

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1764th
MEETING

Wednesday, 18 November 1970,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 27: Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (continued)	1
Organization of work	6
Agenda item 93: Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolu- tion 2456 B (XXIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) (concluded)	7
Agenda item 29: Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (concluded)	10

Chairman: Mr. Andrés AGUILAR M. (Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEM 27

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of
the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament
(continued) (A/7958, A/7960 and Corr.1, A/7961, A/
8059-DC/233, A/C.1/1001 and 1010, A/C.1/L.532 and
534)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): At
yesterday's morning meeting the Committee voted on draft
resolution A/C.1/L.523 and on the amendments [A/C.1/
L.528] to the draft treaty on the prohibition of the
emplacement of nuclear weapons on the sea-bed and the
ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, which is annexed to
the draft resolution.

2. As members will recall, we were unable to hear the
explanations which delegations wished to give of their
votes, owing to the lateness of the hour. We shall now hear
these explanations.

3. Mr. DA COSTA LOBO (Portugal) (*interpretation from
French*): Mr. Chairman, may I first of all congratulate you
on your election to preside over this Committee. This
election, whose wisdom has already been confirmed by the
able way in which you have guided the Committee, is at
one and the same time a proof of recognition of your
personal qualifications and a tribute to your country.

4. I also wish to congratulate Ambassador Farah and
Ambassador Cerník on their elections to the posts of
Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur respectively.

5. Last year during the general debate on disarmament the
delegation of Portugal expressed some reservations relating
to the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement
of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction
on the sea-bed and ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof.¹

6. My delegation considers that the changes made in the
draft treaty have considerably improved it and have allayed
many of our misgivings. As an example, I could speak of
the right of States to explore their continental shelf and the
explicit mention of the fact that provisions of the Treaty
cannot affect the position of States concerning their rights
and claims in relation to the law of the sea.

7. Taking all this into account, my delegation voted in
favour of the draft resolution contained in document
A/C.1/L.523.

8. However, it seems to us that a certain lack of clarity in
the text has not been completely dispelled. Therefore we
think that before passing final judgement on the draft
treaty we shall have to engage in a longer and more careful
scrutiny of the text.

9. That is what my delegation thought it necessary to say
at the moment of voting. But we should like to express that
we are in full agreement with the objective of the treaty
and we pay tribute to the work of all those who
contributed to the elaboration of this draft.

10. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I
thank the representative of Portugal for his congratulations
addressed to the members of the Committee.

11. Mrs. BORODOWSKY-JACKIEWICH (Cuba) (*inter-
pretation from Spanish*): The position of my Government
on the acts that endanger or threaten international security
is well known.

12. In accordance with that position and the principles on
which the foreign policy of my Government is based, the
Cuban delegation recognizes and appreciates the efforts
made to ensure the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and the
ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction and
we welcome the intentions and the purposes of the draft
treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear
weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the
sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof,

¹ Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement
for 1969, document DC/232, annex A.

approved in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which is covered by draft resolution A/C.1/L.523.

13. Despite the affirmative vote we cast for that resolution, my delegation wishes to enter its reservations on the draft treaty. These reservations refer to the following aspects.

14. First, they concern the definitions and of references to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone signed in April 1958 at Geneva, to which Cuba is not a party.

15. Secondly, we have reservations regarding the risks inherent in the adoption of decisions on such delicate questions as those covered by the draft treaty based on concepts that are as yet not internationally accepted, such as the breadth of the territorial sea and the limits of the continental shelf over which the coastal State exercises rights of sovereignty, an aspect to which the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth regular session had already granted recognition in its resolution 2574 (XXIV).

16. Thirdly, our reservations have regard to proposed safeguards in the draft treaty, which call for a previous definition concerning the structure, the powers and the authority of the international agency or machinery that will have competence to regulate the utilization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

17. Finally, my delegation has serious doubts regarding the true effectiveness and the guarantees of implementation of the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, while the imperialist Powers maintain a policy of domination and aggression all over the world which stands in the way of the implementation of the draft treaty.

18. We should be very grateful if our reservations might be entered in the record of the meeting.

19. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): The records will definitely take note of the comments and reservations made by the representative of Cuba, since, as the representative of Cuba knows, the records of this Committee are verbatim records which reproduce *in extenso* everything that is said by all members of the Committee.

20. Mr. NAVA CARRILLO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Venezuela, in the statement it made on the 16th of this month [1761st meeting], when referring to the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, said that it would reserve its opinions until it had heard the statements of the co-Chairmen and the other members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament concerning the doubts and the difficulties of interpretation given rise to by the text.

21. The explanations given and the statements made in this Committee at the 1762nd meeting by the delegations of the United States and the USSR, of which we had taken

due note, did facilitate the decision adopted by my delegation on the draft resolution proposed by 37 countries and circulated as document A/C.1/L.523, which the Committee adopted yesterday.

22. We consider that, although the treaty is a collateral and partial measure and covers a region of marginal military worth, it is still a positive step in the approach towards general and complete disarmament. In fact, article V of the treaty specifies the commitment of the parties in good faith to continue negotiations concerning further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed, the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof.

23. We also understand that the treaty does not modify and cannot change the rights that States possess in accordance with the Geneva Convention of 1958, to which Venezuela is a party.

24. In conclusion, my delegation wishes expressly to state that its vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.523 does not prejudice the position of Venezuela concerning the possible future signing and ratification of the treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof.

25. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation considers it its bounden duty to explain the vote it cast at the previous meeting. Since we did not participate in the debate on draft resolution A/C.1/L.523 or in the general debate on the subject, we believe it is necessary to make our position perfectly clear.

