

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1264th
MEETING

Friday, 2 November 1962,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 77:	
The urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests (continued)	
Consideration of draft resolutions (continued).....	105

Chairman: Mr. Omar Abdel Hamid ADEEL
(Sudan).

AGENDA ITEM 77

The urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests (A/5141 and Add.1, A/C.1/873, A/C.1/874, A/C.1/L.310 and Add.1-4, A/C.1/L.311) (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that a revised text of the Canadian amendments (A/C.1/L.313/Rev.1) to the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.310 and Add.1-4) had been submitted.

2. In addition, the United Kingdom and the United States had submitted an amendment to the fourth Canadian amendment.^{1/}

3. Mr. BURNS (Canada) said that the revised Canadian amendments (A/C.1/L.313/Rev.1) had been submitted after consultation with the delegations that had submitted sub-amendments to the fourth Canadian amendment. The revised text of the proposed operative paragraph 6 incorporated the essence of the Ghanaian sub-amendment (A/C.1/L.314) and had, he understood, also been approved by the delegations of Madagascar and Mauritania, who had indicated that they would not press their sub-amendment (A/C.1/L.315) to a vote. The Canadian delegation had also inserted the words "by 1 January 1963" in the proposed new operative paragraph 3, in order to clarify the request contained in the draft resolution. It hoped that the Committee would support the revised Canadian amendments, the aim of which was to indicate more clearly to the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament the lines which the Committee wanted the negotiations to follow.

^{1/} The text of the amendment submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States to the fourth Canadian amendment in document A/C.1/L.313/Rev.1 was circulated at the beginning of the meeting as a provisional document under the symbol A/C.1/L.316, with the following text:

"Add the following words at the end of the proposed new operative paragraph 6:

"such limited interim agreement to include adequate assurances for effective on-site inspection of unidentified seismic events by an international commission;"

Later in the meeting the text of the amendment as revised by the sponsors was circulated under the same symbol (see paragraph 10 below).

4. At first sight the sub-amendment that had just been submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom was not incompatible with the memorandum of the eight non-aligned nations and should not present any difficulty if it was added to paragraph 6.

5. Mr. SOULEYMANE (Mauritania) explained that in submitting their sub-amendment (A/C.1/L.315) the delegations of Madagascar and Mauritania had wanted to emphasize two factors: the continuation of negotiations in a propitious and relaxed atmosphere, and the cessation of nuclear tests in all environments and in all forms. It would be difficult to achieve results if some tests were allowed to continue. Since the revised text of paragraph 6 submitted by the Canadian delegation took those two factors into account, the delegations of Madagascar and Mauritania had decided to accept it and to withdraw their amendment. They also hoped that the United States and the United Kingdom would withdraw their draft resolution (A/C.1/L.311), so that the Committee could adopt a single resolution.

6. Mr. QUAISON-SACKKEY (Ghana) said that he was glad that the Canadian delegation had been able to incorporate the Ghanaian amendment in the proposed operative paragraph 6. With regard to the sub-amendment submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom, the Ghanaian delegation thought that, if the nuclear Powers accepted the eight-nation memorandum as a basis for negotiations to reach agreement on underground tests, they would have to discuss inspection, and the decision whether on-site inspection should be compulsory or optional would be for them. He was therefore somewhat disturbed by that amendment, and urged the United States and the United Kingdom to withdraw it so that the Committee could adopt the revised text of the Canadian amendments unanimously.

7. Mr. DEAN (United States of America) recalled the efforts made by his Government since 1958 to achieve a treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments. Taking into account the eight-nation memorandum and the discussions at Geneva, the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom had finally submitted two draft treaties: a general treaty banning tests in all environments under effective international control;^{2/} and, in case that could not be concluded, a treaty without international control banning tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water.^{3/} The United States Government would do everything possible to comply with the directives contained in the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution, as amended by the Canadian amendments; but it thought that the "interim arrangement limited in time suspending all underground tests, taking as a

^{2/} Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January 1961 to December 1962, document DC/205, annex 1, sect. 0.

