



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Organization of work . . . . .	1
Agenda item 30:	
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament ( <i>concluded</i> )	
Consideration of the draft resolutions . . . . .	1

**Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).**

*Organization of work*

1. The CHAIRMAN: At the end of our meeting yesterday following the conclusion of the general debate on the disarmament items, I informed the Committee that I proposed to consult the sponsors of the various draft resolutions relating to the disarmament items in order to reach agreement on the order in which they should be taken up.
2. During the consultations which I held this morning, it was noted that, first, one or more additional draft resolutions are expected to be submitted under agenda item 29 on the question of general and complete disarmament.
3. Secondly, regarding draft resolutions on the question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons (agenda item 104), consultations are still going on with a view to reaching agreement on the draft resolutions already before the Committee. There is also the possibility of an additional draft resolution being submitted under this item.
4. Thirdly, regarding the question of suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests (agenda item 30), the Committee has before it two draft resolutions. No additional draft resolutions are expected to be submitted.
5. Fourthly, regarding the item on the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (agenda item 31), no draft resolutions have yet been submitted. It is understood that a number of countries are still consulting together with a view to submitting a draft on this item.
6. Taking all this into account, it appears to me there is general agreement that: first, the Committee should now take up for consideration the draft resolutions under agenda item 30 and proceed to vote on them at the end of the discussion; secondly, with regard to the remaining items, the Committee should follow the order already decided upon by the Committee and set out in document A/C.1/984/Add.1. If I hear no comments I shall take it that the Committee agrees to this procedure.

*It was so decided.*

AGENDA ITEM 30

**Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/7741-DC/232; A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4, A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1) (*concluded*)**

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

7. I would now appeal to all delegations which are still engaged in consultations concerning the draft resolutions under agenda items 29, 104 and 31 to submit their drafts not later than Friday, 5 December at 6 p.m.—that is, tomorrow, at 6 p.m. It is my intention to continue my consultations with all the delegations concerned with regard to the future organization of work and I shall keep the Committee informed as necessary.
8. In accordance with the decision just taken, the Committee will now proceed to the consideration of the draft resolutions under agenda item 30; namely, urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. Before giving the floor to the first speaker I should like to inform the Committee that if we are able to vote on these draft resolutions today there will be no need for a meeting tomorrow. The draft resolutions are contained in documents A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4 and A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1. Final action today on these resolutions would enable delegations to use the three days for consultations and reflection on the action to be taken on the remaining three items on Monday, 8 December 1969.
9. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): In accordance with the procedure you have just put to the Committee, and that has been adopted without objection, I wish to make some remarks regarding draft resolution A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4 which was submitted by Canada and twenty-seven co-sponsors. I should like to take this opportunity of making some brief clarifying comments on this proposal on an international exchange of a seismological data. We think our resolution affords the General Assembly an opportunity of taking specific and concrete action in the direction of a verified comprehensive test ban.
10. Before considering any voluntary seismological data exchange system, it is obviously necessary to ascertain the extent of co-operation which Governments would be prepared to extend freely and the form in which this data would be made available. We have no pretensions about the significance of the measure we propose; none the less, we believe it is a useful substantive step towards the implementation of paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 2455 (XXIII), and it is relevant to the task of circumventing some of the obstacles to the achievement of a comprehensive test ban.

11. In view of the urgency which previous sessions of the General Assembly attached, and I believe that this Assembly attaches also, to the achievement of a comprehensive test ban, we hope that this resolution will be supported by all delegations.

12. In particular I should like to try to dispel any possibility of misunderstanding about this draft resolution. Our Soviet colleague in his statement of 25 November [1699th meeting], said that the Soviet delegation is ready to undertake on a voluntary basis an exchange of seismological data with other parties to a treaty on the general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, and to take part in an international exchange of data within the framework of the detection club proposed by Sweden. We warmly welcome this statement. However, the representative of the Soviet Union went on to suggest that the exchange “must not impose any obligations on the participants in such exchange to have international inspection carried out on their territory, and the evaluation of the data compiled must be made not by some international body but by each State for itself” [*ibid.*, para. 117]. There is nothing in the text of our resolution which can be regarded as prejudicing this position in any way even by implication.

13. The representative of the Soviet Union also suggested that the draft resolution which we have offered intends “compulsory exchange of seismological data” [*ibid.*, para. 118], and would not be voluntary. I wish to assure the Soviet delegation, and any other delegations having similar concerns, that we have no such intention in mind, nor is there any reference to any element of compulsion in the text of the draft resolution. Indeed, if it were to facilitate the co-operation of the Soviet Union in seismic exchanges on the basis of this proposal, we should be happy to add the word “voluntarily” after the word “co-operate” in the second operative paragraph of our draft resolution.

