

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1895th
MEETING

Thursday, 16 November 1972,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 26, 31, 32, 33 and 34 (continued):	
World Disarmament Conference: report of the Secretary-General	
Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament	
Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests:	
(a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament;	
(b) Report of the Secretary-General	
Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General	
Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace: report of the Secretary-General	1

Chairman: Mr. Radha Krishna RAMPHUL
(Mauritius).

AGENDA ITEMS 26, 31, 32, 33 AND 34
(continued)

World Disarmament Conference: report of the Secretary-General (A/8654, A/8668, A/8681, A/8693, and Corr.1, A/8757, A/8817 and Add.1, A/C.1/L.618)

Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8818)

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests (A/8740, A/8741, A/C.1/L.611, 615, 620 and 624):

(a) Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (A/8818);

(b) Report of the Secretary-General (A/8807)

Implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco): report of the Secretary-General (A/8653, A/8808, A/C.1/1028, A/C.1/L.619/Rev.1)

Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace: report of the Secretary-General (A/8809)

1. The CHAIRMAN: As I announced this morning, the Committee will now take up agenda item 32.

2. With regard to this agenda item the Committee has before it three draft resolutions. The first is a 14-Power

draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.611; amendments to that draft resolution have been submitted by 8 delegations, in document A/C.1/L.624. The second is an 18-Power draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.615. The third is a 15-Power draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.620.

3. I have several names on the list of representatives wishing to speak on these draft resolutions. It is understood, of course, that representatives speaking on this item may refer to any or all the draft resolutions and amendments that are now before the Committee.

4. Mr. CORADIN (Haiti) [*interpretation from French*]: My delegation has expressed the desire to explain its vote on the draft resolutions before the Committee this afternoon to present the position of its Government on a matter whose complex and various elements are of concern to the whole international community.

5. On agenda item 32, "Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests", three draft resolutions have been submitted in documents A/C.1/L.611, L.615 and L.620. These draft resolutions express the concern of the groups of countries which submitted them about nuclear and thermonuclear tests still being carried out in some parts of the world in outer space, under ground and under water. They consider that the suspension of these tests would be a valuable contribution to the cause of disarmament and the solution of all related problems: economic and social development of the third world, environment, and so on. They deplore that not all Powers are parties to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, despite the adoption by the General Assembly of 21 successive resolutions. These three draft resolutions express the concern of the international community about the problem of disarmament and stress the need to bend every effort to achieve complete prohibition of nuclear and thermonuclear tests.

6. My delegation has always been of the opinion that no matter what valuable efforts were made by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament or in the SALT Talks in terms of negotiating agreements on guarantees among nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon Powers, the slowness perhaps deliberate—with which some major Powers carry out decisions of the Assembly and their refusal to be associated with the study of fundamental elements of disarmament, make these draft resolutions most objective and valid.

7. We duly value the partial agreements achieved by the two super-Powers on the limitation of strategic weapons. Such agreements were welcomed with optimism by the international community as fostering the climate of *détente* beginning in international relations. But a question arises:

does one consider that this is a lasting *détente* if the Powers responsible for international peace and security are reticent and hesitant when it comes to exerting needed further efforts to make a true and human contribution to the final settlement of urgent problems such as the arms race?

8. This is why my delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 submitted by a number of countries from the Pacific area. The sponsors lay stress on the serious concern of their populations about nuclear tests still carried out in some parts of the world, especially in the Pacific. They deplore that many States have not yet adhered to the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, and therefore note the fact that some peoples directly involved in that situation are concerned about the consequences of these tests for their environment.

9. There are amendments to that draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.624, sponsored by a group of countries. The representative of Belgium, who introduced them here, stated that draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 was somewhat discriminatory since it spelled out the part of the world where nuclear-weapons tests are being carried out, and therefore would be directed against a specific country. We consider that the sponsors, which are all from the Pacific area, probably wanted to pinpoint their area and show the concern of their peoples. It certainly is not a matter for them to state that one specific Power is conducting nuclear-weapons tests in that area. They merely deplore that nuclear-weapons tests should be carried out in this part of the world. There is probably no manifest intention to point a finger at any specific country.

10. Furthermore, the draft resolution attempts to circumscribe the reality of one of the serious problems of our time without losing its universal scope and cannot be said to be so unusual. In the same spirit, the Treaty of Tlatelolco strives to free Latin America from all nuclear tests. The Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace would be in the same spirit of regional defence.

11. My delegation does not see any specific and concerted criticism of any Power in these paragraphs, and we shall therefore not support the amendment in document A/C.1/L.624.

12. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.615 deals with the same matters. It deplores the reticence of parties to the Treaty banning nuclear tests in carrying out its provisions. It stresses the need for a specific proposal for an underground test ban agreement. It welcomes the progress achieved so far in bilateral talks. All the operative paragraphs are moderate in their wording and express the wish that nuclear Powers will finally conquer their aversion to part with their deterrent power and find in a specific and universal vision of peace the means to halt their nuclear tests. We shall vote in favour of this draft resolution.

13. The last draft resolution, pertaining to agenda item 32 and contained in document A/C.1/L.620, has been sponsored by a group of countries, including Haiti. It was introduced last week by the representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, in a luminous, lucid and objective statement. This draft resolution recalls resolution 1762 A

(XVII) on the prohibition of nuclear weapons. It asks the Governments of nuclear-weapon States to put an end to all tests through a permanent agreement or a moratorium until a permanent agreement is reached. This requires no comment. It is in full consonance with the ideas expressed here by the great majority of representatives. My delegation firmly hopes that it will be unanimously adopted by the Committee.

14. Mr. KHATTABI (Morocco) [*interpretation from French*]: I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/L.611 and L.620.

15. In referring to resolution 2828 A (XXVI) in which the General Assembly, *inter alia*, urgently called upon Governments of States possessing nuclear weapons to put an end to all testing of those weapons as quickly as possible, the report of the Secretary-General [A/8807] which we have before us makes the following comment:

“As of 15 September 1972, no replies to the letter of the Secretary-General have been received”.

The report refers, of course, to the letter of 8 February 1972 sent to the five nuclear Powers, communicating to them the text of the aforementioned resolution and asking that the Secretary-General should be informed in due course of all measures taken in that connexion.

16. The silence of the five nuclear Powers is more than eloquent. They have no intention of halting, either in the immediate future or at a foreseeable date, their experimental testing—and this despite the repeated appeals of the international community expressed in resolutions of the General Assembly. This fact is itself subject to condemnation. That is why my delegation considers it appropriate to submit draft resolution A/C.1/L.620, the firm language of which shows the indignation aroused in all the peoples of the world by the continuation of nuclear testing. My delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

17. With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, I should like first of all to state that my country fully shares the legitimate concerns of the sponsors of this text and we sincerely and emphatically desire that an end be put to nuclear testing in the Pacific and elsewhere in the world, for the dangers flowing from experimental testing of nuclear weapons, as we know, threaten all regions of the globe without distinction. We are all vulnerable to the effects of experimental nuclear testing. That is why my delegation has continued, at Geneva and here in New York, to defend the principle of the complete prohibition of the testing of nuclear weapons, because in our view this can be effective only if all Powers possessing these weapons adhere to the 1963 Moscow Treaty, and conclude an international agreement prohibiting the testing of nuclear weapons underground. It is in this spirit and out of concern for efficiency that we shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, together with the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624.

18. I should add, in conclusion, that if the amendments in question are not adopted, we will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 as it stands.

19. Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): I should like to explain how the United States intends to vote on the three test ban draft resolutions which are before the Committee.

20. The United States supports the objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 and intends to vote for it. As on similar past occasions, I should like to place on record that the United States understands the language of that draft resolution to call for a suspension of tests in all environments pursuant to an adequately verified treaty. We continue to hope that it will become possible to negotiate such a treaty in the nearest future and we intend, in the course of the deliberations of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, to continue to work towards this objective.