26. My delegation feels that first of all we should explain how we assess the matter on which a vote was taken, that is the contents of the draft resolution and the amendments to it submitted by the delegation of Peru in document A/C.1/L.528. However, in no case was it a question of the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor which was annexed to the report on the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Therefore, when the draft resolution was adopted, we did not approve a treaty, but only the following points: first, the Committee commends the treaty, but it is obvious that to praise or commend the treaty does not mean that we adopt it—simply that it is praiseworthy; secondly, it requests the depositary Governments to open it for signature, but this also is not an adoption, since each State reserves its right to sign it or not, and in so doing to enter whatever reservations or explanations of adherence it may wish; and thirdly, the simple expression of the hope that it will have the widest possible adherence is also not in itself tantamount to adherence.

27. The draft resolution adopted gives no legal validity to the draft treaty of the United States and the Soviet Union. Many States that supported the draft resolution explained that their vote did not commit the opinions of their Governments on the signature of the treaty, nor did it bind them to adopt the United States-Soviet Union treaty.

28. My delegation wishes to explain that despite the previous interpretation of the scope of the draft resolution,

we voted in favour of the Peruvian amendments, which called for a change in the text of the draft treaty, and we did so only to express our rejection of certain points in that draft treaty which my delegation considers unacceptable.

29. Had the draft resolution implied the adoption of the draft treaty proposed by the United States and the Soviet Union, my delegation would not have hesitated to vote against it. But since it does contain a certain, albeit limited, support, we preferred to abstain.

30. My delegation did not vote against the draft resolution because we consider that the United States-Soviet treaty is a relatively useful contribution; in fact the prohibition on the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor beyond the 12-mile limit from the coast is important, although my delegation understands that for the States which are parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco,² which applies to the State I represent, the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons is total and refers not only to the territory, territorial waters and to the continental shelf, but also to a zone of application of that treaty which generally exceeds the jurisdictional waters of any Latin American State. Since we understand that the exception from the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof only refers to the coastal States in its territorial waters within a 12-mile limit that may or may not coincide with the jurisdictional limits set by each State, the problem does not arise for the Latin American States parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, regardless of the extension of their territorial seas, since neither they nor the States not parties to the treaty can install nuclear weapons within the zone covered by the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

31. The United States-Soviet draft treaty is an important step towards the non-nuclearization of the zones that are not covered by a special treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons, and for that reason my delegation could not vote against the draft resolution submitted by Argentina and other States.

32. At this time, I wish to express the full agreement of my delegation with the very judicious legal criticisms levelled against the United States-Soviet draft by a number of delegations, particularly those of El Salvador, that it was a network of ambiguities, subtleties and errors which my delegation feels have been especially designed by the two great super-Powers to limit the extension of the jurisdictional waters of States.

33. However, my delegation believes that the indirect allusion to the contiguous zone and to the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone³ is only lamentable lack of clarity and that it is dangerous to juridical techniques, but it does not mean that the Geneva Convention constitutes a series of norms of international law, nor does it, for the same reason, refer to article 38 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties⁴ were this treaty to enter into force.

² Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068).

³ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 516 (1964), No. 7477.

⁴ Document A/CONF.39/27 and Corr. 1.

34. My delegation also feels that, despite the lack of clarity in the drafting, and the errors and ambiguities contained in articles I and II of the United States-Soviet Union treaty, the only logical interpretation is that only a coastal State can make use of the reservation to the general rule on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the sea-bed and the ocean floor; in other words, to install these within 12 miles of its coast regardless of the extension of its territorial sea.

35. Finally, my delegation considers that if the United States-Soviet draft were to become a valid treaty, it would not affect the provisions of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which would constitute a special law regarding the new treaty.

36. It is on the basis of these views, as well as of others, that my Government will be guided when it has to determine whether or not to sign the United States-Soviet treaty when it is opened for signature.

37. Mr. MESSIA (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation pondered long and considered carefully all the factors before it before casting our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.523. We did so because we felt that in the draft treaty there were many valuable points, but that does not mean that we considered the document in question, even after substantial improvements, to be either entirely satisfactory or perfect.

38. Although the efforts made by the sponsors were worthy of praise, we would have preferred again in greater strictness of thought and accuracy of formulation at the cost of the time used to achieve such desirable precision.

39. Our vote, being both prudent and constructive, was not, however, entirely devoid of reservations regarding the definition and the scope of some of the provisions of the draft treaty. We specifically feel a great concern regarding article III, since we consider that the control system provided in it does not adequately guarantee the complete fulfilment of the purposes of the treaty.

40. Mr. SHARIF (Indonesia): My Government is grateful to the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union for having initiated last year the idea of a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof, in the context of the total demilitarization of those areas. We are equally indebted to the members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for having prepared the draft treaty.

41. Some provisions of that draft treaty, however, have raised doubts in our mind, particularly those referring to the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone,⁵ to which Indonesia is not a party. My delegation has had occasion to explain that in an archipelago-State like my country and others, the adjacent waters around the component islands are important, not only as part and parcel of the national life and a God-given source of living for the people of those islands, but for the security of the entire nation as well. Indonesian waters are regulated by Law No. 4 of 18 February 1960. The draft

⁵ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 516 (1964), No. 7477.

treaty should not encroach upon our national territorial jurisdiction, either directly or indirectly.

42. Furthermore, since no observers were allowed to attend the proceedings of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, my delegation had no knowledge of the text of this draft treaty until the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was circulated at the beginning of our present Assembly. Time was too short indeed to consider seriously the over-all implications of the limitation of the so-called sea-bed zone to 12 miles reserved for our own defence arrangements; the more so, when security guarantees have not been obtained thus far on the part of the nuclear-weapon States, particularly from the one in our area.