14. Our Soviet colleague also spoke of the inflexible time-table for the provision of the information requested. We would be open to any suggestion from the Soviet delegation as to how the convenience of his Government might be met by an extension of the time-table. The target date of 1 July, for instance, would be quite acceptable. The only reason, indeed, for suggesting any time-table is that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva should, in our view, be given a chance to study the voluntary replies of the Governments to the Secretary-General’s circular letter attached to our draft resolution before reporting to the next session of the General Assembly on this problem.

15. Lastly, the Soviet delegation suggested that a discriminatory formula was being employed with regard to the transmission of the inquiry to be made by the Secretary-General on a voluntary basis to various Governments. I should explain that the reasons for the formula used is that, as I understand it, it cannot be left to the Secretary-General or the Secretariat to decide which Governments should be approached on this important question of seismic exchange, and this is the formula normally used in the United Nations at the present time.

16. Again, however, if this were the only obstacle to unanimity, I am sure there would be a willingness on the

part of the co-sponsors, as well as ourselves, to consider suggestions which would enable us to overcome this difficulty on a widely acceptable and reasonable basis.

17. I make these comments in the spirit of accommodation which we truly believe is the only basis on which arms control and disarmament negotiation can usefully proceed. A wise diplomat has said that negotiation is like settling quarrels with your wife; you must realize that you have to live with her in the end and you must therefore always leave room for accommodation. I may say that this is the spirit, as I understand it, of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, the spirit of Geneva, the spirit which at the present time is particularly important in view of the historic decisions taken by the great Powers who are at Geneva, such initiatives as the beginning of the strategic arms limitation talks, their ratification of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the United States declaration of tremendous importance on chemical and bacteriological warfare, the proposal of the Soviet Union and other socialist States on the same subject [A/7655], and, last but not least, the joint proposal for a draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the sea-bed and ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof [A/7741-DC/232,<sup>1</sup> annex A].

18. It is this spirit which animates our approach in trying to find a fair and equitable basis of co-operation in the arrangements for international seismic exchange which we believe will help to contribute materially to the solution of the difficult problem of verification of a comprehensive test ban.

19. The Canadian delegation attaches the greatest importance to this proposal, for it is directly related to the attainment of the priority objective set both by the General Assembly and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, of trying to end the arms race in nuclear weapons.

20. In conclusion, I should like to add that the Canadian delegation will be supporting the other resolution under item 30, namely, document A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1, sponsored by Sweden and several other delegations, on the need for the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests.

21. Mr. EDELSTAM (Sweden): As an important part of the statement by the leader of the Swedish delegation, Mrs. Myrdal on 20 November [1695th meeting], was devoted to the question of the comprehensive test ban, I can be brief today.

22. We have been gratified to note, together with the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1, that there has been no opposition to its contents from speakers in the general debate. On the contrary, the overwhelming majority of delegations which took part in that debate have supported the views contained in the draft resolution.

23. I hope therefore that it will receive the same virtually unanimous approval as has been the case with similar resolutions in the past. More important than passing

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1969*, document DC/232.

resolutions, however, is concrete action. It cannot be ascertained at this juncture whether such action will lead to a comprehensive test ban in the year ahead. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1 should, however, constitute a good basis for further active negotiations on the subject in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

24. As far as the other draft resolution on the test-ban issue is concerned [*A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4*], I wish to support, in the strongest possible terms, what has just been said by the representative of Canada. The sponsors of this draft resolution stand ready, I am sure, to make any reasonable changes in the present text which could—without damaging the purpose of the draft resolution—lead to its universal acceptance. The action called for in the draft resolution is a modest one, but important in the sense that the proposed seismological data exchange may well turn out to be a necessary and vital part of the verification system in connexion with the treaty to prohibit all underground nuclear-weapon tests.

25. The Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom have declared their willingness to take part in such a data exchange on a voluntary basis; many other countries have done the same. However, in order to be able to ascertain the effectiveness of such a system, more precise information about participating seismological stations and their data output is necessary. This is the purpose of the proposed action. Most States can take part in the data exchange at modest cost.

26. We appeal to all delegations to support this step forward and to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4.

27. Mr. ROSHCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I too should like to comment on the draft resolutions relating to suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, as the Canadian and Swedish representatives did before me.

