical argument. It certainly has not been confirmed by scientific findings. It has not been proved that the gradual accumulation of small doses is not noxious to future generations. And that very doubt must lead us from a sense of an humanitarian approach to call for an immediate cessation of atmospheric tests.

Furthermore, nuclear explosions in the atmosphere acquire a political and legal aspect when they are carried out over ocean space that is shared by a number of countries, or when they are carried out over the populations of Non-Self-Governing Territories, or again when they are carried out despite the appeals of friendly Governments and peoples. This has been the case for the tests carried out in the South Pacific. But this fact is so obvious that more than 70 Heads of State and Government of the non-aligned nations in the Political Declaration of the Fourth Summit Conference of Algiers demanded, I say, an immediate stop to all tests and particularly to atmospheric tests programmed and carried out on the atoll of Mururoa in the South Pacific.

In conclusion, because these draft resolutions reflect the fundamental principles that underlie the position of Peru, my delegation will support them and vote in favour of them.

Mr. DI BERNARDO (Italy): I refer first to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651.

The Italian Government has always taken an active interest in and constantly contributed to the negotiations aimed at a comprehensive test ban. Accordingly, its position in the field has always been consistent with the principles and rules contained in the Moscow Treaty of 1963 which remains a milestone in the process towards nuclear disarmament. However, we doubt that drastic expressions of condemnation -- without taking into due account objective difficulties, such as those concerning the matter of effective controls of a test-ban treat -- may contribute positively to the present negotiations and
help in the efforts which, we hope, would lead to the adoption of international measures towards nuclear disarmament.

For these reasons, though we appreciate the intentions and though we share the aims that have inspired the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 in front of us, the Italian delegation will abstain.

The Italian delegation will abstain also on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1. It is my intention briefly to clarify the reasons that motivate the abstention of the Italian delegation so that it may not be interpreted in any way as an expression of lack of interest on the part of the Italian Government on the fundamental question of the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. On the contrary, Italy has constantly and actively participated in the discussion and in the negotiations aimed at achieving a complete test ban. Furthermore, and I wish to stress this point, my Government has on many occasions -- as was the case last year when we voted in favour of resolution 2934 (XXVII) A and B -- expressed its support for resolutions containing balanced recommendations and fairly indicating appropriate ways and means which might help us in achieving our common goal.

After careful examination of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, I must say that, although we appreciate the aim clearly expressed by its co-sponsors to encourage and to stimulate common efforts towards the achievement of a complete test ban, we cannot share, however, certain expressions that in our view create an imbalance in its operative paragraphs. Furthermore, it seems to us that operative paragraph 5 does not take into due account the important efforts -- unfortunately, fruitless up to now -- made by many countries during the negotiations taking place at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, as well as some objective difficulties that appeared in the course of such negotiations with regard to the possibility of adopting effective means of control of an underground test ban.
Mr. GUERRREIRO (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651, since we support the objectives sought in that draft. Last year, my delegation had the opportunity of casting a positive vote on resolution 2934 C (XXVII), the aims and language of which were similar to those of the draft now before the First Committee.

I should note, however, that my delegation believes that operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 contains a clause, "whatever may be the differences on the question of verification," which in our view should not be construed as prejudging the substance of such a question, but as asserting the possibility and need of solving it.

In addition, it is obvious that our favourable vote at this time does not entail any change in the Brazilian position on parts of certain resolutions referred to in the third paragraph of the preamble of the draft, namely, resolutions 2663 (XXV), 2828 (XXVI) and 2934 (XXVII), on which we had abstained at the time of their adoption and for reasons that are a matter of record.

I wish to emphasize also that my delegation does not interpret the second paragraph of the preamble as implying the adoption at this moment of a position that would necessarily preclude the participation in the conference on the revision of the non-proliferation Treaty of States that are not parties to that Treaty.

As to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, we will vote in favour of it consistent with our voting record in previous Assemblies.
Mr. METTERNICH (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on the two draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.651 and L.652/Rev.1.

My delegation would have liked to vote in favour of both draft resolutions because the aim expressed in them coincides with the policy of my country on this important issue. But, in view of the difficult problems involved, we felt that the language should have been more balanced.

As to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 let me add that my delegation has appreciated the very considerable efforts of the co-sponsors to find a commonly acceptable wording.

In order to prevent many misunderstandings on the arms control policy of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, let me make it quite clear that we are in favour of the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests, both in the atmosphere and under ground; we are in favour of universal accession to the 1963 Treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, and we support the efforts for a speedy conclusion of a comprehensive treaty banning nuclear-weapon tests in all environments.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I can hardly add anything more constructive to the statement made by the representative of Senegal in explanation of his vote on the two draft resolutions regarding the urgent need for the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests.

The emphasis is on the words "urgent need". We fully concur with the letter and spirit of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651. We shall cast an affirmative vote on this draft resolution, which is at once comprehensive, unequivocal and self-explanatory. It should have been the only draft resolution on this item during this session of the Assembly.