21. With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/L.615, we intend to abstain. In doing so I wish to reaffirm the long-standing policy commitment of the United States to work towards a cessation of all our nuclear-weapon testing, pursuant to an adequately verified treaty. We noted in our statement last year when we were voting on a similar draft resolution that if we were to vote for the draft resolution a misunderstanding could result in that we might be expected to take some immediate and dramatic new initiative relating to our test ban policy. However, as we have noted on earlier occasions, this is not a problem that lends itself to easy and immediate solution, since further progress towards restraints on testing is dependent upon understanding and resolving the complex problem of verification. We are actively and constructively participating in the deliberations of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on this problem. This was demonstrated by our lengthy statement on the test ban issue and the detailed working paper we presented on progress and problems in the area of seismic verification.

22. We will be prepared to make appropriate proposals when we are convinced that they will lead to progress. For now, we feel that we can continue to be most constructive through our practical contributions towards gaining a better understanding of the verification issue and through continuing deliberations of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on the many issues and options involved in further negotiated restraints on testing.

23. With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/L.620, we intend to abstain, as we did on a similar resolution last year. In our view the condemnation of all nuclear testing and the imposition of arbitrary deadlines are detrimental to the creation of that atmosphere of accommodation which is essential to progress towards meaningful arms control measures. Moreover, contrary to the assertions in operative paragraph 2, we regard the question of verification as central to and inseparable from the consideration of the test ban issue.

24. With regard to the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624, the United States does not have strong views. We intend to abstain in the vote on the amendments because they do not appear to alter draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 in any substantive sense. In the United States view the key element in that part of the draft resolution dealing with atmospheric testing is that it urges all countries not

yet parties to the limited test ban Treaty to adhere to that Treaty without delay.

25. Mr. NANDAN (Fiji): My delegation would like to make some observations on the amendments proposed by Belgium and others to draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, of which Fiji is a sponsor.

26. In introducing the amendments in the Committee, the representative of Belgium stated that the sponsors of the amendments wanted to reassure the sponsors of the draft resolution that they shared and still share our views and objectives and that they respect our concern. It is submitted that, if the sponsors of the amendments really shared the concern and objectives of the peoples of the Pacific region they would certainly not have introduced these amendments, which seek to remove from this draft resolution the reflexion of the very concern which they profess to share.

27. We know only too well whose objectives the sponsors of the amendments share and are concerned about. Only a glance at the list of the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624 will tell the tale of whose interest these are trying to protect and whose influence has inspired these seemingly harmless amendments. The people whose embarrassments these amendments are designed to protect are the very same who do not feel embarrassed in putting the lives and the environment of the South Pacific people in jeopardy. This is no light matter to those who live in the Pacific region and are continually subjected to this treatment. But, of course, the sponsors of the amendments are safe on distant continents, thousands of miles away from the testing grounds of the Mururoa Atoll in the South Pacific.

28. Let me frankly ask the representatives of Belgium, Cameroon, the Ivory Coast, Italy, Lebanon, Morocco, Rwanda and Zaire, the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.1/L.624, who seek to omit the reference to tests in the Pacific region, if they would do the same if France were to shift the tests to their region. With respect, we submit that our safety and survival in our own region comes first. The purely global notions which have already been expressed in many resolutions of this Organization are often conveniently ignored, and the atmospheric testing in the Pacific is one example of this.

29. The representative of Belgium has used the argument that there is some nebulous tradition that resolutions on this subject are always of a general nature and that the regional concept represented in draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 constitutes discrimination. However, this Committee knows very well that regional approaches and concerns are repeated year after year in Assembly resolutions. Permit me to refer to the resolutions on the problems of southern Africa as an example. Why, then, this present double standard?

30. At its fourteenth session the General Assembly adopted resolution 1379 (XIV) which emanated from this Committee and was entitled "Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara". This was a matter of regional concern at that time; and, if the Assembly records are correct, it was Morocco, now one of the sponsors of the Belgian amend-

ments, which requested the consideration of that item. That resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority of 51 votes to 16. If I may refresh the memory of this Committee, that resolution contained the following provisions *inter alia*:

“The General Assembly,

“... .

“Noting the declared intention of the Government of France to undertake nuclear tests in the Sahara,

“... .

“Recognizing the anxiety caused by the contemplated tests in the Sahara among all peoples, and more particularly those of Africa,

“1. Expresses its grave concern over the intention of the Government of France to conduct nuclear tests;

“2. Requests France to refrain from such tests.”

31. That resolution on the Sahara tests was at that time based only on well-founded apprehension about the intention of a country to conduct tests in that region, whereas the tests to which draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 refers are in fact taking place in the Pacific region.

32. I should like to emphasize that draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 is relatively modest. It is of general application as compared to the Assembly resolution on the French tests in the Sahara. It calls for a halt to all atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons in the Pacific region or anywhere else in the world and, further, seeks universal support for the partial test ban Treaty of 1963. It also seeks a suspension of all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments and the negotiation of a treaty banning all such tests.

33. Some other common examples of regional concern expressed in this Committee's resolutions are to be found in those relating to the denuclearization of Africa and Latin America, which *inter alia* ban the testing of nuclear weapons in those regions. That is what document A/C.1/L.611 seeks with regard to the Pacific region. The proposal for the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is but another example of regional concern.

34. The sponsors of the amendments would have the international community believe that the Pacific region does not belong to this planet. Other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 have already cogently stated that it is the Pacific region that is being used as a ground for contamination by people who do not belong to that region. It is apparently a convenient garbage can for Europe. It is the Pacific region that is being discriminated against. The sponsors of the amendment, some of whom come from Europe and some, to our regret, from Africa, are asking the United Nations to condone and perpetuate this discrimination against the peoples of the Pacific.

35. It is highly ironical that the States in this Committee that are at this very time preparing the European security conference, a very exclusive, regional concept, have taken it

upon themselves to attempt to delete this reference to our problems in our region. Yet the right of the people of the Pacific region to live in peace and security and in the safety of their environment is as much a matter of concern to mankind as the peace and security and safety of the people of Europe. We cannot, therefore, see why the Pacific region cannot be especially mentioned in resolutions of this Assembly. Nuclear explosions are not, after all, a matter of trifling importance. There are already plans for larger explosions than hitherto conducted. At this very time, while we are considering this item, there is news from Paris that further tests are to be carried out—and I quote from *The Times* of London of yesterday, 15 November 1972:

“France is planning to explode a hydrogen bomb of megaton strength next summer above Mururoa atoll in the South Pacific and considerable fall-out is expected.”

The same report further states:

“The megaton blast will create considerable fall-out, but the French Government is determined to go ahead with its nuclear programme.”

Similar reports appear in *Le Monde* of 12 and 13 November.

36. The tests are being conducted in the Mururoa atoll in the Pacific. This is the hub of a cluster of small Pacific States and some of the colonial Territories in the region. It is the peoples of these States and colonial Territories that are most immediate to the testing grounds. It is they that look to this Organization and the international community to do justice to their cause. All they ask of this Organization is to add its collective voice so that they and their environment may be spared man-made hazards which give no benefit to the inhabitants of the area but rather put their lives and environment in jeopardy.

37. If we, the Members of this Organization—and that means all of us who are seated here—should fail to focus on the problems and concerns of these peoples by adopting the proposed amendments, we shall have failed ourselves by promoting the interest of a big Power as against the legitimate concerns and fears of small, helpless peoples. In doing so, I venture to add, we should have gravely impaired the hopes and faith reposed in this Organization and the international community as a whole by the many small and unprotected peoples of all regions of this world. It is the weak who look to this Organization for justice and humanity.

38. It is my delegation's submission that in retaining the reference to the Pacific region this Committee would be consistent with its past practice. The United Nations would also fulfil the aims of the Charter. We therefore urge the Committee to vote against the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624. On the other hand, we make an appeal to the representatives who have promoted these amendments to reconsider their position in the light of the statements made against those amendments in this Committee and to withdraw them.

39. Finally, I would point out that “Pacific” means “peaceful”. We should like to keep it that way.

40. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) [*interpretation from French*]: My delegation supports the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624, of which we are a sponsor and which were brilliantly introduced by our colleague from Belgium [*1890th meeting*].

