

General Assembly

Official Records

ad... ans
e n
re... it
t... on
e
n... s
e... nts
3/
3/
e
er
r.
s
r... nt
e
g... c
n
n
f... t
n
e... d
N... e
C...
i
i

critically, the proposed amendments would deny us the opportunity to express our views on this issue.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 is the product of broad consultation by its sponsors. We understand from continuing consultations that it enjoys wide support across regional groups. In our considered view, it would be a serious mistake to revisit the text of the draft resolution. The most effective approach, we believe, is for the Committee to consider the draft resolution as it stands, without considering amendments. The sponsors will be calling for "no action" on each "L" document containing amendments. By supporting "no action" the Committee has a clear opportunity to protect the central message in the draft resolution and provide itself with the ability to take action on the draft resolution itself.

The sponsors renew the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 will receive the widest possible support in the Committee, and that efforts to amend it will be opposed vigorously.

Mr. Izquierdo (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to speak with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, entitled "Nuclear testing", and the package of amendments to it.

Ecuador decided to join in sponsoring the draft resolution because of our unequivocal, firm position of rejecting nuclear tests. None of us, no matter where we come from, have ever been selective regarding regions or countries. My country reacted immediately by deploring tests which took place in the past, and it did so again regarding the more recent tests, because they came after the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to which 187 States are party, and when the negotiations on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty had concluded and it had already been signed by 150 countries. As a party to these international instruments, Ecuador expressed itself accordingly.

In addition to its individual statements, Ecuador subscribed to the declarations on nuclear testing adopted this year by, among others, the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of American States and the Rio Group. Our support for the draft resolution reflects exactly the positions adopted in those declarations.

My delegation would like to be perfectly clear. Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 refers to a specific subject. Therefore, we do not believe it would be wise to alter its

essence with amendments which, on the one hand, refer to a variety of subjects and, on the other, would limit the scope of the draft resolution by seeking to change its purpose.

The subjects dealt with in the proposed amendments are important; my country would have no problem supporting many of them. In addition, they encompass principles that Ecuador has always defended. However, regrettably, we cannot support their adoption in this context, because they deal with matters far beyond the objective of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. Furthermore, we believe that the texts of the amendments are already contained in other draft resolutions that have come before the First Committee.

Let me now make a brief marginal comment. It seems to my delegation that multilateral confrontation, which has been hinted at on occasion, has nothing to do with the matter under consideration. As far as my country is concerned, draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 refers exclusively to the recent nuclear tests, and therefore has nothing to do with the friendly relations of cooperation and solidarity which Ecuador maintains with the countries of South Asia, whose social and economic ideals it shares. Nuclear aspirations are certainly not part of that common agenda.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I would like to take this opportunity to respond to the statement by the representative of New Zealand and to take up a few of his assertions.

A central contradiction in the position of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 and in their statements is that whereas the draft resolution is entitled "Nuclear testing" its contents are directed only at the nuclear tests conducted in South Asia. My delegation has stated before, and I repeat, that if it was the intention of the sponsors and other delegations to deal with the tests in South Asia and their implications, then they should have introduced a draft resolution which dealt with the nuclear and security aspects of the situation in South Asia. The First Committee could then have dealt with that situation in all its aspects and ramifications. I say this because nuclear tests do not arise out of a vacuum; they are a response to a security environment. The implications of the nuclear tests go far beyond a morality play on non-proliferation to questions of security, the political issues involved in South Asia and nuclear disarmament.

The sponsors of the draft resolution cannot, therefore, focus the draft resolution on nuclear testing and then limit it to South Asia. They have to do one or the other. If they wish to focus the draft resolution on what its title says —

“Nuclear testing” — then they must refer to all nuclear testing. That testing has not taken place only in South Asia. I will share with my colleague from New Zealand — although I am sure I do not need to — the pamphlets issued by various non-governmental organizations describing the subcritical tests that have been conducted and those that are planned, as well as the fusion research and other laboratory simulation exercises that are going on, which are all classified as “nuclear testing”.