I shall make it clear why we cannot support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1. This draft resolution has two enigmatic paragraphs. Operative paragraph 3 places at a disadvantage two permanent member States of the Security Council which, with the three other permanent members of the Council, have the primary responsibility for maintaining world peace in accordance with the Charter. The United States and the Soviet Union have completed the carrying out of nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere and can afford to discontinue such tests. This is not the case in so far as China and France are concerned.
This does not mean that I am condoning tests in the atmosphere, by any Power for that matter. However, let us face the facts realistically. It seems -- and I stand to be corrected -- that neither France nor China wishes to place itself at the mercy of the two other nuclear Powers, namely, the United States and the Soviet Union. I do not know about the United Kingdom -- are you still, Mr. Jamieson, carrying out tests? I think it depends on the United States. I repeat, it seems that neither France nor China wishes to place itself at the mercy of the other nuclear Powers, namely, the United States and Russia. When we find these two Powers, France and China, harbouring such distrust as we gather from the statements made by them, not only in this Committee but in other bodies of the United Nations, we should take their distrust seriously, because that distrust stems from their conviction.

Now we come to paragraph 5 of this draft resolution, which reads:

"Vigorously urges the States members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, especially those which are nuclear-weapon States and parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, immediately to start negotiations for elaborating a treaty designed to achieve the objective of a comprehensive test ban."

The phraseology of that paragraph puts the emphasis on negotiations for a treaty to achieve the objective of a comprehensive test ban. Emphasis should also be placed on the word "comprehensive". I submit that there is no assurance whatsoever that the nuclear Powers will come to an agreement as a result of such negotiations. Furthermore, how long will such negotiations take? One year? Two years? Three years?

It seems only yesterday -- Mr. Garcia Robles will bear me out because we were both working on the same subject, although separately, but with the same objective -- that both our draft resolutions were voted upon in the General Assembly. I refer to the year 1971. And here I must thank the office of this Committee for having furnished me with the record of what took place then. I refer to the session of two years ago, in other words 1971, and this is from the record:
"On 19 November Saudi Arabia submitted a draft resolution, later revised by the General Assembly, by which the General Assembly would appeal to the nuclear Powers to desist from carrying out further nuclear tests of any kind, urge them to reach agreement on the cessation of all tests without delay, and request them not to deploy such weapons of mass destruction.

"On 9 December the First Committee adopted this draft resolution, and later the General Assembly adopted it by recorded vote."

That was two years ago, and with the Chairman's permission, I shall read part of that resolution, which was adopted. It was a draft resolution at that time -- a revised draft, the number of which was A/C.1/L.583/Rev.1.
It reads as follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Noting that one of the first steps for the strengthening of international security is to dissipate world-wide fears that nuclear, thermonuclear and other weapons of mass destruction may be used by miscalculation in what could appear to be a desperate situation" --

And we were told only a few weeks ago that we had almost had a desperate situation. Do I have to remind you what happened only a few weeks ago, when the United States sent the Sixth Fleet to the Mediterranean, when they put their aerial forces on the alert and allegedly the Soviet Union was on the point of sending troops to the Middle East, and how both parties rattled their nuclear weapons? They were not going to shoot each other with bullets. Many people were scared. Miscalculation: do not dismiss it. Every day that passes may confront us with miscalculation. I shall proceed to show you that nothing has changed, though perhaps it has deteriorated. I now continue to read the resolution:

"Considering that for the last few years the United Nations has been preoccupied with finding ways and means of diminishing the pollution of the earth's atmosphere" --

What is all this talk about pollution from cars and the chimneys of Consolidated Edison and I know not what else?

"Noting that scientists have been unanimous on the conclusion that the fall-out from nuclear tests is injurious to human and animal life and that such fall-out may poison the earth's atmosphere for many decades to come,

"Taking into account that underground nuclear and thermonuclear tests may not only create serious health hazards but may also cause as yet undetermined injury to humans and animals of the region where such tests are conducted,

"Recognizing that there already exist sufficient nuclear, thermonuclear and other lethal weapons of mass destruction in the arsenals of certain
Powers to decimate the world's population and possibly render the earth uninhabitable" --
and today our colleague from Senegal mentioned that the arsenals may contain weapons that could destroy a hundredfold the population of this planet.
And now come the operative paragraphs:

"1. Appeals to the nuclear Powers to desist from carrying out further nuclear and thermonuclear tests, whether" -- and here is the emphasis -- "underground, under water or in the earth's atmosphere;

"2. Urges the nuclear Powers to reach an agreement on the cessation of all nuclear and thermonuclear tests without delay;

"3. Reassures the peoples of the world that the United Nations will continue to raise its voice against nuclear and thermonuclear tests of any kind and earnestly requests the nuclear Powers not to deeply such weapons of mass destruction."

That resolution was adopted two years ago. Has any progress been made since 1971? There has been no progress.

And again our illustrious colleague from Mexico involves himself with others in trying to repeat -- as we say in Arabic, "Bil i'aadah ifadah", "By repetition there is benefit" -- the same thing he and I said two years ago on behalf of all of us, not just García Robles or Baroody. We belong to small Powers and we can speak with a clear conscience, fearing nobody except our Creator or, if we are atheists, nature.

Let us assume we can allow ourselves to be optimistic about an eventual treaty. Who can assure us small nations that the nuclear Powers will not by unspecified technological means -- mind you, they need not have any tests in the atmosphere, under water or underground; Remember, the resolution named only three types of tests: atmospheric tests, underground tests and underwater tests -- I repeat: who can assure us that the nuclear Powers will not by unspecified technological means continue clandestinely to devise new nuclear weapons, more potent and more sophisticated than they already have in their secret arsenals? What assurance do we have? Should we, then, if one of them, using one of those devices that detect, by whatever unspecified technological means, that certain nuclear weapons have been devised, have another pourparler, other negotiations to include those tests in another treaty? This is interminable.
Whom are they fooling here? We are human beings with brains, although we do not belong to big Powers. We stand for humanity, and you stand only for your dirty national interests here. Dare you say, "No, Baroody"? I would take you up on that.