41. The Ivory Coast, a small developing country which more than ever wants to see peace established, has always supported here and in the General Assembly any initiative in favour of peace and friendly relations among States. It also supports all resolutions aimed at achieving general and complete disarmament under effective international control, among others those relating to the total prohibition of nuclear tests in all environments. Having adhered to the Moscow Treaty of 5 August 1963 banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, as well as the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Ivory Coast wanted to be associated with the efforts of the international community aimed at reaching an international agreement on the prohibition of all nuclear tests in all environments, convinced as we are that this would brake, if not reverse, the trend towards the nuclear and thermonuclear arms race, which contains inherent risks for the whole of mankind. We also have faith in the future, that one day the world will be free from the spectre of nuclear war and the obsession of general destruction.

42. Therefore, my delegation would like to state clearly that the Ivory Coast is firmly opposed to all nuclear-weapon tests in any environment, by any country whatever. We are against French and Chinese tests, as well as Soviet, American or British tests. No nuclear-weapon tests can be justified in any way, whether they are carried out in outer space, in the atmosphere, under water or under ground, on the national territory of a country or in territories under the sovereignty of any given State.

43. Therefore, there cannot be any divergence of views between the delegation of the Ivory Coast and the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 as to the substance of the matter, that is, the need to prohibit all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments. However, we believe that we should consider this question as a whole, in a serene and impartial manner, as we have always done. We understand and share the views and the concerns of the sponsors of the draft resolution at the silence of a nuclear Power in response to their efforts to obtain the cessation of these nuclear-weapon tests in the Pacific area or at least their postponement. But those legitimate regional concerns should not make us forget our common objective, which is to achieve the prohibition of all nuclear weapon tests in all environments. We fear that by stressing in particular nuclear-weapon tests in the Pacific the sponsors of the draft resolution, who of course wish to make their protests known, might lead the Committee to depart somewhat from its general practice of condemning all nuclear-weapon tests.

44. It is to eliminate any element of partiality that my delegation, together with other delegations, has introduced the amendments in document A/C.1/L.624. We are somewhat surprised at seeing the negative reaction to those amendments, the only objective of which was to lead us back to a global approach to this problem, which is of concern to us all.

45. It is difficult for us to understand that attitude, especially since some of the sponsors of the draft resolution have in the past authorized other nuclear tests by another Power in the same area, as if those tests were more justified or less dangerous for their peoples. It is true that at that time the Partial Test Ban Treaty had not yet been signed. What is more, astonishment has been expressed that some African countries far removed from the Pacific area are sponsors of these amendments. Need we recall that at the time when the Assembly was echoing the emotion aroused all over the world by the nuclear tests in the Sahara, some of the States which reproach us for our initiative did not hesitate either to vote against resolution 1379 (XIV) of 20 November 1959 or to abstain from voting on that resolution? Was it because the effects of those tests were less nefarious? Could their vote be explained by the fact that they were far removed from the Sahara and were therefore indifferent to the concern of the peoples of that area? We do not think so, because, as was said by our colleague and friend the representative of Senegal, we are all concerned about the continuation of nuclear-weapon tests, of whatever kind, in whatever environment and no matter where. That is why we ask for the deletion of the words "including the Pacific area" and "in and around the Pacific area". We do so in order to keep the text general. We have no reservations about or objections to that, because we are resolutely in favour of the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests in any environment, anywhere in the world, and we support the appeals addressed to nuclear Powers to suspend nuclear tests in all environments.

46. We therefore think that the sponsors of the draft resolution should show tolerance toward us and avoid any attempt to distort our intentions. We have no lessons to learn from them in this field. We are ready in a spirit of co-operation to seek together with them a balanced text, a text acceptable to all, which would reflect the legitimate concerns of the whole international community. We believe that this is possible. However, if the sponsors reject our initiative out of hand and if our amendments are rejected, we should have to reconsider our attitude towards draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 as now worded.

47. Mr. BOATEN (Ghana): My delegation has asked to speak in order to make a few observations on draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, introduced by the delegation of New Zealand and sponsored by 12 other Member States, on the urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests, and on the amendments to it contained in document A/C.1/L.624, introduced by the delegation of Belgium and sponsored by seven other countries.

48. In a statement made in this Committee on 3 November 1972, my delegation expressed its concern over the lack of progress on agreement regarding a comprehensive nuclear-weapon test treaty banning all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments. In that statement specific mention was made of the continued atmospheric tests in the South Pacific by a member of the Security Council, a body, as was then pointed out, charged under Chapter V, Article 24 of the Charter with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In that statement reference was made also to the statement made by the representative of New Zealand in introducing draft resolution A/C.1/L.611. That statement, as pointed out in my

delegation's statement, "left us in no doubt about the strength of feeling, both official and unofficial, in countries bordering the area of the tests" [1883rd meeting, para. 96]. My delegation referred to the relevance of those atmospheric nuclear-weapon tests to the growing world concern over environmental pollution and asked whether we were to understand that pollution arising from nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere was less harmful to human, animal and plant life than pollution resulting from other factors.

49. Here my delegation considers it relevant to recall events of a similar nature on the continent of Africa. In 1959 it was learned that France, the same country which is now conducting atmospheric nuclear-weapon tests in the South Pacific, was preparing to explode a nuclear device in the Sahara. Upon learning this, the African countries which had at the time achieved their independence—and that included Ghana—met in Monrovia, Liberia, to discuss the danger which this posed to the African continent. At the conclusion of that meeting a resolution was passed

"denouncing vigorously and with profound indignation the decision of any Government to carry out nuclear tests in the Sahara or in any part of Africa."

My delegation would like to believe that African countries which became independent after that Monrovia meeting not only would have attended the meeting but would have subscribed to the resolution resulting from it.

50. In addition to the official action taken by the then independent African countries, unofficial protests were organized in various African countries against the French test. Ghana, for example, organized a protest march to the test site. Although this was stopped by French action, it demonstrated the extent of feeling against the test even at the unofficial level.

51. We have already been told that, arising out of this, in 1959 an item entitled "Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara" was inscribed on the agenda of the First Committee at the fourteenth session of the General Assembly. We have already been told of the resolution which resulted from that and I do not wish to bore this Committee with the details. I should only like to say that looking at the pattern of the voting on the resolution when it came before the General Assembly, one is impressed by the fact that we should consider all issues that come before this Assembly as issues of general concern.

52. It is not the intention of my delegation to be tedious. We have recalled these events in Africa, with regard to French nuclear-weapon tests in the Sahara, to show the similarity of those events to what we are now witnessing in the South Pacific. The similarity of the pattern of those events in both regions—expressions of concern and protests by Governments and peoples directly affected by the tests; the same country which conducted the tests in both regions turning a deaf ear to the anxiety thus expressed—should give us all cause for concern.

53. The second reason in this connexion is that my Government played a significant part when similar events affected Africa, and can therefore not condone the same

kind of activity in other regions of the world by contenting itself with a resolution which shies away from a specific mention of the region in which these tests are being conducted.

54. If in 1959 this Committee, and then the General Assembly, in resolution 1379 (XIV), found it necessary to express

"grave concern over the intention of the Government of France to conduct nuclear tests;"

and requested France "to refrain from such tests", it is the view of my delegation that there is an even greater necessity for this Committee to express itself in no uncertain terms against the atmospheric nuclear-weapon tests in the South Pacific. Why is there an even greater necessity? Because since 1959 a partial test ban Treaty has been concluded to which all the nuclear Powers, except two, including the one now continuing to conduct atmospheric nuclear-weapon tests in the South Pacific, have acceded.

55. Secondly, in many statements made in this Committee gratification has been expressed at the thawing of the tension in international relations as they affect the relations among the big Powers. One would have thought that given this welcome situation every effort would be made by States Members of this Organization, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council, to ensure that this process continued. Surely, the way to do that is not for a permanent member of the Security Council to continue atmospheric nuclear-weapon tests in a region which is so far away from its own that the effect of its action on its own citizens is very remote. Yet that is precisely what is being done in the face of expressions of concern and protests from the Governments and peoples of the region. Or shall we acknowledge as a fact, an irony of circumstances, that the two nuclear super-Powers, which presented a posture of hostility to each other for many years after the Second World War, have now built a nuclear-weapons umbrella under which it is no longer necessary to seek international co-operation and understanding?

