5. He hoped that the sponsors of the amendments would be able to accept the sub-amendments and that the sub-amendments would receive the support of the Committee as a whole.

6. Mr. PAZHWA (Afghanistan) said that his delegation wished to exercise its right of reply in view of the fact that certain amendments had been proposed to the draft resolution of which Afghanistan was a sponsor and also because the draft resolution presented by Italy, Peru and the United Kingdom (A/C.1/L.239 and Add.1) was still before the Committee.

7. If the three-Power draft resolution was not withdrawn, Afghanistan intended to vote against it, because, while in substance it requested France to take full account of the views expressed in the debate, the draft itself did not appear to take account of those views. In the second paragraph of the preamble, for example, the draft referred only to the views of representatives of African States on the hazards of the nuclear tests, though those views had been expressed also by a great number of countries in Asia, Europe and other parts of the world. The twenty-two-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.238/Rev.1) and the Latin-American amendments (A/C.1/L.240/Rev.1) reflected the fact that that concern was not limited to the African States.

8. Furthermore, that paragraph referred only to the hazards to the health of the neighbouring peoples, whereas the Committee was aware that not only the neighbouring countries but a number of others, including European countries, had considered that they had cause for concern.

9. The fourth paragraph of the preamble of the three-Power draft recalled General Assembly resolution 1252 (XIII) and stated that the purpose of the agreement in question was the suspension of nuclear weapons tests. Afghanistan, however, had always understood the true purpose of that draft resolution to be the cessation or the discontinuance of tests. It was significant that, in their revised text, the sponsors of the amendments had taken that factor into consideration. The same objection applied to operative paragraph 1 of the three-Power draft. What was more disconcerting, however, was that in the same paragraph the sponsors, which included a nuclear Power, referred to the negotiations in progress in terms that were not sufficiently decisive.

10. As for operative paragraph 2 of the three-Power draft, it was not clear what was meant by taking "full account of the views expressed in this debate". It would seem, from France's keen participation in the debate and its analysis of opposing arguments that it had already taken account of the views expressed. Moreover, the purpose of taking account of those views was not elucidated. The phrase might be interpreted as implying that France had not taken account of the debate in which it had been participating, but since France had expressed disagreement with views voiced
in the Committee, it was hard to believe that it had not taken them into account.

11. For all those reasons, the delegation of Afghanistan hoped that the three-Power draft resolution would be withdrawn.

12. As for the five-Power amendments (A/C.1/L.240/Rev.1), while Afghanistan appreciated their submission as an attempt at making a constructive contribution to the Committee's work, it could not agree with all the provisions they contained.

13. In the first paragraph of the first amendment reference was made to the dangers and risks which such tests "might entail". The word "might" surely did not reflect the views of the majority of the Committee, which felt that dangers and risks were in fact entailed in such tests.

14. On the subject of those amendments, the representative of Argentina had rightly stated that the dignity of France as a sovereign State should be considered. However, the twenty-two-Power draft resolution was intended only as a friendly appeal, which could surely not impair France's dignity as a sovereign State.

15. With regard to the second amendment, the General Assembly should request France to reconsider its decision, not express the hope that it would do so, and in making that request, the purpose of the request should be clearly stated, namely that France should refrain from carrying out such a test.

16. He had already expressed his opinion on the concluding phrase of the operative paragraph of the amendments when dealing with the three-Power draft resolution. He noted that the representative of El Salvador, who was a sponsor of the amendments, had considered that the corresponding phrase in the three-Power draft was unsatisfactory. In view of those considerations, Afghanistan would vote for the sub-amendments submitted by Ghana and Indonesia.

17. Mr. PACABACHI (Iraq) said that his delegation had co-sponsored the twenty-two-Power draft resolution because of its concern over the safety of the African peoples and because it feared the possible effects that the proposed tests might have on the coming disarmament negotiations. Iraq had pointed out (1049th meeting) that the United Nations could not pass over in silence the emergence of a new nuclear Power without falling in its responsibilities and undermining its authority.

18. The statement made by the President of France, General de Gaulle, on 30 November 1959 had confirmed Iraq's fears and it was now imperative for the Assembly to take an unequivocal stand on the proposed tests. The twenty-two-Power draft resolution, of which Iraq was a sponsor, was based on the unquestionable competence of the Assembly to consider such matters and expressed the universally-held fears concerning the tests.

19. The five sponsors of the amendments had made an admirable effort to bring together differing views on the question, but the amendments did not fully recognize the gravity of the situation. If France were left to reconsider its decision, it would be tantamount to recognizing the French Government's right to conduct tests, thereby leaving a matter with serious international implications to the discretion of one Member State. Moreover, in the light of General de Gaulle's declared intention to conduct the tests notwithstanding the wishes of the Assembly, the request that France should reconsider its decision served no purpose.

20. Iraq would therefore support the sub-amendments submitted by Ghana and Indonesia. Under those sub-amendments, the General Assembly would take a firm stand in accordance with its responsibilities.