Is it not enough that you destroyed Nagasaki and Hiroshima? Have you not been chastened by your guilt? Is it not enough that conventional weapons can also destroy the world? Do you want to destroy the animals and the plants too? What has the animal kingdom done to you? And you have here in the host country societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals. What about us human beings? The potential proverbial sword of Damocles hangs over the head of every creature, be it a homo sapiens or a criminal. We stand for the rights of the criminal.

Well, the prescription for the resolution of this whole question, which is bedevilling all of us, is not farfetched. I will tell you what the prescription is. It is, first of all, genuine goodwill, not negotiations. The second ingredient of the prescription is mutual trust. And both those elements elements are lacking. And everything you do, you nuclear Powers, will not deceive us.

All else is illusory, a mirage of fond expectation. Many of you do not know what a mirage is. You must go to the desert. People crossing the desert in a caravan are thirsty; they are so thirsty and they do not know whether they have strayed in the desert. They begin to see mirages. Perhaps we now use the word in a literary sense, but they actually see water in the distance -- water that does not exist. And here you want to make us human beings -- regardless of our ideology, nationality, race, religion or political persuasion -- develop along with you, a mirage of expectation. You are human beings, like us. And we feel that your people and our people are brothers, because we are all brothers under the skin. And you come and talk about treaties.

If I were young -- oh, if I were young I would rouse the people to take issue with their Governments. But the people are preoccupied with making a living and have no time to think, and we should think on their behalf.

Therefore, although I applaud the purpose and intent of those who sponsored the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, I feel the resolution I referred to earlier is adequate and I shall vote against this one.
Mr. WODAJO (Ethiopia): Although the two draft resolutions taken separately do not fully reflect our position on the urgent need to discontinue all nuclear test explosions in all environments, we believe that taken together they reflect adequately our position. For that reason we shall vote affirmatively on both draft resolutions.

We believe that 10 years after the conclusion of the partial test ban agreement, and particularly after 10 years of urging for the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban agreement that would ban underground testing as well, no useful purpose would be served at this stage by making a distinction between atmospheric and underground testing. For that reason we have certain reservations with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.

Having said that, we do appreciate the fact that if all States abstained from carrying out test explosions in the atmosphere, that in itself would create strong pressure on those States that still carry out underground testing. We also appreciate the immediate effect of atmospheric testing on polluting the environment.

Therefore, the vote that we shall cast on the two draft resolutions should be regarded as a vote that reflects our position when these two drafts are taken together.

Mr. NAHDAN (Fiji): My delegation wishes briefly to exercise its right of reply to some of the statements made with respect to one of the draft resolutions.

We heard with interest the well conducted orchestration this afternoon expressing a particular point of view, though perhaps for different reasons, on aspects of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1. The refrain, however, has been the same. Those delegations all support the end of nuclear tests in all environments, but they will not support a draft resolution which calls for just that, the excuse being that there is a difference in emphasis in the draft resolution. Such contentions are irreconcilable. One representative had the audacity to allege that the draft resolution was tainted with hypocrisy. Referring to operative paragraph 3, that same representative said:
"Although no country is named in the draft resolution, we are all aware of what this is all about and to whom it is addressed. That is why I spoke of a taint of hypocrisy." (supra, p. 21)

I am glad, first of all, that he understands the intent and purport of operative paragraph 3, at least as far as my delegation is concerned. Therefore, by saying that that part of the draft resolution is tainted with hypocrisy, he is really saying that all those who show regional concern or concerns over problems immediate to them are hypocrites. In that category he would probably include our Latin American friends because of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and closer to his home he would include the concerns of those African States that protested against the tests on the African continent. Would one call others -- our brothers from Ghana and Sudan -- who recalled their Ambassadors from Paris in protest against the test in the Sahara, hypocrites? Would one say that Nigeria was hypocritical when it broke diplomatic relations with that same country? Would one call the African States hypocrites that sponsored General Assembly resolution 1652 (XVI) and other resolutions calling upon Member States "to refrain from carrying out or continuing to carry out in Africa nuclear tests in any form"?

The country to which that Afro-Asian sponsored resolution related is clear to everyone -- which country alone was carrying out or continuing to carry out nuclear tests in Africa.

In our view, all these protests were not tainted with hypocrisy, but were a reflection of the genuine fears and concerns of the States in the region. Our apprehension over the atmospheric tests in the Pacific is exactly the same thing, and my delegation feels that that concern is reflected in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in a restrained form. There is no hypocrisy on our part. The hypocrites are those who know that our cause is right but cannot support it in spite of their conscience. We are not so much concerned about their conscience, but we are a little concerned about their arms, which must be hurting by now.
The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651, and I now announce the beginning of the voting in accordance with rule 130 of the rules of procedure.

A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651, and I now put operative paragraph 1 to the vote.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 63 votes to 4, with 41 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Paraguay, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Democratic Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan

Against: Portugal, Albania, China, France, Gabon

Abstaining: Poland, Romania, South Africa, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Algeria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 92 votes to 5, with 27 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.651 after the vote.

Mr. de GUINGAUD (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation did not feel it necessary to speak before the vote on document A/C.1/L.651, referring to agenda item 36 and co-sponsored by Mexico and other delegations, which has just been adopted. This draft resolution in fact, contrary to the one in document A/C.1/L.652, calls for equal treatment for all nuclear tests and thus it is not discriminatory. The main criticism we level did not have to be made known before the vote, since it was obvious from the explanations that I myself gave in the statement I made on 1 November. However, I do not believe it redundant now to explain the vote that we cast against this draft resolution.