28. As my delegation has already stated its opinion of the first of these texts, i.e., the draft resolution submitted by Canada and a number of other countries and contained in document A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4, I can now only repeat it, and also reply to the questions put by the Canadian representative. I would emphasize once again that the Soviet Union is prepared, on a voluntary basis, to exchange seismological data, i.e., seismograms, but not data regarding seismological stations, as the Canadian representative insists, with the other parties to the treaty on the comprehensive prohibition of nuclear testing. We are also ready to take part in an international exchange of such data, i.e., seismological data and not data regarding stations, in the framework of the proposed detection club. The Soviet side considers, however, that participation in an international exchange of seismological data should in no case impose any obligation on the participating countries to submit to international inspection in their territory. It believes that the material resulting from the exchange of seismological data—by which I mean an exchange of seismograms—must be evaluated by every State on its own account, and not by any international organ.

29. The Canadian representative explained in his statement today that there was nothing in his draft resolution

making the submission of data compulsory. However, it will be seen from the draft resolution co-sponsored by Canada, in particular from its operative paragraphs 1 and 2, that the General Assembly is asked to invite Governments to submit broad and detailed information relating not to seismograms or seismological data, but to seismograph stations, which is quite different from what the Canadian representative has been saying. There is a difference between data on seismograph stations and seismograms, which record the type of explosion and whether it was a natural event or a man-made one, in other words, a nuclear explosion.

30. Moreover, the draft resolution sets a definite date for the submission of such information—1 May 1970. Consequently, it is really based on the assumption that the submission of information on seismograph stations—I repeat, seismograph stations—is merely to serve as a basis for a compulsory exchange of seismological data, an exchange, in fact, not on a voluntary but on a mandatory basis.

31. Furthermore, the other operative paragraphs of the draft resolution submitted by Canada and other countries contain a formula excluding socialist countries not Members of the United Nations—in particular, the German Democratic Republic—a formula we regard as discriminatory and unacceptable. The draft resolution calls for submission of information on seismograph stations by States Members of the United Nations, members of any of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency or Parties to the statute of the International Court of Justice, but it does not allow for participation in this entire undertaking by States which in fact are now actively concerned with the question of the prohibition of nuclear testing. As everyone knows, the German Democratic Republic is party to relevant international treaties, it is a party to the Moscow Treaty, but here it is being excluded. Why should it be so excluded? It is in fact an active party to the agreement on the prohibition of nuclear tests.

32. Consequently, my delegation is entirely unable to accept the approach recommended by the Canadian and other delegations. This approach is being urged by those States which refuse to face reality and to recognize the fact that for over twenty years now an independent and sovereign German State—the German Democratic Republic—has been existing and prospering in central Europe, that it is a direct party to a number of important international agreements and, in particular and especially, agreements on the prohibition of nuclear testing in three media, and is also actively participating in discussing the prohibition of underground testing. For these reasons, the USSR delegation regards draft resolution A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4 as unacceptable and will vote against it.

33. As to the draft resolution submitted by Sweden and other countries and contained in document A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1, the USSR delegation regards it as constructive and conducive to progress in attaining a comprehensive prohibition of nuclear tests. For these reasons, the USSR delegation supports this draft resolution and will vote for it.

34. Mr. PORTER (United Kingdom): I, too, should like to say a few words on the two draft resolutions before us under this item. I shall be very brief.

35. My delegation is a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4 and Lord Chalfont has already explained our reasons for supporting this Canadian initiative [1694th meeting]. We endorse what the representative of Canada said this afternoon about the intention of the draft resolution. The conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty is the priority task in the field of nuclear arms control and we consider it important to show that we are making some progress, even if slow, on this difficult and complicated subject. The adoption of the resolution and a good response to the resulting letter from the Secretary-General would, in our view, be a significant step forward.

36. My delegation also supports the intention behind draft resolution A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1. We fully endorse the desire that the Committee on Disarmament should continue to consider this problem as a matter of urgency. We have misgivings, however, about the call for a special report on the subject to be submitted to the General Assembly by 15 July 1970. The preparation of such a special report could disrupt the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and distract its attention from substantial negotiations at a time well before its session normally ends. We should therefore prefer the report on this subject to form part of the regular report which the Committee submits annually to the Assembly. We hope that the sponsors of the resolution will be prepared to reconsider this feature of their resolution.

37. Mr. LEONARD (United States): The United States warmly supports the objectives of the draft resolution put forward by the delegation of Canada [A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4] and feels that it can support the language of this resolution as it stands. We feel that this proposal would, it is very true, be a real contribution towards the solution of this very difficult problem of resolving the question of how to reach an appropriately verified, complete prohibition of underground tests of nuclear weapons.

