

*United Nations*  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
THIRTY-NINTH SESSION  
*Official Records\**



SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE  
4th meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 9 October 1984  
at 11 a.m.  
New York

---

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 4th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. DIALLO (Guinea)

CONTENTS

EFFECTS OF ATOMIC RADIATION: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON  
THE EFFECTS OF ATOMIC RADIATION

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC 2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 70: EFFECTS OF ATOMIC RADIATION: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON THE EFFECTS OF ATOMIC RADIATION  
(A/39/341; A/SPC/39/L.2) (continued)

1. Mr. KAZAKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the consideration of the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation coincided with the thirtieth anniversary of the inauguration of the world's first atomic power plant at Obninsk in the USSR. Since 1954, nuclear energy had become an important factor in the economic and social development of many countries, particularly the developing ones. The Soviet Union was making a very substantial contribution to the development of international co-operation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy, particularly in the Scientific Committee.
2. The Committee would also be celebrating its thirtieth anniversary in the following year. It was now a respected body whose work had contributed to progress towards the cessation of nuclear-weapon testing. The data gathered by the Committee had served as a basis for many important studies, such as the work entitled Nuclear War: Medical and Biological Effects, published by Soviet scientists in 1984.
3. All States Members of the United Nations, being responsible for the fate of present and future generations, must try to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear war. The Soviet Union for its part was resolutely committed to the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. It had shown its good will in pledging not to be the first to resort to nuclear weapons and it was working actively to promote a nuclear-weapon freeze and nuclear disarmament. Like most of the States which had participated in the debates of the Special Political Committee, it wanted an end to nuclear-weapon tests. Unfortunately, the opponents of that idea were sabotaging the vigorous efforts made by States to that end. Trilateral negotiations on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests had been interrupted, as had the process of ratification of the Soviet-United States treaties on the limitation of underground nuclear tests and on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, even though they had been signed a long time ago.
4. On the initiative of the Soviet Union, the United Nations had in the previous year adopted a declaration condemning nuclear war as the most monstrous crime that could be committed against peoples. As Mr. Gromyko had stressed in his statement to the General Assembly at its current session, political thinking must evolve in order to take the realities of the nuclear age into account. The notions of "force", "deterrence" and "supremacy" must be replaced by those of the non-use of force, trust, equality and mutual respect for security interests. The nuclear Powers should respect in their relations the norms laid down in March 1984 by the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Chernenko. The Soviet Union was ready at any time to meet with the other nuclear Powers in order to give mutual recognition to those norms and to make them obligatory.

/...

(Mr. Kazakov, USSR)

5. It was important in the highest degree not to permit the extension of the nuclear or any other arms race, to outer space, which certain well-known forces wish to turn into a battlefield. The Soviet Union had therefore proposed the inclusion in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly an item entitled "Use of outer space for exclusively peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind". It proposed that the General Assembly should proclaim that it was the historical responsibility of all States to ensure that the conquest of space was solely for peaceful purposes, and for the benefit of mankind and recommended specific measures to reach that goal.

6. His delegation was convinced that the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation would continue, as in the past, to perform successfully its important task of co-ordinating studies concerning the effects of atomic radiation, particularly on human beings. It noted with satisfaction the close co-operation between the Scientific Committee and the United Nations Environment Programme, as well as the assistance provided to the Committee by the International Atomic Energy Agency. His country participated actively in the Committee's work and would continue to contribute to the effective functioning of that important United Nations body. His delegation, which was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.2, wished to express the hope that the latter would be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

7. Mr. CHATURVEDI (India) stated that his delegation had read with interest the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (A/39/341). The questions examined by the Committee were of vital importance to the world's population, and his delegation looked forward with interest to the presentation of the various documents being prepared by the Committee. It associated itself with the appeal made by the latter to Member States, specialized agencies - including WHO and IAEA - and other scientific organizations to extend their co-operation to an even greater extent.