21. The three-Power draft resolution was totally unacceptable to the delegation of Iraq because, in effect, it accepted France's decision to conduct tests. The hope expressed in operative paragraph 1 was meaningless because if the negotiations at Geneva resulted in an arrangement, not only France, but all States would be able to associate themselves with it. Iraq would therefore vote against that draft. It would also vote against the five-Power amendments as they stood, but would support the sub-amendments.

22. Mr. BHADRAVADI (Thailand) said that the fact that his delegation had abstained from participating in the general debate on the item did not imply a lack of concern over the risks which nuclear weapons tests would entail by the dissemination of radioactive fallout. On the contrary, Thailand wished nothing better than to see an early settlement of the problem.

23. However it had always maintained that any prohibition of nuclear tests should not be confined to a particular region, but should extend to all parts of the world. A universal prohibition would be of interest to all States throughout the world, not only for psychological reasons, but also in order to eliminate the fear of the consequences of radiation. Moreover, a universal prohibition of tests would further facilitate the work of the ten-Power disarmament committee.

24. Although the cessation of tests did not solve the problem of disarmament, it constituted an important step towards the complete prohibition of weapons of mass destruction. It would also serve to halt the arms race and every effort should therefore be made in that direction.

25. The delegation of Thailand felt that the three-Power draft resolution constituted the best contribution towards achieving that goal and would accordingly vote for it. It would, however, abstain in the vote on the twenty-two-Power draft resolution and on the amendments and sub-amendments to it.

26. Mr. ORTIZ MARTIN (Costa Rica) said that Costa Rica, being a small and economically under-developed country, had constantly striven to achieve disarmament and had set an example by abolishing the army under its Constitution. In fact, it had just sold its remaining armaments to a United States company in return for agricultural machinery.

27. Costa Rica had frequently spoken in favour of the definitive cessation of atomic tests by all Powers without exception and could not depart from that position.

28. However, his delegation was not satisfied with the wording of the twenty-two-Power draft resolution or the sub-amendments, and it would therefore abstain from voting on them. On the other hand, it would vote for the amendments submitted by the five Latin-American countries.

29. Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia) said that the basic issue at stake in the matter under discussion was the grave concern felt throughout the world over the pro-
jected French nuclear tests. The twenty-two-Power draft resolution, which voiced that concern, had been sponsored by fourteen Asian, as well as eight African, States.

30. It was to be noted that the boundaries of the French Sahara region had been fixed for purposes of administrative convenience at a time when France had also controlled the adjoining countries. The frontiers that had been drawn for administrative convenience did not necessarily correspond with the actual frontiers of the adjoining countries. That accounted for the fact that those boundaries had been contested by Tunisia and Morocco. Moreover, it was not for France to undertake to ensure the protection of near-by sovereign States, while the well-being of the dependent peoples in the area was the responsibility of the United Nations. The twenty-two-Power draft resolution therefore called upon France to refrain from carrying out its nuclear test in order thereby to dispel existing anxiety and promote the cause of general nuclear disarmament. Such a request did not constitute discrimination against France; indeed, it would be discriminatory not to call upon France to abandon its test, since General Assembly resolution 1252 (XIII) had urged the existing nuclear Powers not to undertake further testing and had in effect been addressed to any States that might contemplate conducting tests in the future.

31. The three-Power draft resolution, in referring to the "views expressed by representatives of African States" over the health hazards that would be created by the projected French test, overlooked the Asian sponsorship of the twenty-two-Power draft resolution and the fact that Italy also had sought reaassurances from the French Government on the possible effects of the test. There was no need to express in the former draft resolution the hope that the French Government would associate itself with any future agreement on the suspension of nuclear weapons tests, since France had repeatedly made known its intention to do so. The request that France should take full account of the views expressed in the First Committee's debate was not sufficient to dispel existing apprehensions, including those of a country under United Kingdom administration like Nigeria, since it did not indicate in what way France was to take account of the various views expressed. In the light of the considerations he had mentioned, his delegation would vote against the three-Power draft resolution.

32. His delegation was also unable to accept the Latin-American amendments. The expression of hope that the French Government would reconsider its decision to carry out a test no longer served any purpose, since President de Gaulle had reaffirmed two days previously his intention to proceed with the test. His delegation could not support the amendments unless they were strengthened so that France was requested to refrain from carrying out the proposed test.

33. The two-Power sub-amendments made the Latin-American amendments more acceptable and his delegation would support them.

34. Mr. ADEEL (Sudan) said that operative paragraph 1 of the three-Power draft resolution was irrelevant to the matter under discussion which was the projected French test in the Sahara and not the general suspension of nuclear tests; it also implied that France was free to proceed with its test until a general agreement was reached on nuclear testing—an implication reinforced by the United Kingdom representative's statements (104th and 104th meetings) in support of the French position. His delegation agreed with the view expressed by several representatives that operative paragraph 2 was too equivocal. It would therefore oppose the draft resolution in question if it was brought to a vote.

35. His delegation would vote for the two-Power sub-amendments but, if they were not adopted, it would vote against the Latin-American amendments.