43. We highly appreciate the additional elaborations by the representative of El Salvador yesterday [1763rd meeting]. We are also indebted to the representative of Peru for his initiative and the explanations he has given [ibid.] regarding his draft amendments in document A/C.1/L.528. The sincere efforts of those delegations do not, however, seem to have satisfied the interests of the major nuclear Powers. No amendments to the treaty were acceptable to them. In those circumstances, my delegation has voted in favour of the revised amendments to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.523 and the preambular paragraphs of the draft treaty and, with our abstention on the amendments to the operative paragraphs, we have refrained from expressing an opinion on the articles of the draft treaty as well as on the amendments to them.

44. We had hoped that it would be possible to adopt the Peruvian amendments, for they could greatly improve the present draft treaty and fulfil our objective, which is the total demilitarization of the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof. Since that was not so, however, and since we cannot commend a treaty on which we have no opinion as yet, we have abstained on the draft resolution. My Government will make a further study of the new treaty.

45. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): I should like to make two points in connexion with the votes of our delegation on the Peruvian amendments [A/C.1/L.528] relating to draft resolution A/C.1/L.523, the amendments on which the Committee voted at the preceding meeting.

46. The votes of the United States on those amendments reflected our substantive views rather than procedural considerations. We would not wish this to be interpreted, however, as indicating that we had no problems from the procedural viewpoint. In particular, we do not wish our vote to be interpreted as implying acceptance of the notion that a treaty text, incorporating what will become binding international legal obligations—a treaty, incidentally, which has been negotiated with careful attention to the interrelationships and to the balances among its many parts—can be amended by a vote in this Committee. Suggestions for amendments can, of course, be introduced in the discussions in this Committee, and some of the suggestions made in last year's discussion resulted in actual amendments. Members will recall that this procedural question was raised last year, and at that time the Chairman ruled in what we considered to be a satisfactory fashion [1701st meeting].

We continue to believe that that ruling by the Chairman last year remains a proper description of the parliamentary situation, one which has not been invalidated by the action this Committee has just taken.

47. Our second point relates to the amendments to the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/L.523, the final language for which was suggested by the representative of Mexico. The United States acceptance of that amended language in no way indicates a change with respect to our view on the so-called moratorium resolution—resolution 2574 D (XXIV)—relating to the exploitation of sea-bed resources beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

48. Mr. ARIAS SCHREIBER (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): When voting against the draft treaty on the partial denuclearization of the sea-bed, the Peruvian delegation expressed its disagreement, not with the spirit of the draft, but with those articles which we proposed to amend in order to prohibit the existence of nuclear arms in all the marine environment.

49. Those amendments were rejected by the negative votes of 54 States out of 127 Members of the United Nations. For a proposal that was not negotiated, the result is significant and we wish to thank the 44 delegations that voted with us or abstained.

50. Of course, since Peru is not a nuclear Power, yesterday's decision does not affect it at all from the point of view of concrete actions that it might perform in any of the two zones, the denuclearized zone and the zone not subject to prohibition. Those affected by yesterday's decision are law and the aspirations of mankind. We voted against the draft treaty because, as we saw it, its exceptions, its lack of coherence and its errors make it a juridically vitiated document, and because it ignores the protests of mankind at the possession of nuclear weapons, which constitute an outrage and a threat to all.

51. Of course, there are different ways of seeing things and it might be considered that the draft treaty, albeit imperfect and limited, is nevertheless a starting point for later progress that the parties will achieve in good faith, leading to the total prohibition from installing nuclear weapons in the sea-bed and ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof. If the majority of the delegations feel that that is so, those who—as is the case for the delegation of Peru—have expressed our disagreement, are nevertheless ready to understand the decision of the others and trust that they were wise in taking it.

52. In the meantime, we take note that the parties will continue negotiations in order to adopt further measures in the field of disarmament, and I trust not as the text says “to prevent the arms race”, but to exclude it entirely from the marine environment. That is the commitment that we should like to see assumed. And when it is at last achieved, those who now refuse to heed us will agree that we were right.

53. Thus too, we take note that nothing in the treaty affects the rights of the coastal States regarding the breadth of their maritime sovereignty. We shall ensure that that

statement be respected when, in the appropriate forum, the other items on the law of the sea are dealt with. We do not doubt the sincerity of the sponsors of the draft, but that can only be proved with deeds. As usual, it is history that will decide who was more far-sighted and just in the casting of votes.

54. Mr. WILLIAMS (Jamaica): The Jamaican delegation is in agreement with the terms of the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/L.523, introduced by the delegation of Peru [A/C.1/L.528] in so far as they seek to extend the scope of the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, to cover the entire marine environment. This is in keeping with our desire to see the attainment of general and complete disarmament in all environments. We understand, however, the difficulties of achieving substantial agreement at this stage regarding this very desirable objective. It is our view that the draft treaty is a step forward in the general direction in which we all hope to go. My delegation could not therefore vote affirmatively in respect of the substantive portions of the Peruvian amendments, as the amendments would render impossible at this time this achievement in a vital area of nuclear-weapon control.

55. The present treaty, as drafted, will have application for Latin America in the way envisaged by the representative of Peru, as soon as all the nuclear-weapon States have signed and ratified the Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, the Treaty of Tlatelolco,⁶ and it is our hope that all such States that have not yet done so will now move speedily towards action in that direction. It is our hope also that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the countries which become parties to this treaty will continue exploring with all possible energy ways and means of bringing about the extension of its application, as provided for in article V.

