

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records

## SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 266th MEETING

Friday, 20 October 1961,  
at 3.20 p.m.



NEW YORK

### CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 24:</i>	
<i>Report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (concluded) . . . . .</i>	29

**Chairman:** Mr. Yordan TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria).

*In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Sanz Briz (Spain), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

### AGENDA ITEM 24

#### Report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (A/4881 and Corr.1, A/SPC/L.68/Rev.1, L.69 and Add.1, L.70) (concluded)

1. Mr. KIZIA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted the useful research work carried out by the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, in the success of which all mankind was greatly interested.

2. His delegation suggested that the Committee should adopt the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/SPC/L.68/Rev.1). It could not support the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.69 and Add.1). Firstly, the Committee was considering the report of a committee on the effects of atomic radiation and not on its causes. Many speakers had spoken of nuclear tests as the cause of radiation, but that matter came within the purview of the First Committee, and not of the Special Political Committee. Secondly, the purely formal report before the Committee did not go into the substance of the question which the Scientific Committee was to answer, namely, the possible effects of atomic radiation, particularly on man. The answer to that question might be given in the Scientific Committee's comprehensive report, to be submitted in 1962. The representative of New Zealand had rightly drawn attention (263rd meeting) to the lack of knowledge of the consequences of atomic radiation; it was that gap which the Scientific Committee was supposed to fill. Nevertheless, the first preambular paragraph of the joint draft resolution appeared to anticipate the technical conclusions of the Scientific Committee; that was hardly the task of men who were diplomats and not scientists. To express opinions on the extent to which an increase in radiation threatened the world population was the prerogative of scientists, who based their conclusions solely on scientific research.

3. His delegation supported the view, stated by several speakers, including the representative of Liberia (263rd meeting), that the Committee should regard the report as a purely technical document. Thus his delegation considered operative paragraph 1 of part I of the draft resolution out of place. The Canadian representative had stated in support of that paragraph that the Committee should express its

anxiety at the threat of increasing levels of radiation (262nd meeting). His delegation shared that anxiety. But if it was to be given meaning, it should be expressed not in a resolution on the activities of a group of scientists working under United Nations auspices, but in the First Committee of the General Assembly. There it would become a force in promoting general and complete disarmament, the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction and the cessation of nuclear testing. Yet, although the Canadian representative had asserted that his Government had always been concerned about the harmful effects of atomic radiation, there had been no sign of that concern when one of its allies had conducted test explosions in the centre of a densely populated continent.

4. His delegation agreed with the Indian (263rd meeting) and United Kingdom (264th meeting) representatives that the Committee should not unduly hurry the Scientific Committee. Yet operative paragraph 6 of part I of the joint draft resolution specifically requested the Scientific Committee to accelerate its second comprehensive report. Scientists working in a subject so new and so complex could not be asked to present definitive results overnight. Hurriedly prepared scientific conclusions might well prove incorrect.

5. With regard to part II of the joint text, his delegation fully shared the misgivings expressed by the Indian representative. If the plan envisaged in part II were put into effect, there would be duplication of effort between the Scientific Committee and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), and further, WMO would be given functions which it was not called upon to discharge under its Convention and which would entail financial implications both for that organization and for its member countries. The report of the Scientific Committee (A/4881 and Corr.1) showed that there was already extensive co-operation between the Scientific Committee and specialized agencies, including the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). If the Scientific Committee required the data referred to in part II of the joint draft resolution, it could either apply to the agencies on its own initiative or raise the matter in its report to the General Assembly. But since there was no such indication in the report, there seemed to be no need to impose a plan the value of which the Scientific Committee had not yet recognized.

6. Some speakers had expressed the view that the Czechoslovak draft resolution was too reassuring and had pointed to paragraph 12 of the Scientific Committee's report. But under the Czechoslovak draft resolution, the General Assembly "Takes note of the annual report of the Scientific Committee", in other words, the draft resolution took account of all opinions expressed in the report and left it open to the scientists themselves to find the best methods of intensifying the necessary studies. His delegation considered that solution the most reasonable.