Neither this draft resolution nor the one in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 establishes a link between the cessation of nuclear tests and the undertaking of true disarmament -- a total, controlled disarmament calling for the elimination of all nuclear stockpiles whose stockpiling threatens peace and the very survival of mankind. That is what we have constantly called for. As long as no serious measures are adopted to make some progress along those lines, in accordance with the will of the majority of the peoples and Governments of the world, as long as certain States continue to multiply their weaponry and to perfect it, we believe that no country can be asked, no Government can be required, to refrain from endowing itself with means to ensure its defence in an effective and independent way, choosing whichever means it deems appropriate.

In the statement I made on 1 November I said that France would be ready to do away with all its nuclear weapons if those that have already built up terrifying arsenals of such weapons were ready to set an example. We stated that years ago, and I repeat it again today. Unfortunately, our proposal has fallen on deaf ears, and I speak specifically of those mainly responsible. Our concern is shared by many other peoples, and this has been eloquently demonstrated by the statements made by the representatives of Gabon and Saudi Arabia. Thus I entirely agree with the analysis that Mr. Obane has just made of the
draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651. Had that draft resolution contained the provisions to which the representative of Gabon referred, my delegation would have supported it with pleasure. However, that was not the case, and therefore my delegation had no other choice but to vote against the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651.

Mr. WOLTENI (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to state that our vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 must not be interpreted as implying any change in our well-known position regarding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which is mentioned in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. NISHIBORI (Japan): Circumstances led my delegation to explain its vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651. That draft resolution embodies in the clearest manner the desires of many countries, and I believe that it has the same ultimate intention as the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, of which Japan is a co-sponsor. Therefore my delegation wishes to give its unconditional support to the intention embodied in it. However, I am distressed to discover that some provisions of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 are not entirely in agreement with our persistent efforts to induce nuclear-weapon States to come to accept our position. Specifically, the wording of operative paragraph 2, which reads, "whatever may be the differences on the question of verification", does not accord with the position of my Government, namely, that effective verification measures are a prerequisite to disarmament agreements, including a comprehensive nuclear test ban. This is the reason why my delegation, with much regret, abstained on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651.
Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia): I will be brief. For reasons known to many, my delegation has abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651, which deals with the subject of the urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. I wish to reiterate here that my Government is fully committed to achieving the goal of the cessation of all nuclear tests by all States in every environment. Also, for the record, I want to state that my delegation's abstention on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 in no way implies our condoning open nuclear tests, which are in contravention to the widely accepted Moscow Treaty of 1963 and are detrimental to the safety and health of present and future generations. Indeed, my Government has strongly objected to and condemned the atmospheric nuclear tests, especially those which have been continuously carried out in the immediate vicinity of my country's frontiers.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would further place on record that this explanation of vote is also applicable to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, on which my delegation will also abstain.

The CHAIRMAN: While we are within the purview of rule 130 of the rules of procedure, I would urge Members to address themselves exclusively to the draft resolution being voted upon.

Mr. ROWE (Canada): The Canadian delegation has just voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651. As Ambassador Barton already had occasion to state on 9 November, during the introduction of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652, we had and continue to have misgivings as to the appropriateness of the language of the operative paragraphs. We believe that any effective ban on nuclear weapons testing requires an agreement containing adequate assurances that its terms will be observed. Notwithstanding our misgivings, we have chosen to vote for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 because we fully share the motivation of its co-sponsors as expressed in the draft resolution's preamble.
The CHAIRMAN: As no other representatives desire to explain their vote, I shall take it that the Committee has concluded its deliberations on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651.

We now turn to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1. Two requests have been made: one for a roll-call vote on the draft resolution as a whole, and the other for a separate vote on operative paragraph 3. We shall first take a separate vote on operative paragraph 3.

I call upon the representative of the Netherlands on a point of order.

Mr. FACK (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, as you stated before we started the voting, those delegations which would like to explain their vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 before the vote would have an opportunity to do so, and I should now like to explain my vote before the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Netherlands.

Mr. FACK (Netherlands): I should like to make a few brief remarks on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, now before us, in order to explain the vote of my delegation. As the Committee is aware, the Netherlands Government is opposed to all nuclear weapon tests whether in the atmosphere or underground. Tests lead to an ever greater sophistication of nuclear weapons and they prove to the world at large that the arms race continues.

My delegation is, however, not entirely happy with some of the wording in the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1) now before us. We consider the revised version an improvement of the original draft and it is gratifying that the co-sponsors have taken account on some of the critical remarks made by other delegations. Our delegation is, however, still of the opinion that there is an imbalance in the draft resolution in so far as it uses stronger terms against atmospheric tests than against underground ones.
From a disarmament point of view, this is not justified. Underground tests -- which are by the way more numerous than atmospheric ones -- are perhaps the more dangerous of the two types because they lead to further sophistication of already excessive nuclear arsenals of the major Powers. Of course, atmospheric tests have an environmental impact which we view as regrettable. In this Committee, however, we should not lose sight of our disarmament goal: that is, the cessation of nuclear weapon tests by all countries in all environments.