56. In voting for draft resolution A/C.1/L.523, my delegation wishes to make it clear that this in no way commits my Government regarding the action it will take on the treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof. This will be studied in due course with all its implications, and appropriate action will be taken at that time.

57. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation wishes, first of all, to join in the expressions of deep sympathy offered by previous speakers to the delegation of Pakistan on the occasion of the unprecedented catastrophe that has befallen that friendly country.

58. We should now like to express our satisfaction to the members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for having reached agreement on the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof.

59. The objective of this treaty is, in itself, a very praiseworthy one, for it involves the exclusion of the sea-bed and the ocean floor from the arms race and their reservation for purely peaceful purposes.

60. The Ivory Coast—a small country with limited resources and very modest pretensions, but one which ardently desires peace—can only rejoice at seeing this new agreement brought into being, a new step along the road to general and complete disarmament. The affirmative vote cast by my delegation on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.523 is an additional proof of our wish to make our modest contribution to the building of a world of peace, a world freed from the fear, the terror, the menace of this diabolical arsenal.

61. By our vote, we also want to encourage any initiative, any action, that will slowly but surely carry us along the difficult road to general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

62. My delegation, however, wishes to state that its vote in no way prejudices the position of our Government on the implications of that treaty with regard to the various aspects of the problems relating to the law of the sea that are involved in that document. We likewise reserve the position of our Government as to the signing and ratification of the treaty. Decisions with regard to these matters will be taken after a more thorough study of the text.

63. We abstained on the Peruvian amendments in document A/C.1/L.528, because those amendments went against the wishes of the main sponsors of the draft treaty, who wanted the text to remain unchanged.

64. Mr. ZEGERS (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before explaining the vote of my delegation, I wish to express the feelings of sorrow and solidarity felt by the Government and the people of Chile at the catastrophe that has befallen our brethren in Pakistan. The delegation of Chile wishes to contribute, through all the appropriate channels of our Organization, to giving Pakistan the same type of assistance that we in Chile and Peru received when we were the victims of similar catastrophes.

65. The Chilean delegation came to this vote with confused feelings. In last year's debate, we stated our reservations with regard to certain provisions of the draft treaty, which have not unfortunately been entirely satisfied by this modest step that has now been proposed to us in the field of disarmament.

66. First of all, we voted on the Peruvian amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.528. We voted in favour of the orally revised amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/L.523, which substantially improves it. Regarding the amendments to the draft treaty, we voted in favour of those applying to the preamble. With respect to those changing the operative part, we agree with them in so far as they represent an effort to extend further the prohibition of armaments, and also because they do away with the unnecessary reference to the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone.⁷ But because we

⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068.

⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 516 (1964), No. 7477.

felt that at this stage it would have been more realistic, we should have preferred an amendment setting an arbitrary zone reserved to the coastal State, as stipulated in the original drafts of the two co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. For these reasons we had to abstain on these.

67. We voted in favour of the draft resolution commending the treaty, within the scope and with the specific understanding that I shall go on to indicate.

68. The reference to the Geneva Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone seemed to us needless and inappropriate. That Convention refers to a different area, and the contiguous zone to which article II of the draft treaty indirectly refers is a surface criterion. To explain this further, I would say that the Convention I referred to has a considerably reduced international standing, for it has failed to obtain even 40 ratifications, in other words, not even one third of the States represented in this room have ratified it, which is a tangible proof of how little its provisions are accepted.

69. It would have sufficed had it set an arbitrary zone of, say, 10, 12 or 15 miles, measured from the lowest tideline. Had a more detailed system of measurement been necessary, substantial parts of the straight-line base system, also used in the Geneva Convention, could have been drawn on, but without in any way relating to that Convention. Alternately, as an ideal solution, we might have resorted to an *ad hoc* and arbitrary system of measuring and nothing would have stood in the way of our accepting it.

70. We understand that the reservations entered regarding article IV of the draft treaty must be interpreted broadly and that therefore it would be inappropriate to argue that a still-born convention is being given new status; it cannot be considered that we are in any way prejudging the value of its provisions or that the criteria of pure and simple surface can be applied to the sea-bed; and, in general, that the position of a State Member vis-à-vis that convention can in no way be affected.

71. The Chilean delegation understands also that article IV should also be interpreted to cover any capricious interpretation that might be attached to any one or more of its provisions regarding the future international régime governing the sea-bed, its resources beyond national jurisdiction or regarding the moratorium on the exploitation of the resources of the sea declared by the General Assembly [resolution 2574 D (XXIV)].

72. We also understand that the clause in article IV and the explanation given us in this Committee render it impossible to attach to the provisions of this draft treaty any interpretation that might prejudice other matters bearing on the law of the sea.

73. Only by bearing in mind these clear and precise definitions has my delegation found itself in a position to support the resolution commending the treaty. We did so in the conviction that this was merely a modest measure not so much of disarmament as of prevention of armaments, which, as has been said in the debate, is in any case smaller in scope than the Treaty of Tlatelolco.⁸

⁸ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068).

74. In fact, by General Assembly resolution 2340 (XXII) and others, the international community has decided that the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond national jurisdiction shall be reserved exclusively for peaceful purposes. That reservation would appear to imply total demilitarization—at least of that area lying beyond national jurisdiction. With regard to that area, the present treaty seems to give contractual form to an extremely limited part of the reservation for exclusively peaceful purposes already decided by the General Assembly. Furthermore, the prohibition of the use of the area for military purposes, according to all experts, seems not to cover the main but only the marginal uses of the region for that purpose. Therefore, we can only interpret article V of the draft treaty as a pledge to continue in future negotiations to reserve for purely peaceful purposes the sea-bed outside national jurisdiction until its complete demilitarization has been achieved.