8. India had always looked upon science and technology as providing a way out of economic backwardness. Scientific knowledge and technical progress should make it possible to alleviate human suffering, and that was why India was committed to using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. India's nuclear programme was prompted not by military objectives but by developmental necessity. It was dedicated to agriculture, medicine and meeting energy needs.

9. His delegation hoped that the efforts of the Scientific Committee and the technical documents it prepared would provide useful and reliable information to all the nations of the world and that the latter would thus be able to harness the atom for peaceful purposes and curtail the harmful effects of atomic radiation. His Government had supported the work of the Scientific Committee since its inception and would continue to do so.

10. Mr. LOUET (France) said that the French delegation wholeheartedly endorsed the statement made by the representative of Ireland on behalf of the European Economic Community and that it had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.2 without reservation.

/...

(Mr. Louet, France)

11. His delegation had listened very attentively to the statements by the representatives of New Zealand and Australia. They had mentioned the report published by the members of a scientific mission from the countries of the Pacific which had visited the French experimental station at Mururoa from 25 to 29 October 1983 at the invitation of the President of the French Republic. He wished to provide some information and background in that connection.

12. With respect to the effects of atomic radiation, the report made it clear that the level of radiation at Mururoa and in that part of the Pacific was lower than it was in other parts of the world and therefore below the level worth mentioning in a study concerning the effects on health of atomic radiation.

13. With respect to the long-term effects on the structures of the atoll, he wished to point out that the transfer of radioactivity - which might, according to the report's conclusions, occur in 500 to 1,000 years at the earliest - was based on an estimate of a total source of activity (in other words, the total of all the tests made) of 100 megatons. However, the total energy measured by the authors of the report over the past 10 years was 0.934 megatons, in other words, it was less than one hundredth of the figure which they had used as their working hypothesis. Those figures, which required no comment, confirmed the conclusions which the French scientists had always reached from their investigations at Mururoa in the past years, the results of which had been regularly communicated both to the Special Political Committee and to the Scientific Committee.

14. The delegations of Australia and New Zealand had also emphasized their opposition to the continuation of all nuclear tests, particularly those carried out by France. That essentially political attitude would be more suited to the discussions in the First Committee on the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon testing in all environments. It should, however, be pointed out that France's nuclear test programme was decided upon and carried out on the authority of the President of the Republic and the French Government and that its only objective was to ensure the maintenance of the credibility of the French strike force with the minimum number of tests. No statement about the intentions of the French Government in that area could be considered authoritative or reliable unless it emanated from the Government authorities themselves or their appointed representatives.

15. The French Minister for Foreign Affairs had indicated clearly the French Government's position on that question at a press conference on 26 September 1984. After stressing the significance of nuclear strength in France's policy of independence, he had said that the French Government hoped that testing of the nuclear part of France's deterrent strength could in time be slowed down and then stopped, but that it would be continued as long as necessary. That statement was the only recent statement which expressed the position of the French Government.

16. Mr. KOVACIC (Czechoslovakia) said that the establishment of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation in 1955 had been prompted by concern about the possible biological consequences of radioactive fallout caused by the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. The Czechoslovak Socialist

/...

(Mr. Kovacic, Czechoslovakia)

Republic had participated in the activities of that Committee from the beginning; there was no doubt that its activities had been influenced decisively by the conclusion in Moscow in 1963 of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water which had resulted in a considerable decrease in the quality of radioactive fallout. The Scientific Committee had thus been able to direct its efforts to the problem of risks arising in connection with radiation from sources other than nuclear explosions and study the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, an area in which notable progress had been made during the past decade.

17. The adoption of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons had played a positive role in the field covered by the Committee. There was, however, cause for concern in the possibility that the States which had not acceded to the Treaty might start testing nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, which would certainly lead to an increase in the quantity of radioactive fallout, not to mention the impact on international security of an increase in the number of countries possessing nuclear weapons. It was therefore desirable that more countries, primarily the technically advanced ones, should accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

18. His delegation believed that in order to enable the Scientific Committee to continue its valuable work, a treaty on a general and complete nuclear weapon test ban should be concluded, as had been proposed for many years by the Soviet Union, the other socialist States and the non-aligned countries.