7. In view of what he had said his delegation would support the draft resolution submitted by Czechoslovakia; it would not, furthermore, oppose the amendments proposed by India (A/SPC/L.70). It could not support the joint draft resolution since it contained a number of provisions which were dictated not by a desire to contribute to the successful work of the Scientific Committee but rather to use the present discussion for political purposes.

*Mr. Tchobanov (Bulgaria) took the Chair.*

8. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan) considered that there would be no need to discuss the progress report before the Committee, were it not for the wide-spread anxiety aroused by the resumption of nuclear tests. In view of the potential dangers, his delegation felt bound to show its concern and appeal for the immediate cessation of all tests as the only possible means of salvation. The report itself was a manifestation of genuine international scientific co-operation and gave evidence of the assistance given by the specialized agencies to the Scientific Committee and to various countries like his own.

9. The two draft resolutions before the Committee were not contradictory. His delegation would vote for both of them if they were put to the vote in the form submitted.

10. Mr. JHA (India) introduced his delegation's amendment (A/SPC/L.70), and said that he found no substantial indication of contradiction between the Czechoslovak draft resolution (A/SPC/L.68/Rev.1) and the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.69 and Add.1). Although he felt that certain parts of the joint draft were not well advised, he was largely in agreement with it and would vote accordingly. His delegation had not seen fit to suggest any particular changes in that draft, partly because of its very large sponsorship. His delegation had no objection of substance to the Czechoslovak text, but thought that it would be improved by certain additions contained in the proposed amendment. He wished to make it quite clear that the amendment was not submitted in a spirit of hostility to any resolution.

11. Mr. PUDLAK (Czechoslovakia) noted that although several representatives had expressed opposition to the Czechoslovak draft resolution none had seemed able to make a single concrete criticism. Only the Danish representative had remarked (263rd meeting) that he did not like the expression "with satisfaction" in the third paragraph because "satisfaction" did not seem to be in keeping with the present situation. The remark was quite out of place, however, because "satisfaction" did not refer to the current situation but, quite obviously, to the work of the Scientific Committee. Indeed, if that was the only word which embarrassed the Danish representative the Czechoslovak delegation would be prepared to delete it.

12. The real issue, however, was that a certain group of representatives was interested in obtaining the passage of an alarmist resolution the political nature of which was visible despite all attempts to cover it over with technical terminology. The Chilean representative (263rd meeting) had all but accused the Czechoslovak delegation of trying to mislead the world community—simply because it had put forward a draft resolution which reacted calmly and objectively to the report of the Scientific Committee. The General Assembly had adopted many resolutions

similar to the one now submitted by his delegation. It was interesting that in earlier years, when atomic tests were being carried out by the United States, the United Kingdom and France, nobody had described those resolutions as complacent or as a deception of public opinion.

13. When, in 1957, the First Committee had, on the initiative of the Czechoslovak delegation, considered the question of the effects of atomic radiation, the United States representative had opposed any reference to atomic testing in the debate, arguing that testing related to the broader question of disarmament. The United States representative had also attempted to justify testing as a necessary defence measure and had even stated that atomic tests were only a minor source of ionizing radiation.<sup>1/</sup> If it was to avoid applying a double standard, the Committee must beware of a one-sided approach to the question. The Committee was, after all, a United Nations organ, and not a propaganda organ for any one country or group of countries. If it adopted complacent resolutions when the Western Powers conducted tests and alarmist, political resolutions when tests were carried out by the Soviet Union, it would find itself in the ridiculous position of those irresponsible journalists who called United States bombs "clean" and Soviet bombs "dirty", and United States tests "useful" and Soviet tests "harmful".