Because of the remaining imbalance of operative paragraph 3 of the text, in comparison with other paragraphs, my delegation will abstain when a separate vote is taken on this paragraph, although, of course, the Netherlands continues to favour the immediate cessation of all atmospheric tests. Since we are, as I said, strongly in favour of a comprehensive universal nuclear test ban, applicable for all time everywhere and to everyone, we will, notwithstanding the reservations I explained, vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN: As there are no other explanations of vote before the vote, the Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 58 votes to 6, with 55 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 as a whole.

I call on the representative of France.

Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (interpretation from French): I should like to make an explanation of vote before the voting on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 as a whole, now before us.

After the separate vote that has just been taken on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 --

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Fiji on a point of order.

Mr. NANDAN (Fiji): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted some clarification. Has the voting begun or not?

The CHAIRMAN: Of course. I announced long ago that we were proceeding to the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1. I call on the representative of France.

Mr. de GUIRINGAUD (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, we asked the Secretariat before the meeting began whether we could speak after the vote on one paragraph of the draft resolution and before the vote on the draft as a whole. We were told that we could, and that is the reason why I did not speak before the voting began.

The CHAIRMAN: In that case, I see no great harm in allowing the representative of France to speak at this time -- although I am not quite sure that the information given to him was correct. I now call on the representative of France.
Mr. de GUIRINCAUD (France) (interpretation from French): After the separate vote that has just been taken on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, a vote that retained that paragraph by a three-vote majority, the text of the draft remains what it was before the vote, that is to say fundamentally discriminatory. Operative paragraph 3 continues to call upon two States, which everyone knows to be France and China, to call an immediate halt to atmospheric tests, while operative paragraph 5 in fact authorizes the two greatest nuclear Powers to continue their underground tests, whose frequency and power are well known, as long as the negotiations continue that they are being urged -- energetically, to be sure -- to undertake after 10 years of procrastination, although everyone knows that the outcome depends only on those Powers. This is indeed a blank cheque that is being given them, and I leave it to the judgement of this Committee to decide on the advisability thereof.

Many representatives -- so many, indeed, that I would not attempt to list them for fear of omitting some, let me, however, mention at least the name of my friend Ambassador Baroody -- have stated most clearly their doubts about this, even their refusal to give such a blank cheque to the two super-Powers.

As far as my delegation is concerned, we can only vote against the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 as it stands at present, and we hope that all delegations that are eager, in such an important matter, to give their support only to a resolution that is balanced and capable of producing a concrete result in the cause of disarmament, will also refuse to support this text.
The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Burma, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil

Against: China, France, Gabon, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Albania

Abstaining: Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Luxembourg; Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Yemen, Zaire, Algeria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria

The draft resolution was adopted by 57 votes to 7, with 50 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): My delegation believed that the resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 was adequate in covering the main provisions embodied in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1. My delegation had some misgivings and apprehensions about operative paragraph 3 of the latter draft resolution, the language of which was in our view unusual. We felt that the word “insists” was excessive, although we understood and appreciated the motivation of the co-sponsors. We believe that the concern of the countries which are near the site of the tests is indeed genuine. We regret the fact that we were unable to go along with the draft resolution, notwithstanding our sympathy with the co-sponsors.

However, our abstention on the draft resolution should not be construed as a departure from our firm belief that nuclear tests, primarily in the atmosphere, must be discontinued. That is a principle of the utmost importance upon which we cannot falter. Had it not been for the excessive language of operative paragraph 3 we would have supported the draft resolution.

Mr. HANSEN (Denmark): Denmark voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1 because we have consistently supported the efforts to achieve the cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. However, we should like to emphasize that the draft resolution does not in all respects reflect the opinion which we feel the General Assembly should express if it is desired to attain a realistic solution to the problem of test explosions.

It is the fundamental view of the Danish delegation that a ban on test explosions should be general and complete in its aim, and it is therefore our wish that all nuclear tests, in all environments, should be discontinued at the earliest possible date. We believe that the draft resolution should have confined itself to an appeal to the nuclear Powers to suspend all test explosions and, accordingly, that it would have been better balanced without its seventh preambular paragraph and its operative paragraph 3, which, moreover, is couched in language different from operative paragraph 2; therefore we abstained on operative paragraph 3.
In this connexion it should be recalled that the now 10-year old partial test-ban Treaty contains a commitment to seek to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time. May I repeat, also in this connexion, the view expressed in my statement in the general disarmament debate in this Committee on 7 November 1973:

"With due respect for legitimate interests of national security or responsibilities for collective defence, we share the opinion that continued nuclear tests in all forms should be brought to an early end, and that increased efforts should be made to reach agreement on a complete nuclear test ban." (1950th meeting, pp. 6 and 7)

It is against that background that my delegation voted on the draft resolution as a whole, but let me re-emphasize that Denmark has for a long time been a protagonist of a complete ban on all test explosions in all environments.

Mr. LOPES DA FONSECA (Portugal): My delegation voted against both draft resolutions (A/C.1/L.651 and L.652/Rev.1). Portugal is well aware of the danger that a nuclear war could bring to mankind and fervently wishes that such a horror may never come about. Nevertheless it does not seem that the restriction of nuclear capabilities to a few strategically privileged countries is the most appropriate way to ensure that there is no resort to such a war. On the contrary, it seems that the non-dependence of world equilibrium on the equilibrium of a very few is a better way of guaranteeing the wide control of nuclear weaponry by means of multiplication of elements that will dissuade, deter and restrain each other. At this point may I stress, however, that the best balance is indeed one resulting from denuclearization itself, but a partial denuclearization is neither as "natural" a balance as the first I mentioned, which is founded on general convenience, nor as "absolute" a one as the second, which is based on general goodwill and sincerity.