19. His delegation, which was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.2, would support every effort to ensure its adoption and implementation.

20. Mr. ALMOSLECHNER (Austria) said that his delegation had noted with interest the report of the Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. The topics which that Committee had included in its work programme covered a spectrum of areas in which it seemed particularly important to acquire more knowledge of the levels, effects and risks of atomic radiation.

21. His delegation was convinced that the scientific information currently sought by the Committee in order to finalize some of the documents which it had to prepare would soon be available. In that connection, the Committee should enjoy the assistance of Member States, the specialized agencies and other scientific organizations. His delegation particularly welcomed the support extended by the United Nations Environment Programme and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

22. His delegation was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.2.

23. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that his delegation warmly welcomed the co-operation established between the Scientific Committee, UNEP and the specialized agencies - especially IAEA - which could not fail to promote the success of its work, in which it took a keen interest. During the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly, it had, however, requested the Scientific Committee, to study the question of

/...

(Mr. Pachachi, Iraq)

attacks against nuclear installations for peaceful purposes, because even if they were carried out with conventional weapons, they nevertheless had dangerous nuclear repercussions, if only through the atmospheric pollution which they caused. The Committee's report did not mention that important question, although it was directly related to its work, and his delegation reiterated its request that it should study all aspects of it.

24. In that connection, it should be noted that the Disarmament Conference and its Ad Hoc Working Group on Radiological Weapons were currently examining the joint proposal concerning the drafting of a convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons submitted by the United States and the USSR. Although it was not a member of that conference, Iraq had closely followed its discussions on that question. In particular, it supported Sweden's proposal to amend article 1 of the draft convention and to extend the scope of the prohibition of the use of radiological weapons for aggressive purposes to cover attacks against nuclear plants. His Government had circulated to the States members of the Conference a memorandum outlining its position on the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons, in which it recalled that it had always unreservedly supported all resolutions adopted on the matter by the General Assembly, in particular resolution 38/188 D.

25. As pointed out by the Director-General of IAEA at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly, the fact that nuclear installations had become the target for attacks with conventional weapons might cause a nuclear war, a most alarming prospect especially since 260 nuclear installations existed in the world. Having been a victim in 1981 of a treacherous attack by Israel against its peaceful nuclear installations - the first of that kind in history - which could have had serious consequences if preventive measures had not been taken, Iraq considered that the international community should examine that question in depth. It therefore again insisted that the Scientific Committee should study all its aspects, in co-operation with the specialized agencies, and particularly IAEA, and hoped that in its next report that request would be complied with.

26. In conclusion, he congratulated the Scientific Committee on its work and on the concise report which it had submitted.

27. Mr. RADRODRO (Fiji) noted with appreciation the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (A/39/341) and commended the Committee for its efforts to provide scientific information on the levels, effects and risks of ionizing radiation by compiling and analysing all available data. The increasing co-operation between the Committee and the various United Nations specialized agencies was also a source of satisfaction.

28. The international community remained concerned about the potentially harmful effects of radiation on mankind and on the environment. Its social, economic and political implications were particularly apparent in the South Pacific region, where most of the island States had limited land resources and consequently had to turn to the marine environment for their sustenance and their future economic

/...

(Mr. Radrodro, Fiji)

development. It was therefore very disquieting that a major nuclear Power should be continuing to conduct tests on one of the atolls of the region, in spite of repeated requests to cease doing so. Another State was proceeding with its plan to dump nuclear and radioactive wastes on the Pacific Ocean sea-bed. By pursuing those activities, both those countries were posing a grave threat to the health and well-being of the peoples of the region, both present and future.