14. The sponsors of the joint draft resolution should also bear in mind that it would be awkward if the countries that expressed their apprehensions were at some future date to revert to the United States thesis that atomic testing was only a secondary source of radiation. As a United Nations body, the Committee should not be alarmist but should, as in the Czechoslovak draft resolution, express confidence in the Scientific Committee, which had been established for the purpose of making an objective scientific analysis of such questions.

15. His delegation thanked those representatives who had supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution. It would be most desirable, of course, for the draft to be adopted unanimously and so his delegation was prepared to accept the amendment of the Indian delegation (A/SPC/L.70), an amendment which should meet the views of delegations that wished to express the need for intensifying studies of the effects of radiation.

16. Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) said that his delegation was greatly encouraged by the nearly general support that had been given to the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.69 and Add.1). That support, which proved that the feeling of concern reflected in the draft was an unquestionable reality, had been so widely forthcoming, he believed, because the text had been sponsored by twenty-five countries representing all continents and all geographical regions. That was a guarantee that the draft resolution had been put forward with the greatest objectivity and sincerity.

17. He had been disappointed, however, that certain delegations should have decided to attack the draft resolution and to argue that it was a political document motivated by cold-war considerations. If the assurances of his delegation on that score were insufficient, he would draw attention to the composition of the group of sponsoring countries and to the state-

<sup>1/</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twelfth Session, First Committee, 894th meeting.*

ments made by a large number of delegations, including the delegations of Malaya, Ghana, Mali, Liberia and the United Arab Republic. He believed that if the critics of the draft resolution were to consider the facts objectively, it might well be possible to adopt the text unanimously.

18. The primary aim of the joint draft was to express the anxiety which people felt about the hazards of atomic radiation which were as yet little known. The draft recommended that the work of the Scientific Committee should be intensified and invited WMO to undertake a task the humanitarian purpose of which was to protect the men, women and children whom delegates represented. He sincerely urged delegations to associate themselves with the warning the sponsors had given concerning the hazards of atomic radiation.

19. It was in that spirit that the sponsors had studied the suggestions put forward by representatives, particularly those of Lebanon and Cyprus (265th meeting), and they had come to the conclusion that, in the final count and in order not to prolong unduly the debate on the item, it would be better to preserve the original text.

20. His delegation formally requested on behalf of all the sponsors of the joint draft resolution that that text should be given priority in the voting.

21. Mr. COLLET (Guinea) noted that the progress report of the Scientific Committee demonstrated the anxiety felt by the peoples at the effects of radioactive fall-out due to nuclear tests. As stated in paragraph 14 of the report, a second comprehensive report was to be submitted to the General Assembly in 1962; at that time the Committee would be able to take a valid stand on the substance of the issue. His delegation was nevertheless convinced of the duty of all States to make the necessary efforts to avert the danger which atmospheric contamination held for both present and future generations. The people and Government of Guinée condemned nuclear tests wherever they might be held.

22. The Guinean delegation wished to commend the Scientific Committee for its unceasing and effective work. Its task became more complicated and more urgent with the resumption of atomic testing, and that was the reason for the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.69 and Add.1). That text, though it went beyond the framework of the Scientific Committee's report, expressed the anxieties to which the resumption of testing had given rise. Furthermore, it provided for the assistance of WMO in the dissemination of relevant information. If those provisions, contained in part II of the draft resolution, were not prejudicial to the work of the Scientific Committee and to the normal activities of international meteorology, his delegation would vote in favour of them. Otherwise, it would abstain on that part of the draft resolution.

23. Draft resolution A/SPC/L.68/Rev.1, which came strictly within the item under consideration by the Committee, expressed as in previous years the General Assembly's endorsement of the Scientific Committee's work. It had his delegation's full approval since it complemented the first resolution without introducing any elements which might provoke futile polemics. The Indian amendment accepted by the Czechoslovak delegation rendered the draft resolution more expressive, and his delegation would support the text as amended.

24. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the Czechoslovak draft resolution as amended, since it met the requirements of the situation.