I believe that this matter should be dealt with carefully and coherently. By that I mean that it has to be viewed in all its comprehensiveness and
and complexity, lest the immediate prohibition of a certain kind of test, as is called for in operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, would mean some leniency vis-à-vis other kinds of tests, and lest the halting of nuclear tests would, because of the absence of reliable means of verification, as referred to in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651, open the door for all kinds of escapades that would in a sense be ratified by a hasty and incomplete legal instrument.

Demilitarization measures are too serious a subject to be solved only in the nuclear test phase. That phase might represent a situation equivalent to a "quiet escalation" and so does not eliminate in a definitive way the resort by some countries -- if they were not sincere and if they were not deprived of substantial know-how -- to the use of nuclear weaponry which would not be definitively eliminated; or else such countries might be led to becoming hopelessly its victims.

The basis of defence is balance, and the optimal balance is the reduction to nil of the causes of threats, by the destruction of nuclear arsenals and the exercise of a genuine spirit of peace.

Portugal vehemently supports the complete destruction of nuclear weaponry. The vote of my country was cast not only on behalf of general morality but, more importantly, on behalf of general security.
Mr. Dharat (Libya): My delegation voted in favour of operative paragraph 3 and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. As a matter of principle, my country strongly supports any urgent call for the immediate cessation of all kinds of nuclear-weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, as well as, underground tests. My delegation agrees with other delegations when stating that the draft just adopted has put stress on the cessation of atmospheric tests, while only expressing concern at the continuance of underground tests. In this connexion we wished that no distinction between the atmospheric and underground tests appear in the draft, because we are of the conviction that all kinds of nuclear tests in all environments should be immediately discontinued. But, as I have just stated, it is a matter of principle for my country to support every effort designed for the cessation of all nuclear tests and we believe that the draft just adopted contains positive elements designed to achieve one of the great objectives of the international community, namely, the immediate end of all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments. For these reasons my delegation cast an affirmative vote when the Committee took action on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.

In the same spirit, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 which rightly condemns with the utmost vigour all nuclear-weapons tests, and urges Governments possessing nuclear weapons to bring to a halt, without delay, all nuclear-weapons tests.

Mr. Ozgur (Cyprus): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on the text which has just been voted upon. Our views on this subject were explained by the head of my delegation in this Committee on 12 November. We stated then that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652, as it stood before revision, did not meet our expectations nor the aspirations of world public opinion in the field of nuclear tests after 10 years from the coming into force of the partial test-ban Treaty.
At the same time, my delegation made informal suggestions for the improvement of operative paragraph 6 of that draft. We then gave our suggestions, in writing, to the co-sponsors of the draft. Although it was stated later by some of the co-sponsors of that draft that they had revised the text with a view to accommodating the views of several delegations, including that of Cyprus, I regret to say that the revision was far from satisfactory to us. Our purpose was to ask the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to submit a draft treaty at the next General Assembly session, after 10 years, and not one of the usual annual reports; it should submit a special report only in the case of its ability to submit a draft treaty, and such a special report should reflect the difficulties which were insurmountable within the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament instead of reflecting areas of agreement, as provided for in the present text.

Indeed, we would have preferred a single resolution, that is, the one in document A/C.1/L.651 which responds more adequately to our needs and for which we have voted in the affirmative. But in view of the fact that the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.651 found it possible to vote for the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, and because of our belief that we should not spare any effort or any measure in achieving an end to nuclear- and thermonuclear-weapons tests, we have voted in favour of both texts.

We have also voted affirmatively on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, not because we approve of any discriminatory treatment, but because we would not wish to do anything that might create the slightest impression that we condone nuclear tests in the atmosphere. We believe that any discriminatory language or intent could have been rectified by amendments. We could have voted differently had such amendments been made. It is unfortunate that no such amendment has been made. In brief, we could not sacrifice the substance for the sake of the form. Our position is guided by our ardent desire to see all nuclear- and thermonuclear-weapons tests in all environments ended immediately.
Mr. MIHAILOVIC (Yugoslavia): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1, as a whole. However, we have abstained in regard to operative paragraph 3 because we find the language not appropriate as compared, for example, with its operative paragraph 5.

Our abstention can in no way imply that the Yugoslav Government finds atmospheric tests acceptable or that it can in any way be interpreted as a departure from a long-standing and well-known position of my Government concerning the necessity that all nuclear testing in all environments should be stopped without delay.

Mr. SAO (Cameroon): Following the statement made by my delegation on 13 November, I wish only to indicate very briefly that we abstained during the vote on operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.652/Rev.1.

Mr. BELLIZZI (Malta): My delegation voted for the draft resolution as a whole but was forced to abstain on operative paragraph 3. This abstention was certainly not because we hold any brief for the continued testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. On the contrary, we have always condemned impartially all nuclear tests, by all States, in all environments. Precisely because of this consistent position against all such tests, we voted for the draft resolution as a whole, with the laudable objectives of which we would certainly be the last to take issue.