75. In voting in favour of this partial and insufficient measure of armament prevention with the reservations I have expressed, the Chilean delegation has done so because this draft treaty is the only concrete draft offered us this year—as was the case last year—by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation trusts that by the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly that organ will have been able to elaborate more significant instruments, perhaps along the lines of the comprehensive programme of disarmament drafted by the delegations of Mexico, Sweden and Yugoslavia [A/8059-DC/233, annex C, sect. 42], or that submitted by the Italian delegation to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [*ibid.*, sect. 38]. Such initiatives might well be linked with the Disarmament Decade proclaimed by the General Assembly and also with the need to free resources for economic development.

76. The Chilean delegation hopes also that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament will in its future deliberations take into account opinions expressed in the Political Committee of the General Assembly, particularly by States not members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, when preparing instruments like the draft treaty submitted to us yesterday.

Organization of work

77. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like first to inform the Committee that the delegations of Lebanon, New Zealand, Sierra Leone and Somalia have added their names to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.529.

78. I should like now to consult the Committee on the order of priority for the consideration of the draft resolutions before it on the various disarmament items. For the information of all members, I shall indicate the situation with respect to each of the agenda items and the draft resolutions that have been submitted.

79. Under agenda item 27, “Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament”, the situation is as follows. The Committee has concluded consideration of the draft resolution and amendments relating to the draft treaty on

the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof.

80. But under this same item 27, the Committee has before it draft resolutions A/C.1/L.532 and 534. Moreover, I understand that the Committee may possibly receive additional draft resolutions dealing with different aspects of item 27.

81. Under item 28, entitled "Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament", the Committee has before it three draft resolutions, which are contained in documents A/C.1/L.526, 527 and 533. I have been informed that the sponsors of these draft resolutions are holding consultations in order, if possible, to draft a single document acceptable to all.

82. Under item 29, entitled "Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament", the Committee has two draft resolutions before it in documents A/C.1/L.529 and 530. I understand that there is no intention of submitting any further draft resolutions on this subject.

83. Under items 30 and 31, entitled "Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the Secretary-General" and "Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency", no draft resolution has been submitted as yet.

84. Under agenda item 93, "Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", the Committee has one draft resolution before it which appears in document A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1.

85. Finally, under agenda item 94, "Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security", the Committee has one draft resolution before it, which has just been circulated this afternoon in document A/C.1/L.535.

86. That is the general picture regarding the disarmament items.

87. That being the case, I would suggest to the Committee that we consider the draft resolutions submitted on agenda items 93, 29, 28 and 94 in that order. I make that suggestion because I presume that the consultations on the three draft resolutions submitted with respect to agenda item 28 will be concluded by the time the Committee concludes its consideration of agenda items 93 and 29.

88. With regard to the order of priority for consideration of the draft resolutions submitted with respect to agenda items 27, 30 and 31, I would suggest that this matter be decided after the pertinent draft resolutions have been submitted. With regard to this last point and in accordance

with the statement I made at yesterday's meeting, I would recommend that the Committee decide on Thursday, 19 November, at 6 p.m., as the dead-line for the presentation of draft resolutions on the disarmament items.

89. If there are no objections, I shall take it that the Committee agrees to that proposal.

It was so decided.

90. I would also suggest to the Committee that after concluding consideration of agenda items 93, 29, 28 and 94, to which I have referred, and while awaiting any draft resolutions that delegations might wish to submit under agenda items 27, 30 and 31, the Committee begin consideration of the substantive aspects of the Korean question. If possible, I would suggest that we start consideration of that item tomorrow.

91. It is understood that after we conclude consideration of the Korean question, which I trust will not be later than Tuesday, 24 November, the Committee will resume its consideration of the disarmament questions. I trust that the Committee will agree to my suggestions.

92. In accordance with the programme that I have outlined, the Committee will now consider under agenda item 93 the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1. If I hear no objections we shall now begin consideration of that draft resolution.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 93

Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco) (*concluded*)* (A/7993 and Add.1 and 2, A/8076, A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

93. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Mexico to submit the revised text of draft resolution A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1 to the Committee.

94. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to say only a few words, since I am sure that all representatives will have fresh in their minds the wide-ranging statement that I made on 12 November [1758th meeting] when, on behalf of the 18 delegations of Latin America that are sponsoring the document, I submitted draft resolution A/C.1/L.522.

95. In view of the length of the draft resolution we felt that it might be helpful to delegations if I were to pinpoint the changes contained in this revised version. I would like to say in advance that none of these changes in any way alters the substance of the draft.

* Resumed from the 1762nd meeting.

96. With regard to the preambular part of the resolution, there is only one change—in the sixth preambular paragraph—which is now drafted as follows:

“*Convinced* that these obligations”—contained in Protocol II and which apply to the countries possessing nuclear weapons—“are entirely in conformity with the general obligations assumed under the Charter of the United Nations, which every Member of the Organization has solemnly undertaken to fulfil in good faith, as set forth in Article 2 of the Charter.”

The rest of the preamble is unchanged.

97. With regard to the operative part, paragraph 1 of the revised text is precisely the same as that which appeared in the original draft as paragraph 2. We have merely changed the order. Paragraph 4 in the revised text is also exactly the same as paragraph 3 of the original draft. Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the revised draft are the same as paragraph 1 of the original text. The original paragraph 1 has been divided into two new paragraphs because the sponsors came to the conclusion, after weighing the suggestions and comments of a number of delegations, that in that way we would more accurately and faithfully reflect the feelings of the Assembly regarding this aspect of the matter.