56. My delegation is of the view that the amendments proposed in document A/C.1/L.624 to draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 merely seek to avoid an issue which should be of the utmost concern to this Committee. Perhaps my delegation would have found reason to go along with them if in the course of our discussions on this item the country concerned had given an assurance that it intended to cease all atmospheric nuclear-weapon tests with immediate effect in due deference to the protests and concerns expressed by the Governments and peoples of the South Pacific, by other Governments, and by world public opinion as a whole. Such an assurance has not been given, nor do we have any reason to believe that it is the intention of that Government not to conduct further atmospheric nuclear-weapon tests in the region. On the contrary, just this afternoon we heard from our colleague from Fiji of a report in *The Times* of London of 15 November that it is in fact the intention of the French Government to continue these tests.

57. In the circumstances, my delegation would consider it an act of hypocrisy on its part if, having regard to its past record on issues of this nature, it accepted the amendments.

Even more important, my delegation does not consider that it would be in the interest of this Organization for this Committee to accept the amendments. My delegation would therefore urge the sponsors of the amendments to give consideration to withdrawing them. Acceptance of them will have the effect, not of improving draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, which is already mild and conciliatory, but of weakening it further and rendering it purposeless.

58. My delegation will therefore vote against the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624 if they are pressed to the vote.

59. Mr. PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Peru) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: My delegation regrets that it cannot accept the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624 submitted by the delegations of Belgium and other countries, amendments designed to delete the specific references to the Pacific area in the draft resolution submitted by Peru, among other delegations, which appears in document A/C.1/L.611 and which deals with the urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. I should like very briefly to explain the reason why we cannot accept them.

60. The 13 countries of the Pacific area joined together in submitting draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 with a two-fold purpose. First, we wanted to express our specific rejection of those tests which are being carried out in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, because there exists with respect to them an international Treaty which was adopted by the overwhelming majority of Member States including a majority of the nuclear Powers.

61. The second reason is specifically to show our rejection of testing in the Pacific area because the 13 sponsors of the draft resolution fear, and rightfully so, the effects of these tests on our territories and on our people. My delegation would venture to think that this fear deserves respect from the members of this Committee simply because it is a fear which, if I may say so, is vital and therefore will command clear support in this room.

62. But we the sponsors have not confined ourselves to expressing our rejection of these nuclear-weapon tests in the atmosphere. Rather, in part II of our draft resolution we call upon all nuclear-weapons States to suspend nuclear-weapons tests in all environments.

63. Therefore it is made abundantly clear that my country, in a perfectly logical sequence of steps which will be appreciated by those of us in this Organization who practise good Cartesian order, is opposed, first, to all tests in all environments, secondly, to all tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water in any part of the world, and thirdly, to nuclear tests in the Pacific.

64. To conclude, allow me immodestly to quote myself, for I said during the general debate on 9 November last:

"I firmly believe that if this regional appeal of the States of the Pacific falls on deaf ears, the General Assembly will be seeking refuge in a level of abstraction that will present it to the world as inexplicably shirking its responsibilities" [*1888th meeting, para. 162*].

65. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): Resolutions on disarmament and like questions have fallen on our desks like autumn leaves in incredible profusion and bewildering confusion. The verbiage is overwhelming. The resolution factory seems to have been working to full capacity.

66. My delegation has already commented on draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 and the amendments proposed in document A/C.1/L.624 and has stated quite categorically that it will vote against all those amendments.

67. Today I should like to make a few observations on two other draft resolutions, A/C.1/L.615 and A/C.1/L.620. We have several objections to draft resolution A/C.1/L.615. First of all, its provisions are not balanced. Secondly, and it amounts to the same thing, like the existing test ban Treaty itself, it is partial. Thirdly, it perpetuates the prevailing fallacy that nuclear-weapon testing in the atmosphere is essentially a problem of environment and it ignores the fact that the fantastic refinement and accumulation of nuclear weapons by the great Powers constitute a much greater threat to the survival of the world. Fourthly, its terms are mutually inconsistent.

68. May I refer the Committee to two of the preambular paragraphs and three of the operative paragraphs to establish, as I can hope to the satisfaction of my audience, the validity of the arguments that I have adduced. The second preambular paragraph speaks of

"Believing that a cessation of all nuclear and thermonuclear weapons tests, including those carried out underground, would contribute to . . . a reduction in world tension."

69. The fifth preambular paragraph notes with regret that "despite the determination expressed by parties to that Treaty to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions . . . for all time, parties to the Treaty continue to test nuclear weapons underground".

70. Then we come to an expression of satisfaction at "the completion of a first set of bilateral agreements on the limitation of strategic arms" without, at the same time, expressing concern that this has in no way reduced the threat of a nuclear war.

71. Then we come to operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, and there is the rub. Operative paragraph 1 "*Stresses again* the urgency of halting all nuclear-weapon testing in all environments by all States".

72. Operative paragraph 2

"*Urges* all States that have not yet done so to adhere without further delay to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, and meanwhile to refrain from testing in environments covered by that Treaty".

Now this implies that adherence to the partial test ban Treaty is by itself a great achievement. In our view, adherence to that Treaty is devoid of all meaning or significance as long as those that adhere to it continue to conduct nuclear-weapon tests underground. By doing so

they have, in fact, nullified and vitiated their adherence to the Treaty and reduced it to a dead letter.

73. But the greatest absurdity of all appears in operative paragraph 3. On the one hand States which have not yet adhered to the partial test ban Treaty are asked to announce their adherence to it and to refrain meanwhile from testing in environments covered by that Treaty. But in operative paragraph 3 those countries that are conducting underground tests are given the option of either suspending or reducing such testing. This is the most meaningless, illogical and indefensible part of the draft resolution, and it is because of the presence of the words “or reduce” that we cannot possibly give our support to it.

74. Another observation I should like to make relates to operative paragraph 5, which requests the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to give first priority to its deliberations on a treaty banning underground nuclear-weapon tests, taking full account of views of experts. We can be assured that if we consult experts they will always have some excuse for being unable to find a sound and fool-proof verification test. There are no means that can be proof against the folly of continuing to produce nuclear weapons.

75. For those reasons we shall not be able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.615, and we shall abstain. We want to assure this Committee that we do agree that the banning of underground tests should be given full priority—let there be no misunderstanding on that point.

76. The other draft resolution on which I should like to make some observations is that contained in document A/C.1/L.620. I notice that that draft resolution is a repetition of a similar text presented last year, but on this occasion there is an omission—I do not know whether it was an accidental omission—since operative paragraph 1 merely states:

“Reiterates once again with the utmost vigour its condemnation of all nuclear-weapon tests;”

Last time the draft resolution “solemnly” reiterated the condemnation. I wonder whether there is a lesser degree of solemnity on this occasion. I am not being facetious. I know that a great deal of importance attaches to every word, every syllable, every comma, every semicolon in these resolutions, but I object to the very use of the word “condemnation” regardless of the degree of vigour with which it is expressed. We condemn all nuclear-weapon tests, but we seem by omission to condone the continuing refinement and accumulation of the most diabolical nuclear weapons.

77. And of course I do not understand the significance in operative paragraph 3, of the date of 5 August 1973, the same date as was mentioned last year. I honestly feel there is something mystical in giving countries a period of 10 years to achieve what they promised to achieve in five years.

78. We do not agree with this draft resolution for the reasons I have given, and we shall not participate in the vote on it.

79. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): I apologize for intervening once again in this debate but there are some remarks I should like to make on draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 and on the amendments to it, before we come to the vote.

80. I have the clear impression that the draft resolution is regarded first of all as insufficiently broad and comprehensive in its application and, secondly, as having implications that seem to discriminate too directly against one State. On the first point, may I once again draw the attention of the Committee not only to the initial preambular paragraphs, those which come before parts I and II, but also to part II, which surely calls unmistakably for the suspension of all nuclear-weapon tests in all environments and calls upon the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to give urgent consideration to the question of a treaty banning all nuclear-weapon tests. I find it hard to see how much more comprehensive the draft resolution could be.

81. As for the second point, when we, the peoples in and around the Pacific Ocean, speak of “the Pacific area” or simply of “the Pacific”, as we have done in this draft resolution, we tend in practice to use those expressions in a broad sense—some might say in a loose sense—to include the countries that border upon or around the Pacific Ocean. Without trying to define precisely the use of the term “Pacific area” or even the term “Pacific”, which for practical purposes we customarily use with the same broad meaning, we should scarcely need to point out, as the representative of New Zealand said in his last intervention, that in fact the nuclear Powers at present engaged in atmospheric testing are Pacific Powers.