Coming back to operative paragraph 3, however, it seems to my delegation that this paragraph injects a note of imbalance as between one kind of nuclear-weapons test and another. It gives the resolution a flavour of prejudice, which it could well have done without. To my delegation it would seem that a primary cause for the continued tests in the atmosphere which, let me repeat, we deplore, are the continuing underground tests which other nuclear Powers had undertaken, 10 years ago, in the partial test-ban Treaty, to do all in their power to bring to an early halt but which, on the contrary, are still going on.
We are all familiar with the ostensible and quite plausible, reasons which for many years have prevented agreement in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. For our part, we have long shared the view that the one insuperable obstacle has been the lack of political will to resolve the impasse. The responsibility for that must be laid on those who continue underground testing and who, indeed, since the conclusion of the partial test-ban Treaty, have between them conducted some 400 such tests.
We are, of course, deeply conscious of the environmental aspects connected with atmospheric tests and, if only for that reason, we should like to appeal once again to those States which are conducting such tests to discontinue them without delay. At the same time, however, we are also conscious of the lack of adequate information concerning the adverse environmental effects of underground nuclear tests and, for the same reason, we should also like very much to see a permanent halt to such tests.

Instead of expressing at least equal displeasure with those who have yet to live up to the spirit if not the strict letter, of their treaty obligations, the draft resolution seems to us to reserve its strongest language for those of us who have not yet assumed any treaty obligations. We would have preferred the draft resolution to direct itself impartially against all nuclear weapon testing in all environments. As it is, my delegation fully shares the views of those who have regarded operative paragraph 3 as, at best, superfluous.

Mr. Scalabre (France) (interpretation from French): A few days ago I asked the Secretariat to put my name on the list at the end of this debate in order to exercise my right of reply, as I am now doing.

In the course of the debate on item 36 a number of ideas were expressed which, since they were not all summed up and couched in terms of a draft resolution, nevertheless had to be replied to by my delegation.

I shall not dwell on the criticism levelled against France for jeopardizing the health and the food of the populations of the Pacific. At the beginning of this session my delegation took the initiative of asking for an immediate meeting of the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, so that all States might have a very clear idea of the effects of the recent tests by examining the latest documents which the Scientific Committee did not have when it drew up its last report at the beginning of last year. My delegation regrets the delay —
unfortunately, much too long -- in convening that meeting, which the General Assembly just agreed to on 9 November, almost six weeks after we had requested it, and in spite of the support given by a number of delegations of the Pacific area. I should like to thank them for the help which they offered to us, but despite that help, it was not possible to speed things up.

The members of this Committee will now find, in the document which my delegation had circulated in document A/9192 of 1 October, a number of comments on the observations that have been made following the tests of 1972. There does exist a complete documentation on those tests. The Scientific Committee will examine it and I hope that its conclusions will be made known before this session comes to an end. The information that we ourselves possess confirms us, as of now, in our conviction that these experiments presented no danger to the human environment.

We have been told repeatedly that if these tests were not dangerous, they should have been carried out on the metropolitan territory of France. Although my delegation has already explained this point, I still believe it is necessary to go back to it and to recall that while there are no long-distance effects from these tests, providing that a few precautions are taken, their immediate effects in an area which may in certain cases amount to a few kilometres are terrible; otherwise, why should the nuclear weapon possess the disastrous features that we attribute to it? They can only be tested in an uninhabited area, and no one would dream of testing them on an ordinary shooting range any more than we would try to use weapons in a public place. We could not find sufficiently uninhabited regions in France to allow the testing of such weapons. But once the flash or thermal or blow effects have passed our technicians bathed in the lagoon of Mururoa in the evening of the day on which the tests took place. The Minister of National Defence did so himself a few years ago. In other words, a few thousand kilometres away, it is unreasonable to have any fears or qualms.

Another criticism has been made against us in the course of this debate and that is that we are disregarding the findings of the International Court of Justice. When this criticism was levelled against us by the delegation
of Fiji we reminded it that Fiji did not accept the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. We do not reproach it for it is free to decide on what to do and it is in the same position as 88 other States. But I believe that it ill behoves that delegation to criticize us in our attitude towards the Court.

Furthermore, France, like 18 of the 46 other States that have accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, explained when we did so that we had one formal reservation and we excluded from that jurisdiction activities dealing with national defence. It is obvious that our tests fall within that framework, and the Court has, without any doubt, gone beyond its jurisdiction when handing down these findings. Furthermore, it reserved its final judgement on the point and, in addition, its decision was taken by a majority of only one.

Some have commented on the fact that these findings were based on article 41 of the Statute of the Court. But that article only gives that jurisdiction the right to indicate the measures to be adopted. These suggestions are not binding, even if they do fall within the competence of the Court -- which in this case, they do not.

I shall not repeat certain words which were used by the representative of Fiji when speaking of the attitude of the French Government regarding the problem of the cessation of nuclear tests. I prefer to believe that, in the heat of the discussion, these expressions were used without thinking.

It is far better for me here to acknowledge the courtesy shown by the representatives of Australia, New Zealand and, generally speaking, those delegations which oppose our tests but have spoken in the course of this debate. I wish to repeat that we are ready, and will always be ready, to join them in studying this matter, to which we attach the greatest importance.

Nor shall I argue certain ideas adduced by the representative of Fiji on the status of French Polynesia. This would be unfair to our fellow-countrymen in those islands who have given so many proofs of their attachment to France.
I shall merely recall the ties of blood spilled in common, ties which in two
world wars were added to the ties of heart that already existed. I wish to stress
that we recognize the value of those sacrifices.

I am deeply sorry that the representative of Peru today seemed to approve
the ideas expressed on this matter by the representative of Fiji.

The CHAIRMAN: Since there are no further explanations of vote, the
Committee has concluded its consideration of the draft resolution in

Before calling upon those who wish to exercise their right of reply, I
should like to make it clear that I called upon the representative of France to
explain his vote after the separate vote on operative paragraph 3 and before the
vote on the draft resolution as a whole, since the Chairman is of course responsible
for the advice given to members from the officers' table. However, I have doubts
about the correctness of the answer given to the representative of France and will
ask that the matter be investigated.