98. Therefore the new paragraph 2 reads as follows:

“*Notes with satisfaction* that one of those States has already signed and ratified the Protocol and that another has signed it and is now actively engaged in the ratification process;”

99. Paragraph 3 essentially reproduces the contents of the original paragraph 1, since in it we deplore that not all nuclear-weapon States have as yet signed the Protocol.

100. Finally, paragraph 5 of the revised text is in substance identical with paragraph 4 of the original draft. As far as the form is concerned, we have used different words, but the procedural question is still the same. This paragraph requests the Secretary-General to arrange the transmittal of the present resolution to the nuclear-weapon States. That is to say, the General Assembly wishes it to be transmitted to all the nuclear-weapon States. We found that this wording was preferable because we had in mind certain precedents that exist in the case of correspondence between the Secretary-General and one of the nuclear-weapon States, precedents to which the attention of the sponsors had been drawn by some delegations.

101. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): My delegation is very pleased to be able to vote for the draft resolution proposed by the delegation of Mexico concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II to the Treaty of Tlatelolco. I should like to recall that the United States has already signed Protocol II, as Ambassador García Robles has just noted, and that the Protocol has now been transmitted to the United States Senate for its advice and consent to ratification.

102. As the draft resolution points out, the Treaty of Tlatelolco is the first treaty to provide for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in a heavily populated area.

103. For that reason, the Treaty is of historic significance. A large number of nations have co-operated constructively towards the realization of that Treaty. The representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, is especially to be commended for his leadership in this regard.

104. May I repeat that my Government considers that that regional disarmament measure deserves the widest possible support.

105. Mr. LUTCHMAN (Guyana): Ever since the adoption in February 1967 of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, Guyana has consistently declared its support for that very important development. We lauded the Treaty at the very outset as a realistic appraisal of the need for positive measures for the attainment of peace. This remains basically our position at this time.

106. However, as delegations are no doubt aware, Guyana is excluded from accession to the Treaty. Under article 25, paragraph 2, of the Treaty, the General Conference is precluded from taking any decision on “the admission of a political entity part or all of whose territory is the subject, prior to the date when this Treaty is opened for signature, of a dispute or claim between an extra-continental country and one or more Latin American States, so long as the dispute has not been settled by peaceful means”.

107. The delegation of Guyana has, on previous occasions, made its views known on that restriction. For example, the Guyana delegation, speaking in the First Committee on 17 November 1967, stated:

“We are now called upon to vote in support of a draft resolution which will enshrine that exclusionary article at the highest level in the General Assembly of this world Organization . . . ; let there be no doubt about Guyana’s recognition of the need to secure that all States ‘give their full co-operation to ensure that the régime laid down in the Treaty enjoys the universal observance to which its lofty principles and noble aims entitle it’. But Guyana cannot give an affirmative vote when by that vote we help to give universal sanction to exclusionary features of which we ourselves are the victims.” [*1531st meeting, para. 14.*]

108. My delegation has also previously expressed the hope—and this remains our position—that exclusionary provisions such as those included in article 25, paragraph 2, will no longer form part of treaties such as the one under discussion and prevent a country like Guyana from making its own contribution to peace.

109. Therefore, in the circumstances, despite our sympathy and support for the objectives which draft resolution A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1 is designed to promote, my delegation feels obliged to abstain on the vote.

110. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In connexion with the vote in this Committee on the draft resolution of a group of Latin American countries on the status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of

the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco), I should like to make a statement on behalf of the Soviet delegation in explanation of its vote.

111. The Soviet Union is in favour of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various parts of the world, as this would be an effective means of limiting the areas in which nuclear weapons could be placed and used. In this connexion, the Soviet Union takes the position that the obligation to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones can be assumed both by groups of States covering whole continents or large geographical areas and by more limited groups of States, or even by individual countries.

112. On the basis of this position of principle, the Soviet Union is prepared to undertake a commitment to respect the statute of denuclearization in respect of individual Latin American countries. It has already made a statement concerning its readiness to undertake such a commitment in respect of Mexico, which, as is known, is reflected in the Soviet-Mexican communiqué of 30 May 1968.

113. The Soviet Union would be prepared to undertake a similar commitment in respect of other Latin American countries which, like Mexico, make their territories completely free of nuclear weapons.

114. With reference to the draft resolution submitted by Latin American countries that is now before us, concerning the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, we wish to confirm the well-known and frequently explained position of the Soviet Union on that Treaty. In view of that position, the Soviet delegation will abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

115. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): There are no further speakers in explanation of vote before the voting. We shall therefore proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1.

The vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria,

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Guyana, Hungary.

The draft resolution was adopted by 71 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.⁹

116. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on delegations that wish to explain their votes.

117. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): The Romanian vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1 concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America is a result of the consistent position of Romania in favour of the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world. Romania considers that the creation of this type of zone in different parts of the world, appropriately guaranteed by the nuclear Powers, constitutes an important and true contribution to the elimination of the nuclear threat to the peace and security of regions and of the world itself. As is well known, the Government of Romania has also made proposals concerning the transformation of the Balkans into a zone of peace and good-neighbourliness completely devoid of nuclear weapons, which is still a timely proposal.

118. Mr. VON HIRSCHBERG (South Africa): I regret very much that I was momentarily absent when the name of South Africa was called in the roll-call vote just taken on draft resolution A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1. Had I been here I would have voted in favour, and I shall be glad if the record could show that.

119. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Note will be taken of the statement of the representative of South Africa.