25. It might have been expected that the current year's progress report would be treated in the same way as the previous year's progress report. They were both interim in character and had a good deal in common. During the fifteenth session, the Committee had unanimously adopted a draft resolution later adopted by the General Assembly as its resolution (1574 (XV)) which closely resembled the Czechoslovak draft resolution currently under consideration. In his view, no convincing arguments had been put forward for a draft resolution which went beyond the resolutions the General Assembly normally adopted with regard to progress reports of the Scientific Committee. It had been said that the renewal of nuclear tests in the atmosphere had created a new situation, but it might be recalled that despite the fact that early in 1960 France had conducted nuclear explosions in the Algerian Sahara, the resolution adopted at the fifteenth session had not in the slightest degree reflected the concern felt about those tests by many Members of the United Nations. Moreover, the resolutions adopted while explosions were going on before 1958 had not reflected the degree of anxiety manifested in the joint draft resolution. The inescapable conclusion was that considerations not directly connected with the scientific character of the report before the Committee had been introduced into the present debate. The injection of such considerations was both unwarranted in the context of the present discussion and moreover duplicated a debate going on in the First Committee of the General Assembly.

26. For that reason, and while fully sharing the concern felt by people everywhere over the dangers of radio-active fall-out, his delegation would be unable to support the joint draft resolution. Nor could it support the motion introduced by the Canadian representative to give priority to that draft resolution in the voting. As some speakers had said, there was actually no contradiction between the two draft resolutions. The adoption of the Czechoslovak draft would in no way affect the joint draft, since the two were not mutually exclusive. He therefore saw no justification whatsoever in requesting priority for the joint draft resolution.

27. Mr. ISSAKA (Togo) said that mankind was most concerned about the effects of fall-out caused by nuclear tests, and was horrified by the prospect of nuclear war. Atomic radiation caused cancer, leukaemia and other fatal diseases, and threatened present and future generations. The study of atomic radiation must be intensified, and national and international organizations concerned with radiation must co-operate closely. His delegation congratulated the Scientific Committee on its work, and would support the draft resolution.

28. Mr. DJIKIC (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation thought the Scientific Committee had done useful work, which should be continued in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly. His delegation would therefore vote for the Czechoslovak revised draft resolution as amended by India.

29. The constant increase in radiation and its inherent dangers were undeniable; the joint draft resolution submitted by Canada and twenty-four co-sponsors was a commendable initiative to broaden

co-operation and his delegation would also vote for it. He added that the Scientific Committee could only discharge its task properly if it bore in mind the mandate given to it at its foundation, and avoided matters outside its competence.

30. Mr. KANE (Senegal) recalled that his country had condemned all nuclear tests, in the atmosphere, underground or elsewhere, whether carried out by France, the Soviet Union or the United States. It would continue to do so until such tests were ended by international agreement.

31. The resumption of nuclear testing had made it particularly necessary to intensify the study of radiation through international co-operation and exchange of experience. His delegation therefore found the joint draft resolution most comprehensive and most suitable. In particular, his country welcomed the invitation contained in that draft to take advantage of laboratory facilities offered for the analysis of radioactive samples, which would be carried out in the laboratories of Dakar University for the benefit of African and other countries. The arrangements for international co-operation in the measurement of atmospheric radio-activity provided for in the draft resolution would also be most useful to his country.

32. U ON SEIN (Burma) said that his Government had consistently opposed all test explosions of nuclear weapons; they should be ended and never resorted to again. The United Nations had a responsibility to keep mankind informed of the dangers resulting from radiation, and his delegation congratulated the Scientific Committee on its useful work. Since both draft resolutions before the Committee, the Czechoslovak draft, as amended by India, and the joint draft expressed the anxiety felt by Members of the United Nations about the increasing threat to mankind, his delegation would vote for both.

33. Mr. GOMEZ ROBLEDO (Mexico) said that his delegation would vote in favour of the motion that priority should be given to the joint draft resolution, not because it was against the Czechoslovak draft, as amended by India, but because the joint draft resolution seemed to have more substance; one example was the task entrusted to WMO, Mexico, as a member of the Scientific Committee, was most concerned that there should be a wide exchange of information, unconnected with politics and the cold war, about a grave danger to human health and welfare.