Why does draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 not refer to these nuclear tests, which are designed to achieve the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons? Is it because those tests are conducted by nuclear-weapon States? Is it because they are conducted by the allies of some of the principal sponsors of this draft resolution? Is it because they are conducted by people of the same race? What is the reason why those tests are not mentioned in draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 and why is it that the sponsors refuse to even entertain any amendments, modifications or reasonable adjustments to their text to make it more balanced and more consistent with the realities of life?

We of course respect New Zealand, because it is a country which has, as I said the other day, the courage of its convictions. It does not receive nuclear-armed ships in its ports, and that is a position of consistency. But, by the same token, I would say to my colleague from New Zealand that — with regard to the tests that took place in the Pacific in 1995 — Mururoa is much closer to New Zealand than South Asia is. Why was Mururoa not mentioned in 1995? Why was the South Pacific not mentioned? Is it not closer to New Zealand than South Asia? In this case New Zealand has co-sponsored a draft resolution that refers to South Asia, which is at a considerable distance from New Zealand.

We do not understand this kind of double standard. We would appeal to fair-minded people, like the delegation of New Zealand, to consider removing the discrimination in this draft resolution and support at least some of the amendments which make

2(of)]p fa(of)-6.eovingIemovationIclosjya[2(In)-402(thJ±¼8mor(Rep222[(me85±¼[(am85±¼Kt)]a):64(I)-Myan

tests in South Asia, which underline the need to work even harder to achieve global disarmament objectives, including the elimination of nuclear weapons.

A letter from the sponsors of this draft resolution made available to delegations today does not mention the Non-Aligned Movement Durban Declaration nor the position taken

amendments designed to exclude or dilute the expression of the international community's concern regarding the nuclear tests conducted in South Asia.

We will abstain on no-action motions with regard to amendments that, without undermining the direct purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, seek to include in the draft resolution the need to halt all nuclear tests or to make progress in the nuclear disarmament process. This is because, although we agree with the contents of these amendments, and if they are put to a vote we will vote in favour of them, these matters are already dealt with in other draft resolutions on which the General Assembly will take action.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): The basic position of Japan on the issue of nuclear weapons has already been expressed in my statement during the general debate and also in my explanations of vote on several draft resolutions. Therefore, it is already well known to the members of the First

consequences of the debate on it will be entirely contrary to the high objectives which have been enumerated by its principal sponsors.

Pakistan has explained its position regarding the

Prime Ministers in the General Assembly relating to the

geographical reference to the South Asia region also seems inappropriate. Finally, the moratorium declared by India and Pakistan, as well as their intention to join the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty should, from our point of view, be encouraged and supported.

My delegation would have had no problem over supporting a text whose language was identical to that of resolution 50/70 A, adopted by the General Assembly in 1995. Up to the last moment, my delegation, which supported the intensive consultations held in the last few days between several delegations interested in this question to reach wording acceptable to all, had hoped that those consultations would be successful.

For all those reasons, my delegation cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, nor can it, on principle, support any no-action motion, which we consider undemocratic. On the other hand, depending on the results of the no-action motion, we will consider supporting the amendments according to their individual merits.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no other delegation wishes to make a general statement, we will move to the second phase of our proceedings: the introduction of amendments. I would ask those who have submitted amendments to introduce them in the order of submission.

I call first on Sri Lanka.

Mr. Bjarme (Sri Lanka): The amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.52, proposed by Sri Lanka on behalf of the seven member countries of the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation, was introduced by Sri Lanka's Ambassador during a previous meeting of the Committee. We do not intend to speak to the amendment once again, as it has been put before the Committee.

The Chairman: The next amendment has been introduced by India. Does India wish to speak to it again?

Mrs. Kunadi (India): India has indeed introduced amendments, and these are contained in documents A/C.1/53/L.55, L.57 and L.58. I would like to have the opportunity to take the floor when they are taken up for a decision.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I would like the representative of India to speak to the amendment now, before we conclude this stage of our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. When we enter the decision-

making process, there will be opportunities for statements in explanation of vote both before and after the vote, as usual.