120. Mr. WOLDE-GIORGIS (Ethiopia) (*interpretation from French*): I merely wish to explain the vote of the delegation of Ethiopia on draft resolution A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1, relating to the signing and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. Ethiopia voted in favour of the draft resolution, convinced as it is that, with respect to progress in general disarmament, any regional agreement creating a nuclear-free zone is an important step and reflects a trend that should be encouraged further. However, a nuclear-free zone is one that should be completely free of nuclear weapons, and that is the trend which ought to be a prerequisite. It is because the result to be achieved sooner or later is full of promise that my delegation voted for the draft resolution.

121. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have no further speakers to explain their votes after the vote, so I believe that we have thus concluded our consideration of item 93.

122. In accordance with the order that I suggested to the Committee, we shall now consider the draft resolutions on item 29.

⁹ In the course of the meeting, the representatives of South Africa, Bolivia and Paraguay stated that if they had been present when the vote was taken they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

AGENDA ITEM 29

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (concluded)* (A/7967 and Add.1 and 2, Add.3 and Corr.1 and 2, Add.4, Add.5 and Corr.1 and 2, A/8059-DC/233, A/C.1/L.529 and 530)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

123. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): On this item, the Committee has before it two draft resolutions, A/C.1/L.529 and 530. I now call on the representative of Canada to present draft resolution A/C.1/L.529.

124. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): When I spoke in the general debate on 2 November, I indicated that the Canadian delegation would very shortly submit to this Committee, in company with other like-minded delegations, a draft resolution which might serve as “a useful focus for support for further progress in clarifying the potential role of a seismic data exchange system in the verification process of a comprehensive ban” on the testing of nuclear weapons underground. [*1749th meeting, para. 18.*]

125. In order to facilitate further consideration of this proposal, which is, as I said, designed to try to overcome disagreement between nuclear Powers on verification of a ban on nuclear testing, we have submitted the text of draft resolution A/C.1/L.529. We are much heartened by the support we have received from other delegations and are pleased to note—according to my last reckoning—that there are now 40 sponsors for our draft resolution.

126. We consider that this draft resolution should be regarded as a complement to the other draft we are considering under this item [*A/C.1/L.530*], which was submitted by the non-aligned delegations on 11 November and which we will support.

127. We realize also that, as the representative of Nigeria pointed out in his closely reasoned statement of 6 November [*1752nd meeting*] the conclusion of any disarmament agreement is principally a political action and therefore presupposes the existence of a necessary political will on the part of all concerned. But, as the representative of Nigeria also stressed, assurance of the reliability or credibility of the control system is a necessary and important contributory factor.

128. Those are indeed the reasons why Canada, together with other sponsors, took the initiative at the last Assembly of seeking information on the willingness of Governments to co-operate in a world-wide seismic data exchange. The result of this initiative was the questionnaire circulated by the Secretary-General, which sought information concerning the quantity and quality of seismic data which national seismological stations could produce and which Governments would be prepared to make available on an assured basis to facilitate the verification of a ban on underground nuclear testing.

129. The information submitted in response to that questionnaire [*A/7967/Rev.1*] was, as I mentioned in my

statement of 2 November, analysed in detail by Canadian seismologists and a preliminary assessment of it was circulated last summer at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Now, a more complete scientific study, incorporating all the returns received to date and with an expression of technical argumentation, is being prepared by Canadian seismologists and we hope to circulate copies of this assessment to all delegations before the end of the current General Assembly for their information and for study by their technical experts. In this study, using the data quoted in the United Nations returns and published in open literature, the capability of each conventional and array station is described in terms of its ability to detect P-waves, or those waves that are propagated through the body of the earth, and Rayleigh waves, or waves which are propagated on the surface of the globe, as a function of the distance from the event. A very brief and oversimplified summary of the results and conclusions of this assessment is that the global system of stations produces proven detection, location and identification of underground nuclear explosions down to yields of about 60 kilotons in hard rock. In most of the northern hemisphere, the threshold is between 10 and 20 kilotons for certain test sites only, and this lower threshold cannot be reached on a global basis with the existing ensemble of stations. The study is completed by a number of recommendations which, with very little financial commitment, will provide some basic data required to define the existing capabilities better and which may significantly improve them.

130. National capabilities moreover could be improved through the development of more technologically advanced scientific equipment. It is for this reason that operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.529 urges Governments to “consider and, wherever possible, to implement methods of improving their capability to contribute high quality seismic data”. In this regard, I might mention that the Canadian Government for its part has now initiated a study project which seeks to further develop technical knowledge for seismological detection techniques.

131. The draft resolution goes further in inviting Governments in a position to do so to consider assistance in the improvement of world-wide seismological capabilities. I am sure that my colleagues noted the example set by the Ambassador of Japan, another of the sponsors, when on 4 November, in the meeting of this Committee, he said that: “It is the intention of the Japanese Government to strive to improve the network of observatories in Japan and to contribute as far as possible to international co-operation in this field.” [*1750th meeting, para. 84.*]

132. I believe that it is universally recognized that the international exchange of seismic data must play a role in ensuring compliance with whatever international agreement or agreements may be negotiated to supplement the Moscow partial test-ban Treaty.¹⁰ It is for this reason that this draft resolution invites members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to co-operate in further study of this issue. In this way, when the international political situation permits a decision on a further ban on

¹⁰ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480 (1963), No. 6964).

* Resumed from the 1762nd meeting.

nuclear testing to be taken, the essential preliminary study of the basic aspects of verification procedure and availability of seismic information will have been completed. I hope that members of this Assembly will agree that this objective is a valid one.