^{3/} Ibid., sect. P.

basis the eight-nation memorandum", mentioned in the new operative paragraph 6, should contain adequate assurances for effective on-site inspection of unidentified seismic events by an international commission. The sub-amendment submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom was in line with the proposals contained in the eight-nation memorandum and with earlier proposals by the United States and the United Kingdom, and merely clarified a point which otherwise might not have been very clear.

8. Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom) paid a tribute to the efforts made by the thirty-seven Powers and by Canada and Ghana to help the nuclear Powers in their negotiations. However, as the United States representative had just pointed out, the revised text of the new paragraph 6 still contained some ambiguities; and experience had shown that proposals which were not sufficiently clear merely gave rise to long discussions between the nuclear Powers about their interpretation. The United States and United Kingdom delegations therefore thought that the proposals in paragraph 6 should be made clearer, and that was the aim of their sub-amendment. In his opinion that amendment, which was designed to ensure that undertakings were respected, was not incompatible with the proposals contained in the eight-nation memorandum. The United States and the United Kingdom, which assumed a great responsibility as nuclear Powers, felt it important to make their attitude absolutely clear. The Committee's deliberations would certainly be useful for the discussions to be resumed in the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament at Geneva. Although the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution, as amended by the Canadian amendments and with the addition of the text proposed in the sub-amendment submitted by the United Kingdom and the United States, did not entirely reflect the position of the Western Powers, it did represent a position somewhere between the two sides. That, however, did not signify that the United Kingdom delegation would be able to vote for it.

9. Mr. LALL (India), speaking on a point of order, proposed that the meeting should be suspended to allow consultations between the sponsors of the newly submitted sub-amendment and other delegations.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 4 p.m. and resumed at 4.45 p.m.

10. The CHAIRMAN announced that the United States and United Kingdom delegations had submitted a revised text of their sub-amendment (A/C.1/L.316), reading: "such limited interim agreement to include adequate assurances for effective detection and identification of seismic events by an international scientific commission".

11. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that it had been satisfying to observe the patient work done in the Committee to bring the two positions closer together. The efforts made by the delegations of Ghana and Canada deserved especial praise. The revised Canadian amendments (A/C.1/L.313/Rev.1) definitely improved on the original drafting by clearly stipulating that an interim arrangement suspending underground tests ought to be concluded forthwith while negotiations continued for a final agreement. The Spanish text of the fourth revised amendment drew a clearer distinction than the other language versions between the agreement prohibiting tests in the atmos-

phere, in outer space and under water and the interim arrangement suggested for the suspension of underground tests. To concord the texts it would be sufficient to replace the words "accompanied by" by the words "as well as".

12. With regard to the amendment submitted by the United States and the United Kingdom (A/C.1/L.316), he presumed that the revised text was the result of a compromise, which was commendable. The new draft took into account the proposals of the eight-nation memorandum, including the idea of an international scientific commission.

13. His delegation would vote for the sub-amendment of the United States and the United Kingdom, the Canadian amendments, and the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution so amended.

14. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) did not think a partial treaty was likely to last, and advocated an agreement covering all categories of nuclear tests, without compromise or half-measures. The amendments proposed by Ghana (A/C.1/L.314) and by Madagascar and Mauritania (A/C.1/L.315) to the Canadian amendments indicated patient and ingenious effort but had unleashed, as if by a chain reaction, a series of other sub-amendments which would change the purport of the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution. As Algeria well knew, it was difficult to reconcile divergent positions without altering them. He was not opposed a priori to control or inspection, but considered that that was a question to be settled by the nuclear Powers themselves in accordance with their technical resources, and that the Committee's task was to make it known to those Powers that the peoples of the world wanted nuclear tests stopped. Algeria, for its part, had particular reasons for hoping that the explosions would cease as soon as possible.

15. The United Kingdom representative's remarks concerning the dangers of ambiguity were very pertinent; for precisely that reason it would be preferable to strip the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution of all the amendments made to it and to restore its original form. One of the nuclear Powers had expressed reservations in regard to it, but had added that the principles it embodied were provisionally acceptable; the other nuclear Powers would do well to adopt a like attitude. All States, great and small, had responsibilities, if only towards their populations which, against their will, were exposed to the effects of nuclear testing; they should accept the only possible solution, the cessation of nuclear tests.