Mrs. Kunadi (India): The amendment proposed by India in document A/C.1/53/L.55 relates to the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, which we would like to be modified to read:

“Reaffirming that the cessation of all nuclear testing will contribute to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects, to the process of nuclear disarmament leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time and therefore to the further enhancement of international peace and security”.

India has already stood for nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time. This is a principle which has been accepted by the Non-Aligned Movement and in the proposals which India along with a group of countries, the Group of 21, has submitted to the Conference on Disarmament. We would hope and expect that this amendment proposed by India would receive the Committee's support.

Our next amendment is in document A/C.1/53/L.57. Here we have proposed that the second preambular

Furthermore, we do not see why paragraph 2 should ask only the States concerned — the States in South Asia — to ratify or adhere to the CTBT. The CTBT would come into force if all 44 States listed in annex 2 of the Treaty ratified the Treaty. In any draft resolution it would be unfair and discriminatory to ask only two States to do so. Therefore, the second amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.61 calls on all States that have not done so, specially those listed in annex 2 of the CTBT, to become parties to the Treaty. We believe that both the amendments are not only factual but fair, and we seek the support of the Committee for their adoption.

The Chairman: The last amendment to the draft resolution is in document A/C.1/53/L.62. I give the floor to the representative of Zimbabwe to introduce the amendment.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): I have the honour to introduce the amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.62, which

“*Urges* the five nuclear-weapon States to fulfil their commitments relating to nuclear disarmament under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to intensify their efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate objective of eliminating those weapons in accordance with that article.”

It is evident that my delegation does not support the no-action motion of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. On the contrary, Zimbabwe has co-sponsored the amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.62, one of the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to explain why we feel that the inclusion of this amendment, sponsored by Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe, would lend weight and meaning to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, on nuclear testing, under consideration today.

May I proceed with my explanation, Sir? I ask because when the leader of the Pakistani delegation made a statement to introduce one of the amendments there was confusion as to whether he was making a general statement or introducing the amendment.

The Chairman: We are now in the phase of introducing draft resolutions and amendments. The phase of general statements is past.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): I shall now proceed to explain the reason for the draft amendment.

Let me state from the outset that Zimbabwe, a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), is committed to the goal of global nuclear disarmament and, like the rest of the international community, is opposed to nuclear testing, whether for the acquisition of nuclear weapons or for their qualitative improvement.

Nuclear testing and nuclear disarmament are interrelated and inseparable issues. The non-existence of nuclear testing cannot be an end in itself. It should be a step towards nuclear disarmament. Some nuclear-weapon States recognize this, and in this connection I wish to quote from a statement by His Excellency Mr. Lin Changhe, Ambassador for Disarmament Affairs of the People's Republic of China, at the fifth meeting of the First Committee, on 14 October.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I would ask the representative of Zimbabwe to end his statement with the introduction of the amendment; it is my opinion that he has gone beyond the introduction of the amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not accept that I have gone beyond introducing the amendment. First, I have stated that I wish to explain the rationale behind the amendment. Secondly, I happen to know that when a Member State is speaking on behalf of other Member States it is usually allotted more time than normal.

The Chairman: Please finish your statement as soon as possible.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): China is one of the five permanent members of the Security Council and one of the nuclear Powers. Mr. Li Changhe stated:

“The complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons is the common aspiration of mankind. We fully understand the wish of the large number of non-nuclear-weapon States for general and complete nuclear disarmament and their concern over the slow pace of this process. The indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) does not imply that the nuclear-weapon States can possess nuclear weapons for ever. The nuclear-weapon States should intensify their efforts to fulfil the obligations set forth in article VI of the NPT.” (A/C.1/53/PV.5, p. 63)

Therefore, it is the considered view of my delegation that the recent nuclear tests conducted in South Asia, which my country deplored, are the result of the existence of a nuclear club of States bent on preserving their nuclear monopoly while pontificating to the other States of the world that they should not acquire the same weaponry. My delegation does not believe that a group of nuclear-weapon States should claim the moral high ground, claiming that those weapons are in safe and civilized hands while the rest of the world cannot be trusted with them.