82. I come back finally to the point which I stressed in my last intervention and which the representatives of Haiti, Fiji and Ghana have eloquently supported this afternoon, that the draft resolution not only calls for an early ending of all nuclear tests everywhere, in all environments, but also gives expression to particularly urgent and vehement protests against atmospheric tests from a region of the world that is represented here by 14 sponsors of the draft resolution, who speak for their own peoples and also for a number of small Pacific Ocean communities not represented here which look to us to express their grave anxiety about the effects upon them of any atmospheric tests that may take place in their vicinity in the future.

83. I again appeal to the Committee to decline to accept the amendments in document A/C.1/L.624 and to give full support to draft resolution A/C.1/L.611.

84. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand): I should like to make two points briefly in support of the statements that have been made this afternoon by the representatives of Australia, Ghana, Fiji and Peru.

85. Dealing with this argument of discrimination, which once again has been raised by one or two speakers but which I feel may persist in the minds of some other delegations, I should like to point out that draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 is first and foremost one directed to putting an end to all nuclear-weapon testing in all environments by everyone. And if we look at the first three preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, the “chapeau” at the

beginning of the text, we see that those three paragraphs are common to the whole draft resolution; they deal generally with the broad question of the urgent need for the cessation of nuclear and thermonuclear weapon tests and recall the many earlier resolutions of the Assembly on the subject.

86. What follows in parts I and II is a carefully balanced, non-discriminatory text. Part I, dealing with tests in the Pacific area, is balanced by part II dealing with the need for a comprehensive test ban treaty.

87. The draft resolution can only be regarded as a whole, and I said in my statement at the 1887th meeting to this Committee that my delegation hardly needs to emphasize that our deep concern about the atmospheric tests held by France in the South Pacific has been one of the motivating forces behind the draft resolution. But we have not restricted the first part of our draft resolution to this aspect alone, because we believe that atmospheric nuclear testing is a problem that concerns everyone, as is underground nuclear-weapon testing, which we have dealt with in the second part of the draft resolution.

88. We have therefore proposed a text which, while drawing attention to atmospheric testing in the Pacific, calls for an end to all atmospheric testing anywhere else in the world. It is hardly necessary for me to point out—I said and I repeat—that all the nuclear Powers at present engaged in nuclear-weapon testing are Pacific Powers.

89. We must insist on our right to draw attention to the nuclear testing that is taking place in our part of the world while not losing sight of the overriding need to end all nuclear testing everywhere, and the draft resolution we are sponsoring does just that. It is not discriminatory; there is only one Power testing in the South Pacific, and, as I understand the meaning of the word—without being too pedagogic about it—“discriminate” means to distinguish between or to differentiate. Well, we are not differentiating between Powers testing in the South Pacific. There is only one. We are drawing attention to this nuclear-weapon testing in our area.

90. Not only is the whole draft resolution introduced under this general and non-discriminatory “*chapeau*”, comprising the first three preambular paragraphs, balanced—part I balancing part II—but part I itself is carefully balanced and non-discriminatory.

91. Finally, after listening to the debate on this subject in the Committee I should like to make a last appeal to the sponsors of the amendments to give serious consideration to withdrawing them. I ask this because of the very evident opposition that those amendments have provoked, and also because at least one of the sponsors has stated that he will still vote for the draft resolution even if the amendments are rejected. This may well be true of many of the other sponsors.

92. In the circumstances, therefore, I wonder whether the importance that they attach to their amendments is really as great as it seems, whether it is worth dividing this Committee over amendments which they themselves have stated will not make a material difference to their final vote on the draft resolution.

93. Mr. CHEN (China) [*translation from Chinese*]: Before the three draft resolutions, on the suspension of nuclear tests are put to the vote, the Chinese delegation would like to state the following.

94. The Chinese delegation fully understands the good intention of some truly peace-loving countries which demand the suspension of nuclear tests out of their opposition to the imperialist policies of aggression and war. However, in the opinion of the Chinese delegation, things will turn contrary to one's desire if the question of the suspension of nuclear tests is not settled along with the fundamental question of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. For that will only bind hand and foot those countries and peoples which are strengthening their self-defence capabilities in order to consolidate their national independence and safeguard their State sovereignty; it will only benefit the nuclear monopoly, nuclear threat and nuclear blackmail by the super-Powers, thus aggravating the danger of the imperialists unleashing wars of aggression.

95. China has been compelled to conduct nuclear tests. China's nuclear tests have been carried out in its deep interior and their number is limited. China develops nuclear weapons entirely for the purpose of self-defence, for breaking the nuclear monopoly of the super-Powers and for ultimately eliminating nuclear weapons and nuclear war. China will never accept the super-Power nuclear hegemony.

96. The Chinese Government has declared on many occasions that at no time and under no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons. China is ready at any time to stop all its nuclear tests, but only on the day the nuclear weapons of the nuclear super-Powers and all nuclear countries are completely prohibited and thoroughly destroyed, and not before.

97. Based on this principle position of the Chinese Government, the Chinese delegation will vote against the three draft resolutions before us.

98. Finally, the Chinese delegation would like to take this opportunity to reaffirm that the Chinese Government and people will, as always, continue to make joint efforts with all the countries and peoples that truly love peace and uphold justice and persevere in the struggle for the attainment of the lofty goal of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

99. Mr. BARTON (Canada): Earlier in this debate the Canadian delegation announced its full support for the draft resolution sponsored by certain other States of the Pacific area [A/C.1/L.611], although that draft resolution varied somewhat in emphasis from the one Canada itself has sponsored.

100. Subsequently, however, amendments were submitted to that draft resolution, in document A/C.1/L.624, underlining an aspect on which my delegation could see that some clarification could be given to the original text, namely, its apparent inference that the atmospheric test programme being carried out by one country should be of greater concern to the General Assembly than the similar

programmes of other countries. Such a position would not be in accord with Canada's view that all nuclear-weapon testing, by whatever country, is to be equally opposed. At the same time, however, the Canadian delegation felt that the removal of all the references to the area where atmospheric testing has actually been taking place would be misconstrued as a lessening of the General Assembly's concern with testing in that area. This feeling has been reinforced by the statements we have heard this afternoon from the delegations of a number of fellow Pacific nations. In particular, the clarification of the two sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, New Zealand and Australia, that they consider the reference to the Pacific area in that text to mean the Pacific and the adjacent land areas, that is, the total area where atmospheric testing is now occurring, has, in our view, removed the possible ambiguity in their draft resolution and has therefore made the amendments unnecessary. On those grounds, if the amendments are not withdrawn, we shall have to vote against them.

101. Mr. SOKOYA (Nigeria): I wish briefly to explain the vote of the Nigerian delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, and the proposed amendments thereto contained in document A/C.1/L.624.

102. The Nigerian delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution because it meets our aspirations as well as the aspirations of many other delegations around this conference table.

103. However, we have some difficulty with regard to the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624. I feel I should say that had the original draft resolution, A/C.1/L.611, been initially submitted with the exact wording now being proposed by Belgium and the other sponsors of [the amendments in] document A/C.1/L.624, the Nigerian delegation would have had no difficulty at all in voting in favour since we are, in fact, seeking a complete cessation of atmospheric nuclear-weapon tests everywhere in the world.

104. But a new dimension had no doubt been introduced now by the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution, who no doubt feel directly and adversely affected, have made a clarion call. They have cried aloud. They have explained their intention in a clear and unequivocal manner. It seems to me, therefore, that they need and really deserve the sympathy of this Committee, if for no other reason than humanitarian considerations. They need our moral support. That has been given before, in the case of the testing in the Sahara some years ago. I see no reason why it should not be given now.

105. In brief, the Nigerian delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611. It will, on the other hand, vote against the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624, not because of their contents but because of the meaning that is likely to be read into them—that is, that the amendments attempt to shy away from the specific issue that is a matter of concern to the Pacific countries.