38. The United States delegation is also in complete sympathy with the objective of draft resolution A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1 presented by the delegation of Sweden. However we do feel in sympathy with the view just expressed by the delegation of the United Kingdom that the particular point suggested in the final sentence of this draft resolution is not, in fact, a desirable suggestion, that, on the contrary, the objective would not be advanced by requiring the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to submit a special report on this subject with what, if I may say so, seems to us to be an artificial deadline coming in the middle of the summer. In fact, this would not facilitate the orderly work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, but would rather tend to distract it from its substantive task, to involve it in the task of preparing a progress report could consume considerable time and energy without actually contributing at all to its objective, which is the negotiation of a verified comprehensive test ban.

39. For this reason, we would suggest—and urge—that the sponsors of this draft resolution should agree to alter it by omitting several words from the final sentence of the last paragraph of the resolution, so that it would read simply: “. . . and to report to the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly on the results of their deliberations”.

40. The CHAIRMAN: I have no other speaker listed in the debate on the draft resolutions A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4 and A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1. I now take it that the Committee is ready to proceed to the vote on the two draft resolutions before us, but I have been requested by some delegations, who are not present here, to give them due notice before I invite the Committee to vote on the draft resolutions. I shall therefore suspend this meeting for fifteen minutes to enable those delegations who are absent to come to this Committee.

*The meeting was suspended at 4.10 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.*

41. The CHAIRMAN: I now invite the First Committee to proceed to a vote on the two draft resolutions before us, namely, documents A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4 and A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1.

42. Mr. EDELSTAM (Sweden): Before you adjourned the meeting, Mr. Chairman, there was a suggestion made by the United Kingdom representative that paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1 should be changed slightly, and this suggestion was supported by the United States representative. During the pause in our deliberations I was in contact with the original sponsors of this draft resolution, and there is agreement among these delegations that this text should be slightly changed; the words “as early as possible and not later than 15 July 1970” should be deleted, so that the last part of the sentence in paragraph 3 would read “and to submit a special report to the General Assembly on the results of their deliberations”.

43. The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further speakers on draft resolutions A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4 and A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1, we shall now proceed to vote. First, I put to the Committee draft resolution A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4. The representative of the United Arab Republic has asked for a separate vote on paragraph 1 of that draft resolution.

*Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4 was adopted by 71 votes to 9, with 8 abstentions.\**

44. The CHAIRMAN: I now invite the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4 as a whole.

*At the request of the representative of Canada, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Trinidad and Tobago, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece,

\* At the 1714th meeting, the representative of Kuwait informed the Committee that had he been present when the vote was taken he would have voted in favour of paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden.

*Against:* Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland.

*Abstaining:* Algeria, Cuba, France, Iraq, Jordan, Romania, Senegal, Sudan, Syria.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1-4, as a whole, was adopted by 78 votes to 8, with 9 abstentions.\**

45. The CHAIRMAN: I now invite the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1, as amended by the representative of Sweden.

*At the request of the representative of the United Arab Republic, the vote was taken by roll-call.*

*The United States of America, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

\* At the 1714th meeting, the representative of Kuwait informed the Committee that had he been present when the vote was taken he would have voted in favour of the draft resolution.

United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Cuba, France, Saudi Arabia.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1, as orally amended, was adopted by 94 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.\**

46. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed with explanations of vote. I call on the representative of Algeria.

47. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): My delegation has voted for draft resolution A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1, but it does not wish to associate itself with the regrets expressed in the third preambular paragraph with regard to countries that have not yet acceded to the Moscow Treaty. My country will maintain this attitude so long as other countries continue to conduct nuclear tests underground.

48. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America): I should only like to place on record now, as in the past on similar occasions, that the United States understands by the language of the resolution which we have just approved that the call for a suspension of tests in all environments means a suspension pursuant to an adequately verified treaty. It is our hope, of course, that it will become possible to negotiate such a treaty in the near future and we intend to do everything in power to further this objective in the deliberations of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

49. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): Having voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.485 and Add.1 to 4, the delegation of Argentina wishes to place on record its understanding that the creation of a world-wide exchange of seismological data to facilitate the banning of underground nuclear weapon tests should in no way change the terms of reference established for the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.486 and Add.1. This draft resolution, which has also just been adopted, sets forth the principles which must govern the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in this matter.

*The meeting rose at 5 p.m.*