My country acceded to the NPT and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) on the understanding that, and in the hope that, these two Treaties were not an end in themselves but part of a process leading towards total nuclear disarmament. This is why my country is co-sponsoring an amendment to reflect the nuclear disarmament goal enshrined in article VI of the NPT.

The 113-member Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, when it met at Cartagena and at Durban, condemned nuclear testing but proceeded to stress the need for nuclear disarmament. The Non-Aligned Movement position is also the African position — that an end to nuclear testing must lead to nuclear disarmament.

I had intended to read out another quotation, but since I see that there is growing impatience, I will not do so. I was going to quote the Canberra Commission, a highly esteemed and respected body, which stated —

The Chairman: Canberra is quite far away from the amendment.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): The Canberra Commission said, in the Statement section of its report:

“Nuclear weapons are held by a handful of states which insist that these weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet reserve uniquely to themselves the right to own them. This situation is highly discriminatory and thus unstable; it cannot be sustained. The possession of nuclear weapons by any state is a constant stimulus to other states to acquire them.”

Hence we condemn all forms of nuclear testing and urge all States to refrain from nuclear testing.

I shall not at this stage quote the delegation of the United States. I refer here to Ambassador Holum, who stated — and I quote —

The Chairman: Mr. Ambassador, you have largely passed the five minutes of a general statement, so I ask you to spare us a quotation from Ambassador Holum.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): I would just say that the quotation from the Ambassador of the United States was exactly in the same vein as that from the representative of China. If the United States, a nuclear-weapon State, like China, is committed to fulfilling its obligations under article VI of the NPT, why would the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 — namely, Australia, Canada and New Zealand, non-nuclear-weapon States themselves — oppose the inclusion of the amendment proposed by Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe?

The Chairman: Thirty seconds.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, these are the reasons why we do not support the no-action motion with respect to this draft, and why Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe are sponsoring the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.62 to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, the amendment which I have had the honour to introduce.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): All the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 have now been introduced. We will take them up in the order I proposed this morning, that is, the order in which they were introduced.

We begin with amendment A/C.1/53/L.52, “Sri Lanka: amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22”.

Mr. Zimonyi (Hungary): My delegation wishes to move a motion of no action on the proposed amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.52. As one of the sponsors, we attach great importance to preserving the integrity of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 and keeping its focus on the subject matter it intends to address.

The Chairman: We are now in a procedure in which two countries may speak in favour of that motion and two against.

Mr. Bjarme (Sri Lanka): As the country which introduced the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.52, on behalf of the States members of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), we wish to register our position on the no-action motion with regard to this amendment.

motion of no action be defeated and that the Committee be

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The draft amendments in documents A/C.1/53/L.55 and A/C.1/53/L.57 are therefore withdrawn.

We will now take up the draft amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.56, "Pakistan: amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22".

Mr. Pearson (New Zealand): With respect to document A/C.1/53/L.56, which is an amendment to draft

Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Chad, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mozambique, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela

The motion of no action on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.56 was carried by 62 votes to 51, with 18 abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): We will now consider the proposed amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.58, "India: amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22".

Mr. Sadauskas (Lithuania): I move that no action be taken on the draft amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.58.

Mr. Tsering (Bhutan): My delegation would like very briefly to state its opposition to this no-action motion. It

will vote against it, and appeals to all other delegations to vote against it.

Mr. Campbell (Australia): For the reasons enunciated by my New Zealand colleague earlier in this debate, Australia supports the proposal just made by our colleague from Lithuania that the Committee take no action on document A/C.1/53/L.58.

Mrs. Kunadi (India): My delegation opposes the no-action motion.

Mr. Izquierdo (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to express its support for Lithuania's no-action motion.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to vote on the no-action motion proposed by Lithuania on the amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.58.

A "Yes" vote is a vote in favour of the no-action motion. A "No" vote is a vote against the no-action motion.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Chad, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea,

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Haiti, Israel, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela

The motion of no action on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L/62 was carried by 59 votes to 57, with 17 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of France advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the motion.]

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): All the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 have thus been considered.