May I also draw the attention of the representative of France to rule 130.

I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to speak in exercise
of their right of reply.

Mr. CHUANG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): A little while ago
the Soviet representative unreasonably attacked the Chinese Government and the
Chinese leadership. What he said was nothing new but a re-play of the old tune,
the same old stuff. It does not deserve rebuttal.

Regardless of how you have coated it with diplomatic niceties, the substance
of the Soviet position is the desire to submit the oppressed peoples and nations
meekly to the nuclear threat of the super-Powers. You have underestimated the
level of awareness of the peoples of the world. They will not be deceived.

A mere look at what you say and what you do will enable us to render a
judgement. You are advocating sham disarmament, and you are using sham
disarmament to cover up your frenzied arms expansion. It is precisely you who
are violating the principles and the spirit of the Charter.
In his statement the Soviet representative lauded to the skies above the Soviet position on the suspending of all nuclear tests. But, as is known to all, during the decade since the signing of the Partial Test-Ban Treaty concocted by the United States and the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union has conducted several hundred tests. In this year alone, from January to October, according to foreign and incomplete reports, the Soviet Union has conducted more than 10 underground nuclear tests. That fully exposes the hypocritical features of the Soviet Union. On the one hand it clamours for the suspension of all nuclear tests, but, on the other, it is desperately conducting nuclear tests. Typical double-dealing. It says one thing, but it does another.

The Soviet representative charged us with once again exposing their attempts to take advantage of the good intentions of the small- and medium-sized countries in order to fish in troubled waters and carry out their ulterior and concealed motives. That will be futile.

The Soviet Union, the super-Power, has inherited the Tsarist tradition and is in fact harbouring even more wanton ambitions than the Tsars. It clamours about peace, détente, security, disarmament and the suspension of nuclear tests are sheer deceptive utterances. Actually, it is stepping up arms expansion and war preparations. Actually, it is pursuing its policies of aggression and war.

Your sugar-coated words cannot deceive anyone.
Mr. NANDAN (Fiji): It was not my intention to speak again, but I feel some explanations ought to be given on certain aspects of the statement just made by the representative of France.

The representative of France is quite correct: Fiji has not as yet accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Since it became independent -- which happened quite recently -- Fiji has been reviewing its position in respect of all multilateral treaties and conventions which might apply to it, and, indeed, the question of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice is part of that review.

However, whether Fiji has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice or not is irrelevant. If in fact it had done so, would that make any difference to France? The real issue is whether France would be prepared to submit itself to the International Court of Justice. That is the question. It is not whether we have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court but whether others are prepared to submit the dispute to that highest international judicial forum. We ourselves were and still are prepared to appear there as an interested party.

Certainly, the International Court of Justice did give an order. Was that order followed? No, it was defied. That is the same International Court of Justice to which France referred in asking whether Fiji accepted its jurisdiction or not.

With respect to the question of the status of the French Polynesian Territories, my delegation made a statement on 7 November during the debate on this item (A/C.1/PV.1951), and it is in the record. We stand by that statement. Nothing in the statement made today by the French delegation alters the position of those Territories as we explained it in our statement.

Finally, the absence of deserts in France does not licence France to conduct nuclear tests in dependent Territories.
Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics): (interpretation from Russian): I do not intend to retain the attention of the Committee for very long. I should just like to remind members that for the three sessions of the General Assembly in which the Chinese People's Republic has taken part, it has not put forward any concrete proposal on disarmament and, at the same time, it has indulged in obstruction and sabotage in the consideration of all concrete proposals on the question of disarmament. That activity has nothing whatsoever to do with the purposes of the United Nations. The task of the United Nations is to develop the co-operation of peoples in support of international peace and security, and one of its tasks in this area is the question of solving the problem of disarmament.

The Chinese People's Republic, as has been shown by the voting today on the question of the cessation of nuclear tests, is resisting all measures and proposals designed to solve this problem.

We all remember that not long ago the Security Council considered the question of ending the war in the Middle East. Similarly that was an extremely important task. Now what was the conduct of the Chinese delegation in the Security Council at that time? It hid its hands under the table so as to avoid taking part in the voting, although all the other members of the Security Council decided unanimously, on all three resolutions, to achieve the purposes enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

I do not want to go into the various controversies with the representative of the Chinese People's Republic here. I simply want to say that their understanding of participation in the work of the United Nations is completely incorrect and is not at all in keeping with the United Nations Charter.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I wish to reply to you and to apologize for my delegation if we have somewhat abused the rules of procedure. It was certainly not our intention to do so. I am not fond of polemics. I have explained the position of my delegation at length and I do not wish to importune the Committee at any great length now. I wish merely to thank all those members who this afternoon gave their close attention to the extremely important questions that we have discussed.
The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of France for his kind remarks.

I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that tomorrow afternoon General Assembly is to consider agenda item 40, concerning the sea-bed and the ocean floor. There are no names inscribed on the list of speakers for tomorrow afternoon's meeting of the First Committee on agenda item 41, the question of Korea, and I have been informed that none of the draft resolutions on the outstanding disarmament issues will be ready to be voted on tomorrow. In those circumstances, and with the consent of the Committee, I shall cancel the meeting scheduled for tomorrow afternoon.

The Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 10.30 to continue its consideration of agenda item 41.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.