29. Insufficient scientific evidence on the subject made one wary of concluding that underground nuclear tests reduced the risk of radiation: any nuclear explosion involved that risk. It did not matter whether the level was high or low or of what was euphemistically referred to as a "permissible level". What was at issue was not the choice between one type of nuclear test and another, but why there should be any tests at all. For those reasons, Fiji and the other countries of the South Pacific had continuously called for the ending of all nuclear tests and had repeatedly protested about French nuclear tests in the Pacific. The French Government had ignored those appeals, but had invited a fact-finding mission to visit Mururoa Atoll in October 1983. The Heads of State and Government of the South Pacific Forum had considered the report of the mission in August 1984 and had noted that, while its findings had allayed to some degree the concern that had been expressed about the short-term effects of the nuclear tests, uncertainty remained about the long-term consequences. The Forum's opposition to nuclear testing had by no means diminished. The Heads of Government of those countries had accordingly reiterated their strong opposition to continued nuclear testing in the South Pacific by France or any other country. They had also declared that the dumping of nuclear wastes in the region was unacceptable.

30. The member countries of the Forum had welcomed the declaration adopted in July 1984 by the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, composed of Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru, concerning French nuclear tests on Mururoa Atoll; it constituted a further expression of the united opposition of the countries of the Pacific to such tests. However, the news media had revealed France's intention to persist in its nuclear testing programme at Mururoa until the year 2000. The countries of the South Pacific, which had hoped that their combined appeals would be heeded by France, were therefore most alarmed.

31. It was the fervent desire of the people of Fiji to live in peaceful coexistence with their neighbours in a safe and healthy environment and to continue to use the resources of the seas. They resolutely opposed any activity that could degrade the quality of their lives. It was for that reason that Fiji had joined the other countries of the South Pacific, including the member countries of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, in voicing strong opposition to continued nuclear testing carried out on Mururoa Atoll.

32. Mr. LASARTE (Uruguay) said that, as at previous sessions, his delegation was a sponsor of the draft resolution on the item under consideration as it wished to support the work of the Scientific Committee, which was arousing increasing interest in spite of the limitations imposed by the Committee's mandate.

/...

(Mr. Lasarte, Uruguay)

33. As paragraph 1 of the draft resolution indicated, the Committee had worked with scientific authority and independence of judgement and had benefited from the collaboration of United Nations agencies with similar functions, such as UNEP and IAEA. However, as the Committee had stressed in its report, it was essential that States Members of the United Nations, the specialized agencies and the non-governmental organizations concerned should extend even greater co-operation in view of the difficulties it was encountering in obtaining additional data. That was apparent from the fact that there were no technical documents accompanying the Committee's report, which simply gave a brief description of the work of the Committee's annual session at Vienna.

34. His delegation therefore drew particular attention to the last paragraph of the draft resolution in the hope that the relevant data, which were mostly of critical importance from the scientific point of view, would be provided before June 1985. That would considerably help the Committee to submit a full report to the next session on the questions within its competence and of concern to Member States.

35. Noting that, generally speaking, the Special Political Committee approved of the mandate of the Scientific Committee and the co-operation established with other agencies in the United Nations system, and would favour a broadening of the Scientific Committee's mandate, his delegation stressed the need to give that Committee the authority to make both general and specific recommendations regarding measures to be taken at the national, regional or international level to prevent or attenuate the effects of atomic radiation on mankind and the environment. Authorizing the Committee to formulate recommendations would not only make its data more useful, but would directly serve the interests of the countries in matters that were giving increasing cause for concern.

36. Mr. RODRIGUEZ MEDINA (Colombia) expressed his support for the serious and systematic work of the Scientific Committee, to which his country attached great importance. For that reason he had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.2.