We will therefore now proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, entitled

(*spoke in English*)

“Nuclear testing”.

(*spoke in French*)

The draft resolution has not been amended.

I first call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions before a decision is taken.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): My delegation deeply regrets that the Committee, through the procedural device of no-action motions, has been prevented from pronouncing itself on the various amendments that have been proposed to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22. It is obvious from the votes that have taken place that this is a divisive and controversial draft resolution, which does not enjoy broad consensus support within the international community.

This draft resolution is discriminatory; it is aimed against my country; and it is unfair. For all the reasons which I have already cited, my delegation will vote against it.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba has had several opportunities in the course of our Committee's work to express its views on the draft resolution on which the Committee is about to take a decision. We made statements in the hope that the sponsors would, in the interests of dealing in depth with the subject of nuclear testing, reach agreement on a text reflecting the legitimate concerns that still exist on this subject.

Cuba's position on nuclear testing is well known. We are opposed to all types of nuclear tests, including so-called laboratory tests aareond/F2 1 Tf±¼2 1 Tf±¼2 1 Tf±¼2 1 o12(one±¼[(labo

For these reasons, Cuba will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22.

Mrs. Burgois (France) (*interpretation from French*):
I should like to clarify a technical point, Mr. Chairman, concerning the voting on the no-action motion on document A/C.1/53/L.62.

If the Committee had not only a legal expert but an expert in magic, I would have asked for the latter's opinion. Failing that, Mr. Chairman, I have to call on your wisdom.

The French delegation voted in favour of the no-action motion. I checked the light on the board, and it was green. Moments later it turned orange. I thought maybe I had

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 was adopted by 98 votes to 6, with 31 abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Oyugi (Kenya): Kenya abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. In brief, we feel that the draft resolution does not take into account amendment proposals, some of which we consider very pertinent to it. The end result, therefore, is that the draft resolution is not as balanced or as fair as we would have liked it to be.

Kenya believes in equity and fair play. In this regard, it is our view that the singling out of States for mention in resolutions goes against that principle. Kenya therefore abstained, just as it did in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.21, which the Committee considered the other day.

This notwithstanding, Kenya remains committed to the ideals inherent in both the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

Mrs. Kunadi (India): The Committee has just taken a vote on the draft resolution on nuclear testing, contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22. We regret the procedural tactics that were used to suppress open debate on substantive issues. The draft resolution, drafted in a coercive and discriminatory manner, will not be helpful to the issues at hand or to the objective of promoting nuclear disarmament.

Assembly on the issue of nuclear testing. However, my delegation was constrained to abstain in the vote just taken because of the selective, partial and negative direction of certain paragraphs of the draft resolution.

It was for these reasons that my delegation in all sincerity joined its South partners in submitting amendments to the draft resolution to give it a more balanced orientation and to make it consistent with previous practices of the Assembly on nuclear testing. Our abstention should not be construed as condoning nuclear testing in any form, by any party, or for any purpose.

Mr. Rodrigue (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, "Nuclear testing", consistent with our position of supporting and encouraging all reasonable initiatives which will help us achieve the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, which constitute the most serious threat to mankind. In the same spirit, we acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and supported its indefinite extension, signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and participated in the movements which led to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legitimacy of the threat or use of nuclear weapons. We welcomed the decision of the Conference on Disarmament to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to negotiate a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

We therefore share the general concern expressed over the tests carried out by India and Pakistan, tests that not only contributed to increasing regional and global tensions but were also a severe blow to the non-proliferation regime which the international community has tried to establish. Haiti noted with interest that the statements made by these two countries indicate their intention not to carry out any further tests and to sign the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. All these elements are reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, which the Committee has just adopted. However, my delegation would have preferred it to take into account all types of tests, because, as we are only too well aware, the nuclear-weapon States continue to carry out laboratory tests in order to perfect their existing stocks of nuclear weapons. Such tests should be deplored, for they thwart the objective of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. These concerns were taken into account in some of the amendments which we presented but which unfortunately were not accepted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no other delegation wishes to take the floor, we have concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.