34. Mr. BENABUD (Morocco) said that part II of the joint draft resolution was mainly technical; since it suggested that action should be taken by WMO some delegations had expressed strong reservations. His delegation thought that operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of part I of the draft resolution could, to a large extent, take the place of operative paragraph 1 of part II, and that the Scientific Committee and WMO should be allowed to decide upon the method and co-ordination of their work, particularly since operative paragraph 2 of part II contained the words "if found feasible".

35. Part II of the draft resolution did not mention the Scientific Committee. Since that Committee was required to carry out studies of the highest importance, it should be given all aid and encouragement. His delegation had intended to propose a new paragraph to replace operative paragraph 1 of part II, but, since the Indian amendment had largely met its

views, he proposed simply that that paragraph should be amended to read:

"1. Invites the World Meteorological Organization, in consultation with the International Atomic Energy Agency as necessary, and through the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, to examine ..."

36. Mr. MAKKAWI (Lebanon) recalled that his delegation had suggested (265th meeting) certain changes in the joint draft resolution. In view of the statement just made by the representative of Canada, it would not press its suggestion, and would vote both for the joint draft resolution and for the Czechoslovak draft resolution as amended by India.

37. Mr. HAILEMARIAM (Ethiopia) said that the Ethiopian people was profoundly disturbed by the present resumption of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union and the United States; it entertained still greater fears because of the fact that France had always felt free to continue its tests. He congratulated the United Kingdom Government on not resuming nuclear testing. He understood that it still felt bound by the moratorium, and hoped it would continue to demonstrate the ability of a great Power to exercise self-restraint.

38. His delegation would have preferred a shorter draft resolution than the joint draft that referred simply to the relevant scientific questions and to the concern expressed by the Scientific Committee in paragraph 12 of its report. That draft however, was mild and innocuous and his delegation would vote for it. He did not consider the Czechoslovak draft objectionable and considered that it had been improved by the Indian amendment; he regretted, however, that it did not mention paragraph 12 of the report, which was not directed against any particular Power, but which expressed a general view. His delegation would be able to support the draft as amended by India if it were to include another preambular paragraph to read:

"Noting that the Scientific Committee, in paragraph 12 of its report (A/4881 and Corr.1) of 21 September 1961, recognizes that the resumption of nuclear test explosions since the publication of its last comprehensive report increases the urgency for intensification of relevant scientific studies."

39. If that paragraph were not included, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

40. Mr. MIDIBURO (Congo, Leopoldville) said that his delegation had always condemned nuclear tests everywhere. His delegation would vote in favour of both draft resolutions, since their sponsors were equally concerned to save present and future generations from the harmful effects of atomic radiation. He regretted that it had not been possible to combine the two drafts.

41. Mr. HEDAYATI (Iran) said that several delegations had pointed out that the two draft resolutions did not contradict one another. However, as the Indian representative had said in introducing his amendment (A/SPC/L.70), the Czechoslovak draft was imperfect and incomplete, and the Czechoslovak representative had admitted that implicitly by accepting the amendment. He preferred the more complete joint draft resolution, the first preambular paragraph of which, for example, referred to an increase in fall-out

levels caused by the renewed discharge of radioactive debris. If that was true, it should be mentioned in the Committee's draft resolution. The sponsors of that draft resolution had also gone into several points in detail, because of their desire for a clear text. His delegation would vote for that draft, and for the Canadian motion to give it priority.

42. Mr. N'THEPE (Cameroun) said that both draft resolutions before the Committee expressed alarm about the effects of atomic radiation. However, since the Committee must support and assist the Scientific Committee and must provide that the studies of the Scientific Committee should be made known to all Governments, the vote on the joint draft resolution should not be delayed, and he supported the Canadian proposal to give it priority.