37. Colombia was particularly interested in the question of the harmful effects of nuclear explosions on health and the environment, under consideration in the Committee. His country had a long coastline on the Pacific Ocean and was therefore a member, with Chile, Ecuador and Peru, of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific. In February 1984, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of those four countries, meeting in Chile, reaffirmed their categorical and continuing opposition to nuclear explosions and to the dumping of radioactive wastes in the South Pacific region. That joint position, which had been reinforced by the nuclear tests carried out by France on Mururoa Atoll, had been expressed in a declaration recently adopted by the Permanent Commission and delivered by its Secretary to the French Embassy at Quito - and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Permanent Representatives of the four countries. Their Governments had declared that those explosions constituted a serious threat to the marine environment and its natural resources and were highly detrimental to the interests of the States members of the South-East Pacific maritime system. In that document the Ministers reaffirmed their opposition to such nuclear tests and called for their immediate cessation.

/...



(Mr. Rodriguez Medina, Colombia)

38. All the relevant scientific studies emphasized that underwater nuclear tests caused direct and immediate maritime pollution in a relatively restricted and well-defined area, whereas explosions on the surface of the sea or in the atmosphere caused a far wider dispersal of radioactive material. The experts considered that the nuclear tests in French Polynesia carried a grave threat of marine pollution in the South-East Pacific because of the dispersal of radioactive material by ocean currents and by the movements of contaminated migratory fish, which were likely to join shoals of fish in the waters of coastal countries. Regional monitoring of that type of contamination and of its unknown future effects was obviously limited in scope. It would therefore be advisable for a specialized agency that was equipped with the necessary modern technical means, such as IAEA, to measure radioactivity and provide a truer picture of the situation.

39. That serious problem showed how essential it was to regulate technical and scientific developments wherever they might conflict with the interests and rights of peoples. Moreover, that would be an opportunity for a country such as France, which was peace-loving and in favour of fraternity among nations, to heed such an appeal, for the benefit of all. Colombia and the countries of Latin America had supported the cessation of all explosions for the purpose of testing nuclear weapons and had urged that a treaty completely banning such tests should be concluded. The United Nations should ensure that the peoples of the world derived from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy the immense advantages they had to offer for their future development.

40. The explanations that the representative of France had just given only served to confirm the anxiety expressed a few days earlier in the General Assembly by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia who had asked why, if those tests were so harmless, France did not conduct them off its own shores rather than in the South Pacific.

41. Mr. VIGLIENZONE (United States of America) said that his country, which was a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.2, continued to take great interest in the work of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, which had discharged its mandate with the highest competence since its establishment 29 years earlier. United States governmental and private agencies had constantly exerted efforts to supply it with all the data necessary for the accomplishment of its functions.

42. His delegation noted with satisfaction that the Committee's report (A/39/341) was once again characterized by its objectivity and that co-operation between the Committee, the United Nations Environment Programme and the International Atomic Energy Agency was continuing; it hoped that such co-operation would develop further.

43. Mr. ORTIZ TERAN (Ecuador) said that it was the policy of Ecuador to support any initiative aimed at eliminating the threats presented to mankind both by the arms race and by the existence of nuclear arsenals and the continuation of nuclear testing.

/...

(Mr. Ortiz Teran, Ecuador)

44. As a Pacific Ocean coastal State, Ecuador was particularly concerned about the grave consequences which nuclear tests might have for the environment, despite the denials of the countries which conducted them. The Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, which was composed of Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru, had adopted a declaration, issued as document A/39/343, in which it was stated that the nuclear tests which France had again carried out in May 1984 on Mururoa Atoll constituted a great risk for the marine environment and its natural resources and were highly detrimental to the States members of the "South-East Pacific Maritime System". The Commission had, moreover, taken a stand and protested vigorously against the nuclear tests and called for their immediate cessation.

45. The French Government's intention to continue nuclear testing for another 15 years on Mururoa Atoll, referred to by the representative of New Zealand in his statement at the 3rd meeting, caused Ecuador acute concern. If that intention was carried out, all the efforts made by the international community to mitigate or eliminate the risks of the nuclear arms race and the almost equally hazardous consequences of nuclear testing for the environment would be brought to naught.