16. Mr. LALL (India) expressed appreciation that the United States and United Kingdom delegations had endeavoured to move towards the position he had suggested. It was encouraging to note that the Committee was now willing to refer to the memorandum of the eight non-aligned nations and to the constructive proposals made during the current discussion; but it was nevertheless regrettable that only an interim arrangement limited in time was contemplated. It would be preferable to speak of an "interim but extendible arrangement", since the eight-nation memorandum was mentioned as a basis for agreement and since, contrary to what the representative of Peru appeared to believe, there had not yet been agreement between the various parties. If the United States and United Kingdom delegations could accept that slight change, they would enable his delegation to take a favourable view of their sub-amendment and expedite the Committee's vote.

17. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) expressed satisfaction that all parties had made praiseworthy efforts to reconcile their points of view, and that the various amendments had taken into account the chief points in his delegation's suggestions, mainly in regard to the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, and also to a separate interim agreement pending the conclusion of a final treaty on underground tests. It was now proposed, however, to speak of an interim arrangement limited in time, which was ambiguous since the time limit was not specified. Moreover, the arrangement was to be based on the proposals contained in the memorandum of the eight non-aligned Powers, which had been variously interpreted; so there also remained the ambiguity about whether the inspection was to be obligatory or voluntary. In order to break that deadlock, his delegation suggested that the following provisions might be incorporated into or annexed to the draft resolution: first, that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament should appoint an international commission of scientists, preferably from non-aligned States, pending the conclusion of a treaty on underground tests; second, that the commission would be entrusted with the detection, identification and verification of seismic events suspected of being caused by underground tests; third, that all data regarding seismic events recorded by national recording and controlling stations would be made available daily and immediately to the international commission, and any nuclear Power would be entitled to indicate to the commission events which it regarded as suspicious; fourth, that the State on whose territory a seismic event of unidentifiable cause occurred should co-operate fully with the commission in its endeavours to verify the cause by all possible means, including on-site inspection where necessary, subject to the permission of the State concerned; fifth, that if, as a result of the refusal of the State concerned to permit on-site inspection, two suspected seismic events remained unidentified, that party's refusal would be taken as a factor justifying the suspicion that such events had been occasioned by test explosions on the territory of the said party; sixth, that on the occurrence of such a situation the international commission would declare that the other parties were no longer bound by the interim arrangements outlined above, and they would be free to resume their positions as they de-

termined them, or to call for a review of those arrangements.

18. Those provisions ought to satisfy both sides, since one side would have the assurance that inspection would be voluntary and the other the assurance that it would not be obliged to continue to accept the situation if the first side refused to accept on-site inspections. It would then be in the interest of the country concerned to accept inspection if it wished the arrangement to remain in force. Furthermore, the arrangement might easily lead to a definite agreement. It would be seen whether, in practice, inspection was necessary or not and, if it was, whether the party concerned agreed to inspection in a specific instance, when it was not merely a question of principle. There would thus be a test of good faith which might lead to the conclusion of agreements on other important questions.

19. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) said that it might be useful if the sponsors of the thirty-seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.310 and Add.1-4) held a consultation before considering any changes in their text, as some apparently wished to do. The meeting could perhaps be suspended for half an hour for that purpose.

20. Mr. QUAISON-SACKY (Ghana) agreed that some time might be allowed for the sponsors to consult together, but wished to make it clear that they had no intention of amending their text; they were simply considering submitting a new amendment to the Canadian amendments.

21. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) proposed the adjournment of the meeting.

22. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria), Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria) and Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) supported the motion for adjournment.

23. Mr. LALL (India) said he would have preferred a suspension, in order that the vote might be taken at the current meeting. He would bow to the will of the majority, however, which appeared to favour adjournment.

The motion for adjournment was adopted by 56 votes to 7, with 28 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.