43. Mr. HASAN (Pakistan) said that his delegation, as one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, would naturally vote in its favour but could not vote in favour of the Czechoslovak draft resolution, which was inadequate. If the joint draft resolution were adopted, the Czechoslovak draft would be unnecessary. He therefore supported the Canadian proposal that priority should be given to the joint draft resolution.

44. Mr. KIKHIA (Libya) said that Libya had always opposed nuclear testing. It had condemned French tests in the Sahara, as well as the recent resumption of testing by the Soviet Union. The General Assembly should express its alarm about the increase of radiation resulting from recent tests and his delegation would vote in favour of the joint draft resolution, as well as the Czechoslovak draft resolution, to which it had no objection.

45. Mr. ASTAPENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation saw no reason why the joint draft resolution should be given priority, as the Canadian representative had proposed. He agreed with the Iraqi representative that that draft and the Czechoslovak draft were in no way contradictory, and that it would be illogical for the Committee to depart from its usual procedure, which was to vote on draft resolutions in the order in which they had been submitted.

46. Mr. JHA (India) said that there was a lingering doubt in the minds of many delegations that the joint draft resolution, being of a controversial nature, might affect the work of the Scientific Committee, which was a non-controversial and purely scientific body. He regretted the Canadian proposal that the joint draft resolution should be given priority over the Czechoslovak draft resolution which, by right, deserved priority. The adoption of the joint draft resolution should not leave a trail of bitterness and controversy, which might be carried over into future debates, and into other Committees. Each draft resolution represented one possible point of view, and did not contradict the other. There was no reason to muzzle the opinion expressed in the Czechoslovak draft, and he appealed to the Canadian representative to withdraw his motion for priority. If necessary he would vote against that motion.

47. Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) said that he had made a formal motion of priority which had been seconded by a number of delegations. He could not therefore withdraw it. There was no question of muzzling opinion, since any delegation could make a statement when a vote was taken on the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

48. Mr. COLLET (Guinea) supported the amendment proposed by the Moroccan representative.

49. Mr. PUDLAK (Czechoslovakia) said that the Czechoslovak draft resolution had been submitted before the joint draft resolution and according to rule 93 of the rules of procedure should be voted on first. He deplored the attempt to discriminate against Czechoslovakia, which had always been active on behalf of the Scientific Committee, of which it was a member. The Czechoslovak delegation had demonstrated a spirit of compromise and co-operation in accepting the Indian amendments to its draft resolution. He appealed to the Canadian delegation to be equally co-operative and not to press its proposal for priority.

50. Mr. MIDIBURO (Congo, Leopoldville) said that his delegation did not find the two draft resolutions mutually exclusive and would vote in favour of both of them. He therefore opposed the proposal to give the joint draft resolution priority.

51. Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) said that after consultation, the co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution felt that they could accept the Moroccan proposal, if it was amended slightly. The co-sponsors therefore proposed to meet the Moroccan viewpoint by inserting the words "and the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation" after the words "in consultation with the IAEA" in the first line of operative paragraph 1 of part II.

52. Mr. BENABUD (Morocco) said that the proposed wording largely removed his delegation's original objection and he would therefore accept it.

53. Mr. PERERA (Ceylon) said that, after the question of priority was settled, when the joint draft resolution was voted on, his delegation would like a separate vote on operative paragraph 1 of part I.

54. Mr. JHA (India) said that his delegation would ask for a separate vote on the word "certain" in operative paragraph 5 of part I of the joint draft resolution, and a separate vote on part II.

55. Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) said that, after consultation, the co-sponsors of the joint draft resolution had agreed to omit the word "certain" from operative paragraph 5 of part I.

56. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on the proposal to put the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.69 and Add.1) to the vote first.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Republic of South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina.

*Against:* Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia.

slovakia, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania.