106. Mr. KHATTABI (Morocco) [*interpretation from French*]: The representative of Fiji alluded to my country, a sponsor of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly in 1959 relating to nuclear tests in the Sahara. I would simply like to draw attention to the fact that at that time the partial test ban Treaty had not yet been

concluded. I would also like to remind him that several of the countries which are sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 did not vote in favour of the resolution pertaining to nuclear tests in the Sahara.

107. Having said that, I shall abstain from commenting on some statements made by the representative of Fiji concerning the sponsors of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624—statements which, to say the least, were out of place—because, in my opinion, they do not even deserve any comment.

108. Mr. Van USSEL (Belgium) [*interpretation from French*]: I have listened very carefully to the statements made by several representatives concerning the amendments which my country, on behalf of seven other Powers and on its own behalf, submitted at the 1890th meeting.

109. I had hoped that my statement would be properly understood by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, and more particularly by all of the countries bordering on the Pacific Ocean. To my regret, however, I am compelled to note that that was not the case. One of the sponsors has had recourse to language that we hear only infrequently in this Committee, such as “cynical distortion of the truth”.

110. However, my statement of last Monday should have allowed no doubt to remain about the real feelings that the sponsors of the amendments have on nuclear and thermonuclear testing everywhere in the world, including the Pacific, and in all environments, including the atmosphere. In the course of the past three weeks the First Committee has heard the concern of all speakers, unceasingly asking for the urgent cessation of testing of nuclear weapons, in the atmosphere, in outer space, under water and under ground. No representative has concealed his emotion at “the dangers which confront mankind in the continuation of the nuclear-arms race”, and we have all emphasized “the urgent need to put an end to all nuclear testing in all environments, by all States”. I deliberately mentioned here the first preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.615, submitted by Austria, Canada, Japan, Ghana, Ethiopia, Nigeria and other countries, because I am convinced that this text, on which we will cast a vote in favour, faithfully reflects the determination of our Committee.

111. I therefore must confess that I was very much surprised to hear the representative of New Zealand, after my statement last Monday, state that the adoption of the Belgian amendments to his text would be tantamount to denying that nuclear tests are going on in the Pacific region. Nothing could be further from the truth.

112. The criticisms and the reservations of those who oppose the improvements which Belgium and seven other Powers would like to introduce into the draft resolution, in a sincere desire to give the text a better balance and to make it more acceptable to the large majority of this Assembly, can be summed up as follows.

113. First, I quote here the representative of Japan, who asserts that our amendments represent

“... an attempt by countries which do not share the special concern of our region [namely, the Pacific region]

to dilute our intensive anxiety, weaken our sense of cohesion and deflect our purpose and direction.” [1891st meeting, para. 42.]

114. Once again I can assure the representatives of the countries which have sponsored the draft resolution that the eight Powers which took the initiative of introducing amendments are deeply concerned by the tests which have been carried out in the Pacific Ocean; but these same Powers are still convinced that the adoption of discriminatory resolutions, whether they are directed against one particular country or a particular type of experiment, will not contribute to a solution of the problem viewed as a whole, but on the contrary will make it more remote from our grasp. Is our Committee not aware of the fact that by isolating, sometimes in pathetic fashion, a single country or a single type of tests, namely, those carried out in the atmosphere, there is the danger of glossing over—if I may so express it—the other types of tests carried out by other nuclear Powers? I am convinced that our Committee’s affirmative vote in support of a non-discriminatory and thus more general resolution would further strengthen “our sense of cohesion”—to quote again the representative of Japan.

115. The second comment made by the sponsors of the draft resolution is—and here I would quote the words of the representative of Australia, Sir Laurence McIntyre—the following:

“...draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, while intended to express anew the desire of peoples around the world for an end to nuclear-weapon testing, was also designed to reflect the particularly vehement regional opposition to continued atmospheric testing in the Pacific area.” [Ibid., para. 78.]

116. Once again may I recall that the mission of our Assembly is primarily to induce Member States to support common action likely to lead the nuclear Powers to reach agreement on an effective cessation of all tests in all environments. This multilateral action within the United Nations is aimed at a specific purpose and has been conceived of for many years now with a concern for objectivity and moderation. True, this multilateral action should be coupled with bilateral diplomatic measures which will enable each country, regardless of the region to which it belongs, to express the concerns experienced by its people in the face of the dangers of pollution to which those people might be exposed—and this applies equally to the Foreign Ministries of the countries bordering on the Pacific Ocean and to those in other regions of the world.

117. Allow me to recall briefly here, as was done by the representative of the Ivory Coast, and particularly for the attention of the representative of Fiji, that in the past another nuclear Power had carried out nuclear tests in the Pacific, even above the national territory of one of the countries which is a sponsor of the draft resolution and with the agreement of the latter, without that series of tests having given rise to any particular reaction in the General Assembly and without the Assembly being called upon to reprimand those countries by resolution. Were the countries bordering on the Pacific less concerned at that time or—and I think this is the true reason—did they probably wish to

avoid committing themselves to the sterile course of partisan and discriminatory resolutions?

118. Lastly, a third argument developed by the sponsors of the draft resolution against the amendments is the precedent of 1959. In 1959 the Assembly adopted resolution 1379 (XIV), the operative part of which reads as follows:

“Expresses its grave concern over the intention of the Government of France to conduct nuclear tests;

“Requests France to refrain from such tests.”

119. In other words, at that time our Committee, in the first place, and then the General Assembly were careful to avoid injecting any regional character or tinge into an appeal made to a specific country. It is significant, moreover, to re-read the preamble of that resolution, which begins:

“Conscious of the great concern throughout the world repeatedly expressed in the United Nations . . .”

I quote this to show that the sponsors of the 1959 resolution had the same concerns as those entertained in the eight-Power amendments.

120. Moreover, out of concern for objectivity I should like to recall here that that resolution should be placed in its true political context, namely, that at that time considerable progress had been made at Geneva between the nuclear Powers with a view to concluding an agreement which was subsequently to lead to the signing of the Moscow Treaty of 1963. Due to the progress made then the three nuclear Powers of that time had voluntarily broken off all their tests; in other words, the appeal included in resolution 1379 (XIV) had, therefore, no regional overtone but was addressed to France, so that it could join the other nuclear Powers and also observe the moratorium that had been freely accepted.

121. I would go further and recall here as the representative of Morocco has done, that in 1959 the great majority of the delegations which are now sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 had voted against or had abstained in the vote on resolution 1379 (XIV). It would therefore be awkward if these same sponsors were to invoke here today the precedent of 13 years ago.

122. Those were the few observations that I wanted to advance to the First Committee following the often disagreeable criticisms expressed by several representatives about the eight Powers.

123. I am more than ever convinced that the best course for finding a solution to the disturbing and urgent problem of nuclear testing lies in objective, well-balanced resolutions likely to command the support of the largest possible number of countries. The history of disarmament teaches us that a massive vote in favour of a resolution which does not directly involve any particular country when other Powers are engaged in similar activities would have greater political weight than discriminatory and fragmentary appeals.

124. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: I have asked for the floor to deal with the suggestion that I ventured to put forth [*1891st meeting*] concerning the last paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution A/C.1/L.615. As will be recalled, in connexion with this paragraph, which speaks about the "completion of a first set of bilateral agreements" of the bilateral talks, namely the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks and also expresses the hope "that the progress so far achieved will lead to further agreed limitations on nuclear arms" and so on, I ventured to suggest, on the same day as I had the honour of introducing here draft resolution A/C.1/L.623, since several of its sponsors were also the sponsors of the draft in document A/C.1/L.615, that to make both drafts agree, perhaps we could include after the words "to further agreed limitations" the words "and sizeable reductions" or "and important reductions" as wished.

125. I did not go so far as to introduce a formal amendment on this point. I merely suggested to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.615, and in particular those who are also sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.623, that they should think about my suggestion. A number of them have approached me or members of my delegation and have told us that for various reasons the inclusion of the terms I suggested might create problems for them.

126. Since that is not the intention of my delegation, we will not press our suggestion. However, we should like to ask—as we have already done in private when we approached several sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.615 who have expressed agreement with us—that the last paragraph of the preamble of the draft should be voted upon separately, since the subject matter dealt with in that text, as far as my delegation is concerned, is already covered in a way much more satisfactory to us in draft resolution A/C.1/L.623, which we adopted this morning by 82 votes in favour to none against, with 30 abstentions.