133. In conclusion, the essence of the problem in trying to bring an end to nuclear and thermonuclear testing, as in other important disarmament measures, as the representative of Malta, who is also a sponsor of the draft resolution, reminded us last week [*1758th meeting*], is confidence. International confidence, if it does not exist, has to be built up block by block. It is to this end that the proposal to continue our work in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in trying to improve the world-wide exchange of seismic information is directed. I hope that, for the reasons I have given, draft resolution A/C.1/L.529 will receive the general support which we believe it merits and I should also like to request that a roll-call vote be taken on this draft resolution when it comes to the vote.

134. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Sweden to submit draft resolution A/C.1/L.530.

135. Mr. EDELSTAM (Sweden): It is my privilege to introduce on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/C.1/L.530, dealing with agenda item 29 on the urgent need for the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. This draft has as its sponsors the delegations of Burma, Ethiopia, India, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Sweden, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia.

136. This draft resolution and the one just introduced by the representative of Canada are, as he pointed out, complementary. Most speakers who have taken part in the general debate have dealt at length with the necessity of completing the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 with a ban on underground nuclear tests. As is evident from the brief enumeration contained in the second preambular paragraph of the present draft, the General Assembly has, in recent years, passed a number of resolutions dealing with the subject. They have had no effect.

137. In our statement in the general debate on 4 November [*1750th meeting*], my delegation mentioned the figure of 73 nuclear tests conducted during the 18 months from January 1969 to June 1970. The efforts to stop nuclear weapons testing do have to be continued. The text of the draft resolution to this effect which is being proposed by the sponsoring delegations in document A/C.1/L.530 follows very closely the similar resolution 2604 B (XXIV), which was passed by the Assembly last year. That resolution was voted upon favourably by a virtually unanimous Assembly. The sponsors hope that the members of the Committee will respond in the same positive way to this year's attempt to bring an end to all nuclear weapons testing.

138. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before voting on this draft resolution, I call on those delegations who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

139. Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Permit me, on behalf of the

Soviet delegation, to explain our vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.529 concerning the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, and the related problem of the international exchange of seismic data. As we understand it, the main provision of this draft resolution is its recommendation that Governments should take measures to expand and improve the exchange of seismic data.

140. In this connexion, permit me once again to state the Soviet Union's position on the exchange of seismic data. The Soviet Union is in favour of the broad exchange of seismic data on an international scale, it being understood that such an exchange would have a specific, well-defined purpose. Our delegation has already stated that the Soviet Union is prepared, on a voluntary basis, to exchange its national seismic data with other parties to a treaty providing for the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, and likewise to take part in an international exchange of such data on condition that such participation would not impose upon countries any obligation in respect of international inspection or verification in their territories, and that the evaluation of the data collected would be carried out not by any international organ but by each State on its own.

141. In accordance with the position of the Soviet Union, therefore—and we should like to stress this once again—the broad exchange of seismic data on the basis that we have indicated presupposes above all an understanding in principle concerning the cessation of underground nuclear tests and the use of national means of detection of nuclear explosions to verify implementation of any agreement on that subject. The Soviet delegation, both here in the General Assembly and in the Committee on Disarmament, has set out in detail this position of the Soviet Union on the international exchange of seismic data.

142. If we analyse the draft resolution now under consideration as it relates to this point, we note that it does not take due account of the matters which we touched upon in setting out the Soviet Union's position on the exchange of seismic data. That being the case, the Soviet delegation will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

143. The provisions of the other draft resolution on the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, submitted by 12 States [*A/C.1/L.530*], in which the General Assembly "*Urges* all States . . . to adhere without further delay to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water" and "*Calls upon* all nuclear-weapon States to suspend nuclear weapon tests in all environments", are fully in keeping with the position of the Soviet State on this matter. The Soviet delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

144. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since no other delegations wish to explain their votes before the voting, we shall proceed immediately to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.529, on which a roll-call vote has been requested.

The vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Australia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Brazil, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Algeria, Argentina.

The draft resolution was adopted by 74 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.¹¹

145. The CHAIRMAN: (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.530.

The draft resolution was adopted by 88 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

146. I now call upon the United States representative in explanation of vote.

147. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): The United States supports the objectives of the resolution we have just adopted. Again, as on similar past occasions, I should like to place on record that the United States understands the language of that resolution to call for a suspension of tests in all environments, pursuant to an adequately verified treaty. We continue to hope it will become possible to negotiate such a treaty in the nearest

¹¹ In the course of the meeting, the representative of Paraguay stated that if he had been present when the vote was taken he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

future, and we intend, in the course of the deliberations of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, to do everything in our power to further this objective.

148. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): No other delegation has expressed a desire to explain its vote after the vote. Therefore, we have concluded our consideration of item 29.

149. I now call on the representative of Bolivia, who wishes to make a brief statement.

150. Mr. EGUINO (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Bolivian delegation would like to state for the record that it was absent from the Committee during the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1, but that had it been present it would have voted in favour of that draft resolution.

151. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Note will be taken in the records of the statement of the representative of Bolivia.

152. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I merely wish to state that my delegation was absent when the vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.1/L.522/Rev.1. Had we been present, we would have voted in favour of it. This applies to draft resolution A/C.1/L.529.

153. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Note will be taken in the records of the statement of the representative of Paraguay.

154. We have no further questions to deal with this afternoon. I think we have progressed as far as possible, but before adjourning the meeting I should like to say that meetings have been scheduled for tomorrow at 10.30 a.m. and 3 p.m. I hope that at tomorrow morning's meeting we will be able to conclude our consideration of the draft resolutions bearing on item 28, the question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, and item 94, the economic and social consequences of the armaments race. Once we have concluded consideration of those questions, I hope that in the afternoon we will be able to start our consideration of the substantive aspect of the Korean question. In due course, once all the draft resolutions on the other disarmament items have been submitted, we can return to them.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.