



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 30:</i>	
<i>Report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (concluded)</i>	117
<i>Organization of work</i>	117

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 30

Report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (A/5216, A/5253; A/SPC/L.82/Rev.1 and Add.1-6, A/SPC/L.86, A/SPC/L.87) (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled that at the preceding meeting the Canadian representative had accepted the Brazilian amendment (A/SPC/L.87) on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/SPC/L.82/Rev.1 and Add.1-6) and had proposed that the words "according to their means" should be inserted between the words "carry out" and the words "large-scale information programmes". The Brazilian representative had accepted that addition. The representative of Belgium had suggested that the amendment, once it was incorporated into the draft resolution, should become operative paragraph 7, the former paragraph 7 thus becoming paragraph 8. The representative of Canada had also accepted that change on behalf of the sponsors of the draft. As the amendment was now part of the proposed text it would not be put to the vote. The representative of Czechoslovakia had requested that the two parts of the draft resolution should be voted on separately.

2. Mr. MENSNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) thought that the new paragraph 7 was lacking in clarity and might give rise to confusion. Nevertheless, his delegation would vote in favour of the whole of the first part of the draft resolution. It would, on the other hand, vote against the second part for the reasons which it had already explained (343rd meeting).

3. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of the provisions of rule 129 of the rules of procedure. As no member of the Committee had asked to speak on the draft resolution, the Chairman would put to the vote the first and second parts of the draft resolution A/SPC/L.82/Rev.1 and Add.1-6, as amended.

The first part of the draft resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

The second part of the draft resolution was adopted by 76 votes to 8, with 2 abstentions.

4. Mr. JABRI (Syria) asked if the words "large-scale" preceding "information programmes" in the new paragraph 7 could be deleted in order to take into account the capabilities of small countries.

5. The CHAIRMAN replied that he understood the concern of the representative of Syria but could only remind him that once the voting had begun it was too late to amend the text of a draft.

6. The CHAIRMAN put the whole of draft resolution A/SPC/L.82/Rev.1 and Add.1-6, as amended, to the vote.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia.

Draft resolution A/SPC/L.82/Rev.1 and Add.1-6 as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 79 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

Organization of work

7. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee was about to take up: Question of boundaries between Venezuela and the territory of British Guiana. He thought that it would be advisable for the Committee to decide at that stage the order of priority of the items to be taken up subsequently.

8. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America) proposed that the Committee should examine the question of Oman before that of the Report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA (A/5214), for in studying the latter it would be necessary to take into account the Report of the Conciliation Commission for Palestine, which all delegations would doubtless wish to

have at hand before the discussion began. That Report was not yet ready and could not be circulated for another week or two. He therefore proposed that the question of Oman should be discussed immediately after that of the boundaries between Venezuela and the territory of British Guiana, which would allow time for the completion and distribution of the Report.

9. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) did not share the opinion of the United States delegation. The Committee's agenda mentioned only the Report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, which was already in the hands of delegations and could be studied without further delay. The Report of the Conciliation Commission could, if it seemed appropriate, be introduced into the discussion during the debate on the Report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA. Jordan had consulted several of the delegations directly concerned with the question of the Palestine refugees and had found that they were in agreement in wanting to consider that question immediately after the question of the boundaries between Venezuela and the territory of British Guiana. They therefore hoped that the United States delegation would agree with their view and that the Committee would decide accordingly.

10. Mr. SUGAIR (Saudi Arabia), Mr. JABRI (Syria) and Mr. HASSAN (Mauritania) supported the proposal of Jordan and urged the United States delegation to agree to consider the question of the Palestine refugees before that of Oman.

11. Mr. PLIMPTON (United States of America) expressed surprise that, considering the importance which everyone attached to the question of Palestine, certain delegations should be unwilling to wait for the completion of the preliminary work which would make it possible to study that item with a full knowledge of the subject.

12. Mr. GARCIA DEL SOLAR (Argentina) thought the position of the United States was reasonable. No one denied the importance of the question of Oman, but that of the Palestine refugees was assuredly a very delicate one and should be studied carefully with the aid of all the necessary documentation. His delegation, for its part, would not be able to take a position until it had acquainted itself with all the elements of the affair. Despite the arguments of the Jordanian and several other delegations, Argentina would support the United States proposal.

13. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) said that it would be regrettable if a question of priority should give rise to dissension in the Committee and he hoped that agreement would be reached on that point. He was not, however, convinced that the expectation of a report

by the Conciliation Commission was sufficient reason for deferring the debate on the question of the Palestine refugees, as the United States delegation seemed to wish. The Report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA was available and there were excellent reasons for according priority to the question of the Palestine refugees. His delegation would therefore continue to press its proposal.

14. Mr. HARARI (Israel) stated that his delegation, which was interested primarily in the discussion of the question of the Palestine refugees, had no preference as to the order of priority decided by the Committee.

15. Mr. MAURTUA (Peru) observed that while the question of Oman was of a relatively limited scope, that of Palestine, on the other hand, was extremely complex and fraught with legal and political implications. The agenda item related expressly to the work of UNRWA, in other words, the humanitarian work of the United Nations. The Report of the Conciliation Commission, which appeared to relate only to one side of the question, could easily be introduced into the discussion during the debate.

16. The question of the Palestine refugees could accordingly be considered first.

17. The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee had two proposals before it and said that he would put them to the vote in the order in which they had been submitted, beginning with that of the United States.

18. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) said that in the interests of avoiding useless dissension in the Committee he hoped that his delegation and that of the United States could confer with each other directly and reach an understanding. He therefore proposed that a decision in the matter should be deferred until the next meeting.

19. Mr. EL SANOUSI (Sudan) endorsed the proposal of Jordan. He, too, hoped that a disagreement which might give rise to misunderstandings concerning the relative importance of the two questions could be avoided and he therefore supported the proposal to adjourn the discussion until the following meeting. He hoped that it would thus be possible to avoid a vote on the subject.

20. The CHAIRMAN, acting in accordance with the provisions of rules 119 and 120, put to the vote without discussion the proposal to adjourn the debate.

The proposal was adopted without opposition.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.