127. Mr. NANDAN (Fiji): I should like to exercise my right of reply. The representatives of Morocco and Belgium have both referred to the statement of my delegation. Their replies are quite understandable, but, as far as my delegation is concerned, it stands by its own statement.

128. With regard to the reference made by the representative of Belgium to some earlier tests in the Pacific, my delegation would have expected him—since he represents an experienced colonial Power—to be aware of Fiji's status at that time and, therefore, its ability to voice its opinions.

129. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syrian Arab Republic): Before the vote is taken, I should like to raise a point for clarification. We have heard elaborate statements on the defects or merits of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624, and no doubt the debate is almost exhausted. But my delegation has listened attentively to the appeal eloquently made by the representative of the Ivory Coast to the sponsors of both the draft resolution and the amendments to attempt to hammer out a compromise draft acceptable to all. That appeal, if I am correct, has not been turned down by any of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611. In the circumstances I see no reason why our Committee should not take it up and give the sponsors of

the draft resolution and the amendments another chance, in the hope that they may arrive at a draft acceptable to all.

130. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) [*interpretation from French*]: My colleague from Syria got in a little ahead of me. I wanted to make a proposal before the various draft resolutions and amendments were put to the vote.

131. We explained the reasons why we have submitted amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/L.611. We shall not revert to that. We should like to say in passing to our friend and brother from Fiji that he does not know much about the Ivory Coast. We do not allow ourselves to be influenced by anyone. He stands by his position, and that is all right, but we would merely ask him to consult the documents of the United Nations so as to understand the manner in which the Ivory Coast takes its stand on the problems considered by various Committees and the General Assembly.

132. We have offered explanations; we have given our reasons; and, in the light of the debate relating to our amendments, my delegation, after having consulted only some of the sponsors—I apologize to those I have not been able to see—would be ready to ask you, Mr. Chairman, if you see no objection, to be kind enough to postpone the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 and the amendments in document A/C.1/L.624 until tomorrow.

133. It will be recalled that I had said in my statement that I thought a balanced text could be found that would be acceptable to all. I continue to think so. That is why I would wish that these two texts not be put to the vote this afternoon. We should allow the sponsors of the two texts to reconsider the matter in the light of the debate, in the hope that they may find, if not a magical formula to which everyone would agree, at least a decision which would facilitate the work of our Committee.

134. We regret the fact that some tendentious comments should have been made and it is to avoid any misunderstanding that I would express the wish that the sponsors of the amendments and possibly the sponsors of the draft resolution should meet, and perhaps dissipate any misunderstanding on the vote to follow.

135. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): Speaking on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, I do very much appreciate the motives of the representatives of Syria and the Ivory Coast in putting forward the suggestion that the sponsors of the draft resolution should perhaps meet before we vote on the amendments in order to reconsider our position and to ask ourselves whether we might not in some way be able to meet the wishes of the sponsors of the amendments.

136. I am afraid that I can really hold out no hope that the sponsors of the draft resolution are prepared in any way to accept changes in its text. I would have hoped that perhaps if there were any reason for the Committee to suspend its meeting now, it might be for the sponsors of the amendments to meet and reconsider their position and, in response to our appeal, decide to withdraw their amendments.

137. I repeat that I cannot really hold out any hope that sponsors of the draft resolution, who have considered their position quite frequently and very recently, are in a position to accept any changes in the text as it now stands.

138. The CHAIRMAN: The Chair is now seized of a formal request from the delegation of the Ivory Coast to postpone the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 and on the amendments in document A/C.1/L.624 until tomorrow morning. On the other hand, we have just listened very attentively to the statement made by the representative of Australia, who has stressed that there is no hope of a compromise, if I understand him correctly. I therefore wonder whether it would serve any useful purpose to postpone the vote until tomorrow morning, and would ask the representative of the Ivory Coast to reconsider the situation. Does he insist on his request to postpone the vote until tomorrow morning?

139. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) [*interpretation from French*]: I insist on my request that the vote be postponed until tomorrow morning. If, as the representative of Australia says, there is no hope of an agreement between the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 and the sponsors of the amendments, could he at least agree that the sponsors of the amendments should consult among themselves? That is the reason for which I asked that the vote be postponed until tomorrow.

140. Mr. KHATTABI (Morocco) [*interpretation from French*]: I should like to support the proposal made by the representative of the Ivory Coast, but I should like to add that I think that a suspension of 15 minutes or so would be sufficient for consultations among the sponsors of the amendments.

141. The CHAIRMAN: As I have said on several prior occasions, the Chairman is only the servant of the Committee. It is for the Committee to decide. Is the Committee in agreement—and in particular, is the representative of the Ivory Coast in agreement—with the suggestion just made by the representative of Morocco that we suspend our meeting for 15 minutes or so for some urgent consultations on this matter so that we may proceed to the vote today?

142. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) [*interpretation from French*]: I have no objections to the proposal of our colleague from Morocco. Let us suspend the meeting for a few minutes before we vote on the various drafts.

143. The CHAIRMAN: Since there is no objection, the meeting will be suspended for 15 minutes in order that consultations may be held.

The meeting was suspended at 5.30 p.m. and resumed at 5.45 p.m.

144. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) [*interpretation from French*]: I wish immediately to assure you that my statement will be brief. We asked for a suspension of the meeting in order to enable the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.1/L.624 to consult and to facilitate the work of the Committee.

145. I should like first to remind the Committee of what I said before: that our delegation and, I can now say, all the

delegations sponsoring that text are in favour of the total prohibition of all nuclear-weapons tests in all environments by any State whatever. Therefore there is no opposition between us and the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611. We submitted our amendments because we wanted a more balanced and more acceptable text. In no way were we guided by the desire to arouse the feelings of the States of the area. We regret the interpretation given to our intentions, and, in order to restore some calm to this Committee and also to appease this debate, after consulting among ourselves the sponsors of the amendments have agreed not to insist on their amendments being put to a vote.

146. I should like to say also that my delegation had hoped that it would be able to hold a meeting with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 because some misunderstandings have been expressed in this Committee. Some speakers went so far as to say that it was under the influence of I don't know who that we introduced such a text. Had we met with the sponsors we could have reassured these friendly delegations that in introducing our amendments we in no way intended to hurt their feelings or those of the peoples affected by the tests conducted in their areas.

147. Therefore, my delegation proposes that when the various drafts are put to the vote the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624 not be voted upon.

148. May I avail myself of this opportunity to tell the sponsors of the draft resolution that we have nothing against their text as such, and that we shall vote in favour of it.

149. Mr. Van USSEL (Belgium) [*interpretation from French*]: As has already been announced by the representative of the Ivory Coast, Mr. Aké, the sponsors have agreed to ask the Chairman not to put to the vote the amendments which appear in document A/C.1/L.624.

150. As I said Monday, as well as this afternoon, the sponsors are the first to share the concerns of the peoples of the Pacific area. We have mentioned this point, we have emphasized it in all our statements, but while we felt it essential at that time to introduce these amendments, it was not our intention to hurt the feelings of the peoples of the Pacific region. Our primary aim was to abide by the procedure traditionally followed in the First Committee, that is to say to have non-discriminatory resolutions, resolutions likely to command the maximum number of votes possible so that they would have a sufficient degree of political weight to exert pressure on the nuclear Powers concerned. In other words, it was for the purpose of efficiency and efficiency alone that we introduced these amendments.

151. Furthermore, we have also stated here that our amendments could not be interpreted as showing indifference to draft resolution A/C.1/L.611. Far from it. From the very first day I stated that this draft resolution had the full sympathy of my country and that in any event my country was going to vote in favour of it.

152. We took the decision to withdraw our amendments also because of our concern not to prolong the division

which exists at this time between the members of the First Committee. We were convinced, of course, that our amendments would have been adopted but, despite that fact, we considered it better in a case like this to restore unanimity and remove any divisions that may still persist within the Committee. On behalf of the sponsors I should like to express gratitude to all the delegations which spontaneously gave us their support, and I am convinced that draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 will be adopted by a very large majority.

153. The CHAIRMAN: As the Committee has heard, the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.624 have been withdrawn. I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the delegations of the Ivory Coast and Belgium and to thank them for their spirit of co-operation.

154. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): I am sure I am speaking for all the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611 when I express to our friends and colleagues from the Ivory Coast and Belgium our deep appreciation and understanding of the generous motives that have prompted them to withdraw the amendments to our draft resolution. I think all the sponsors of our draft resolution have understood very well the genuine doubts of the sponsors of the amendments regarding the balance and the effectiveness, in the long term, of our own draft resolution. We ourselves have been convinced, and I think we have done our best to explain, that our draft resolution contains a balance that will not hinder but, we hope, assist the process of working towards an agreement on the banning of all nuclear tests in all environments.

155. None the less we recognized and fully understood the sentiments of the sponsors of the amendments. We at no time thought, in any event, that they were pointing in an unfriendly manner at our motives; but we greatly appreciate the gesture of those sponsors in withdrawing their amendments—and, I repeat, I am sure I am expressing the feelings of all the sponsors of the draft resolution—and I echo the words of the representative of Belgium, that we should now be able to proceed to a vote, which I hope will be, if not unanimous, at least nearly so.

156. Mr. GIUFFRIDA (Italy) [*interpretation from French*]: While we share the objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, my delegation joined in the submission of the amendments in question because it was of the opinion that they would have strengthened even further the universal scope of the text. In the course of the debate we noted, however, that the amendments could have been interpreted by the sponsors of the draft resolution—all sincere friends of Italy—in a sense completely different from that which we intended. We wish to reaffirm our full support for the principles which inspired the draft resolution. We are convinced of the necessity to put an end to all nuclear-weapon tests in every part of the world and in all environments. We are certainly aware of the concern expressed in this connexion in the course of the debate, and we sincerely associate ourselves with the wishes of all governments which would like to see a complete halt to the testing of nuclear weapons. It is with those feelings in mind and with a desire to restore an atmosphere of co-operation that we have agreed to the withdrawal of the amendments.

157. I would add that, consistent with the position it has always taken as a signatory to the Moscow Treaty, Italy will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611.

158. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand): I do not wish to delay the Committee at this late hour when we are about to vote but my delegation would not like to allow the opportunity to pass, since we did appeal to the sponsors of the amendments to withdraw them, without expressing thanks for their generosity and the spirit of conciliation they have shown. It is now very clear that there is widespread support for the draft resolution and it had always seemed to my delegation that in such a situation it would be unnecessarily divisive for us to have gone further into a discussion of the amendments. I merely want to second the remarks made by the representative of Australia and to say that I am extremely grateful to the sponsors of the amendments for their action. I also reciprocate the remarks made on an earlier occasion by the representative of Belgium—that differences of opinion in this Committee have no bearing whatsoever on the friendship we have for the countries that sponsored the amendments.

159. Mr. NANDAN (Fiji): My delegation would like to join the delegations of Australia and New Zealand in expressing appreciation to the sponsors of the amendments for responding to our appeals in a positive manner and withdrawing those amendments.

160. The CHAIRMAN: Now that all possible misunderstanding has happily been cleared, I take it the Committee is ready to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.611.

The draft resolution was adopted by 106 votes to 4, with 8 abstentions.

161. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will next vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.615.

162. The delegation of Mexico has requested a separate vote on the last preambular paragraph of this draft resolution. I now put that paragraph to the vote.

The paragraph was adopted by 65 votes to 2, with 44 abstentions.

163. The CHAIRMAN: I now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/L.615, as a whole.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 94 votes to 4, with 28 abstentions.

164. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.620.

The draft resolution was adopted by 81 votes to 4, with 30 abstentions.

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

166. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: My delegation has set forth on previous occasions the reasons why we were not able to vote for the draft

resolutions on the item that this Committee has just disposed of. We adhere to this position and, therefore, it seems to us unnecessary to repeat the reasons that we have advanced here on other occasions. For those reasons, my delegation did not support the three drafts submitted for the consideration of this Committee on this item.

167. None the less, in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/L.611, we should like to state our understanding of the concern expressed by some coastal States of the Pacific area, in particular Chile and Peru, about the dangerous effects these explosions may have for their peoples. I wish the record to reflect our sympathy towards their peoples and Governments on this problem.

168. Mr. BARTON (Canada): The Canadian delegation has just voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.620, which was sponsored by Mexico and 14 other Latin American countries. I should like to put on record an explanation of our vote for that draft resolution.

169. As we did in connexion with a similar text at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, Canada voted in favour of this draft resolution because we remain firmly opposed to all nuclear-weapon testing in all environments and by all nations. While we support this objective which draft resolution A/C.1/L.620 is designed to highlight, I must say that we do have reservations about the resort to a deadline such as that recommended in operative paragraph 3. We consider that the most useful way to bring all nuclear-weapon testing to a halt is to pursue effective negotiations towards a balanced and lasting agreement. That is what the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament is attempting to do right now, and it is precisely to the attainment of that objective that draft resolution A/C.1/L.615 has been designed to contribute.

170. Mr. BANERJEE (India): I should like to explain my vote in regard to draft resolution A/C.1/L.615. My delegation abstained because of operative paragraph 3, which in our view is an effort to detract from the objective that we have been striving for. In particular, it affords a loop-hole for the reduction of such testing, which is opposed to our point of view. Furthermore, operative paragraph 3 is somewhat in contradiction of operative paragraph 7. In view of this, our delegation abstained, though other paragraphs and the recommendations are acceptable to us.

171. Mr. MOLINA (Costa Rica) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: I only want to explain why my delegation abstained from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/L.615. We consider that operative paragraph 3 is a tacit authorization to continue nuclear tests, although on a limited scale; and we think that this is in contradiction with the statement of operative paragraph 7.

172. For that reason, since we are in favour of a complete halt to nuclear and thermonuclear tests, we abstained from voting on this draft.

173. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/L.620 which the Committee has just adopted. My delegation agreed with the spirit and the objectives of the draft

resolution and we were accordingly able to support it. Having done so, however, I am bound to say that we have difficulty with some of the provisions of the draft resolution. Our first problem is with operative paragraph 2. In the light of my delegation's consistent attitude towards the verification of an underground nuclear weapon test ban, we have some difficulty with the view that, whatever may be the differences on the question of verification, there is no valid reason for delaying the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban.

174. Our other problem is with operative paragraph 3, which could have the effect of instituting or seeking an unverified moratorium on nuclear-weapon testing. In our view, action of this kind would be likely to be effective as a short-term measure only if all of the nuclear-weapon Powers were prepared to endorse it. Even then, in the absence of effective means of verification, its efficacy could be open to doubt. But notwithstanding these difficulties, we were prepared to support the draft resolution because of our sympathy with its broad objectives.

175. The CHAIRMAN: The next item on our programme is agenda item 33. Under this item the Committee has before it draft resolution A/C.1/L.619/Rev.1, sponsored by 16 delegations. The Committee will consider this item tomorrow morning.

176. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) [*Interpretation from Spanish*]: I should like to make a very brief clarification which I think might be useful in expediting our work tomorrow. I refer to the draft resolution A/C.1/L.619/Rev.1 on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco to which you, Mr. Chairman, have just referred.

177. Some representatives have asked my delegation which is the declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China to which reference is made in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.619/Rev.1.

178. Although I shall explain this in detail and extensively tomorrow when I shall have the honour of introducing this draft officially on behalf of the sponsors, I should like now to state, so that there may not be the slightest doubt in the mind of any representative, that the declaration referred to in operative paragraph 3 as "the solemn declaration made..." is the declaration to be found in the fourth paragraph of the note sent by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to the Ambassador of Mexico in China and reproduced in document A/C.1/1028. In that document and, I repeat, it is the declaration to which reference is made in operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.619/Rev.1:

"The Chinese Government has repeatedly declared that at no time and in no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons. As a specific undertaking regarding the nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America, I now declare solemnly on behalf of the Chinese Government: China will never use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear Latin American countries and the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone, nor will China test, manufacture, produce, stock-

pile, install or deploy nuclear weapons in these countries or in this zone, or send her means of transportation and delivery carrying nuclear weapons to traverse the territory, territorial sea and territorial air space of Latin American countries.”

179. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mexico for his statement, which will no doubt facilitate the work of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.