Abstaining: Burma, Cambodia, Chad, Ethiopia, Finland, Guinea, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

*The proposal to give priority in the voting to the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.69 and Add.1) as amended was adopted by 56 votes to 15, with 21 abstentions.*

57. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of part I of the joint draft resolution (A/SPC/L.69 and Add.1).

*The paragraph was adopted by 74 votes to 12, with 4 abstentions.*

58. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote part II of the joint draft resolution as amended.

*Part II was adopted by 76 votes to 9, with 4 abstentions.*

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the joint draft resolution, as amended, as a whole.

*At the request of the representative of the Congo (Leopoldville), a vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

In favour: Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroun, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Somalia, Republic of South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*The resolution as amended, as a whole, was adopted by 75 votes to none, with 17 abstentions.*

60. The CHAIRMAN called upon the Committee to vote on the Czechoslovak revised draft resolution (A/SPC/L.68/Rev.1), as amended by India.

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

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

In favour: Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Libya, Mali, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Leopoldville), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, New Zealand, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay, Argentina, Brazil, Cameroun, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador.

Abstaining: France, Ghana, Greece, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Republic of South Africa, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland.

*The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 33 votes to 22, with 37 abstentions.*

61. Mr. HOOD (Australia) said that he had abstained from voting on the revised Czechoslovak resolution as amended because the joint draft resolution made all the points included in it and also went further. The Australian delegation had voted in favour of the joint draft resolution in the belief that it met the desire of the great majority of the world's community at the present time. It wished to place on record, however, a reservation relating to the wording of sub-paragraph (b) of operative paragraph 1 of part II. It would have preferred the sub-paragraph to read "To ensure prompt distribution of this information" rather than "To ensure the day-to-day exchange of this information". It did so because "day-to-day" reporting of fall-out levels implied a very small time lag between sampling measurements and reporting. Such measurements would necessarily be confined to total beta-activity determination, which the Scientific Committee had in the past regarded as being of insignificant value in compiling assessments of radiation doses of biological consequence. Secondly, day-to-day levels of total beta-activity were known to fluctuate considerably with meteorological conditions, and no useful purpose would be served by the prompt exchange of such day-to-day variations. Thirdly, in order to obtain meaningful and reliable results, there must be some delay between sampling and obtaining the results of measurements and the sampling period might need to be longer than one day. Fall-out levels in the Southern hemisphere from tests carried out in the Northern hemisphere were much lower than in the latter, and longer periods of sampling were required in order to obtain reliable results. Lastly, the Australian delegation felt that such a system might have the unfortunate result of taxing national capacities to such an extent that a limitation might be imposed on other activities, such as the determination of radio-active levels in human bones and food, which were essential for the effective work of the Scientific Committee.

62. Mr. DA COSTA (Brazil) said that he had voted against the revised Czechoslovak resolution as amended, not because his delegation was opposed to its principles but because it felt that after the adoption of the joint draft resolution it was redundant.

63. Mr. ALVARADO (Venezuela) said that his delegation felt that the Czechoslovak draft resolution as amended was inadequate by itself and redundant after

the adoption of the joint draft resolution. Since it had no substantive objection to the draft resolution, however, it had abstained from voting on it.

64. Mr. ATTOLICO (Italy) said that he had abstained from voting on the revised Czechoslovak draft resolution, as amended, because his delegation felt that there was no need for a further resolution after the adoption of the joint draft resolution. The Czechoslovak draft resolution had been improved by the Indian amendments but it was still too weak. It seemed, in fact, almost deliberately innocuous in the face of the great concern that was felt all over the world over the increase in radio-active fall-out from

the series of atmospheric nuclear tests still in progress. He associated himself with the view of the representative of Pakistan and others that the Czechoslovak draft resolution was insufficient to constitute a satisfactory answer by the General Assembly to the general concern over the increase in levels of radio-active fall-out. The joint draft resolution, on the other hand, was a definite step forward in expressing the opinion deeply felt throughout the world that the increases should be halted. It reflected the general hope, which Italy shared, that nuclear tests, and in particular tests in the atmosphere, should cease.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.