46. The Ecuadorian Government, whose spirit of co-operation was well known, had been anxious to support the work of the Scientific Committee by becoming a sponsor of draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.2. It was, moreover, resolved not to relax its vigilance with regard to any new nuclear tests.

47. Mr. CANALES (Chile) paid a tribute to the work of the Scientific Committee, which should be continued, because it made it possible to arrive at a broader knowledge and a more extensive understanding of the risks of atomic radiation for mankind. It was therefore very important that the Scientific Committee and the United Nations Environment Programme should collaborate closely.

48. Like the other States members of the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific, his country attached primary importance to halting all nuclear testing. The conduct of such tests by certain Powers, which constituted a violation of the most elementary norms of justice because of their injurious consequences for the marine environment of other States, could not be tolerated.

49. His delegation reaffirmed the position of the States members of the Permanent Commission set forth in document A/39/343, wherein they protested categorically against the nuclear tests carried out in the South Pacific because they constituted a serious threat to the marine environment and its natural resources.

50. Chile took the present opportunity to urge the international community, in particular, the nuclear States, to devote their efforts to promoting economic and social development in order to establish greater justice and preserve the peace.

51. Mr. FARMER (Australia), addressing the French delegation in exercise of his right of reply, said that he would confine himself to reiterating the views of the Heads of State and Government of the South Pacific Forum, which the representative of Fiji had set forth in his statement. As had been stressed by the members of the scientific mission which had visited the atoll, uncertainty remained as to the

/...

(Mr. Farmer, Australia)

long-term consequences of nuclear explosions for the environment. The missions' conclusions were thus unlikely to reduce in any way the opposition of the countries of the region to the continuation of France's nuclear testing.

52. With regard to the French delegation's argument that it was in the First Committee that New Zealand and Australia should raise the question of the cessation of nuclear testing, it should be recalled that item 70 - currently before the Special Committee - dealt precisely with what concerned these countries, namely, the effects of atomic radiation on the environment. It was ironical that France should reproach them for expressing their concern in a forum that was inappropriate, when, for decades, the countries of the region had been telling France that it was the site which it had chosen for its nuclear testing that was inappropriate.

53. Since July 1966, 104 tests had taken place, 63 of them under ground, and it had been only since June 1975, following the proceedings instituted by Australia against France before the International Court of Justice, that all the nuclear tests - eight a year on average - had been carried out under ground. During that current year, four explosions had been registered so far, the most recent dating from June. The Australian Government would continue to oppose categorically the continuation of such testing, as it had recently stated at the meeting of the South Pacific Forum. The opposition of Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru was equally categorical.

54. Australia was determined to spare no effort to ensure the conclusion in the near future of a treaty placing a total ban on nuclear testing and to have the South Pacific declared a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Its desire to see France put an end to its nuclear testing was heightened by the fact that it maintained excellent relations with that country in all other areas.

55. Mr. RAPIN (France) said that he merely wished to recall that the report under consideration was that of the Scientific Committee, as its name indicated. There were, therefore, no grounds for mentioning, in the context of consideration of agenda item 70, the nuclear tests carried out by France; it was sufficient to confine the discussion to their consequences at the level of the effects of atomic radiation. His delegation had said in its statement at the current meeting that, with regard to the effects of atomic radiation, the report issued by the scientific mission composed of scientists from Australia, New Zealand and Papua New Guinea had made it quite clear that the level of radiation on Mururoa and in that part of the Pacific was lower than the level found in the other parts of the world and that it was, therefore, below the level meriting mention in a study on the effects of atomic radiation on health.

56. Condemnation of or opposition to nuclear testing in the Pacific constituted a political stand that would be more in place in other organs of the General Assembly, namely in the First Committee, which every year devoted a debate to the problem of the cessation of all experimental explosions of nuclear weapons.

/...

57. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take a decision on draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.2, whose sponsors had been joined by the Netherlands, Nigeria, Peru and the United Kingdom.

58. Draft resolution A/SPC/39/L.2 was adopted without a vote.

59. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had concluded its consideration of agenda item 70.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.