36. Mr. NIELSEN (Norway) said that his delegation did not question the fact that all necessary safety precautions had been taken in connexion with the projected French nuclear test and that the latter would have little effect on the world-wide level of radiation. However, it felt obliged to take into consideration the concern felt in the States adjoining the test area; it also considered that every effort should be made to contribute to the success of the present negotiations on the discontinuance of nuclear tests, since a general resumption of testing would increase radiation hazards and undermine international security. Therefore, while deploiring certain unwarranted utterances made about France during the debate in the Committee, his delegation supported the Latin-American amendments to the twenty-two-Power draft resolution, it would also vote for the three-Power draft resolution, which pointed the way to future action on the cessation of tests.

37. Mr. GUTIERREZ (Chile) said that, while his delegation was certain that France would not carry out a nuclear test that might endanger neighbouring countries, it was essential to maintain the present improved international atmosphere in which the three existing nuclear Powers had refrained from carrying out tests during the past year. His delegation therefore supported the Latin-American amendments, which, while they recognized France's right to test weapons and did not challenge the latter's sovereignty over the area in which the proposed test was to take place, nevertheless expressed the hope that the French Government would reconsider its decision to carry out the test.

38. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) said that he would vote for the twenty-two-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/ L.238/Rev.1). He could not support the three-Power draft (A/C.1/L.239 and Add.1) because it did not request France to refrain from carrying out its atomic test or to reconsider its decision to do so. He would have been prepared to accept it if it had extended an invitation to France, not only to adhere to any agreement reached at Geneva for the cessation of tests, but to participate in negotiations towards that end or, without consultation, to affix its signature to any agreement reached by the three nuclear Powers. The Liberian delegation continued to believe that the proposed French tests would create hazards to the health of the neighbouring people, as confirmed by eminent scientists. It had not been reassured by the French representative's arguments to the contrary.

39. The amendments proposed by the five Latin-American States (A/C.1/L.240/Rev.1) were in fact a substitute for the twenty-two-Power proposal. Liberia was prepared to vote for the first three paragraphs of the preamble, but could not agree that the references to the anxieties caused by the proposed French test
and to the dangers it created for the people of Africa contained in the twenty-two-Power draft should be eliminated. Moreover, in the light of the recent statement by President de Gaulle, it was not enough to express the hope, as the Latin-American States had done, that France would reconsider its decision. Until the General Assembly was prepared to support what was right and just and not what was opportune, all hopes for agreement on disarmament would remain unfulfilled. In view of the overwhelming public clamour that tests should be abandoned and in view of previous resolutions of the United Nations, the General Assembly would be betraying the confidence of the peoples of the world if it failed to express its strong determination not only to France, but to any other country that might contemplate the explosion of a nuclear bomb. In the circumstances, Liberia would support the sub-amendments submitted by Ghana and Indonesia (A/C.1/L.241). If they were rejected, it would have to vote against the Latin-American amendments.

40. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal) also regarded the operative part of the Latin-American amendments as inadequate. The statement of President de Gaulle had confirmed France's determination to carry out its decision to explode a bomb in the Sahara; the Latin-American text was not clearly aimed at restraining France from its purpose. He hoped that the Latin-American States would support the twenty-two-Power draft resolution as modified by the sub-amendments of Ghana and Indonesia. Those sub-amendments represented the maximum concession which could be made to reconcile the position of the twenty-two Powers with that of the Latin-American sponsors.

41. Mr. ORTONA (Italy) said that his delegation had co-sponsored the three-Power draft resolution because it believed that it indicated the proper course to be taken by the Assembly. The draft resolution submitted by the twenty-two Asian and African States brought up considerations which should be dealt with in a different context. Italy therefore could not support it and would vote against it. The Latin-American amendments also contained elements at variance with the findings of reliable scientists regarding the technical and scientific consequences of the proposed French tests, and Italy would be unable to vote for them.

42. In that connexion, he announced that the meetings between Italian and French experts which Italy had requested had been concluded and that the information gathered by the Italian scientists confirmed that the proposed test involved absolutely no dangers to the population.

43. Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) said that, despite Haiti's profound admiration for France and its present Head of Government, it could not subscribe to the plan to explode an atomic bomb in the Sahara. By adopting the draft resolution on general and complete disarmament the First Committee had pledged full support to the ten-Power disarmament committee in its forthcoming meetings designed to achieve an agreement under which, as a first step, nations would be asked to renounce all nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. In order not to impair the prospects for disarmament and to indicate clearly to the three nuclear Powers what was expected of them, the Assembly should express its disapproval of the French test. Accordingly, Haiti would vote in favour of the Latin-American amendments.

44. Mr. DELGADO (Philippines) said that, in accordance with its policy in favour of disarmament, his Government would vote for any proposal or amendment which would tend to prohibit or suspend nuclear tests.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the sub-amendments submitted by Ghana and Indonesia (A/C.1/L.241) to the Latin-American amendments. A separate vote would be taken on each preambular paragraph of sub-amendment 1 except the second, third and fourth paragraphs, which would be voted on together.

46. He called for a vote on the first preambular paragraph of sub-amendment 1.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania.

Against: Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia.

Abstaining: China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Finland, Greece, Israel, Mexico, Paraguay, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Austria.

The paragraph was adopted by 45 votes to 24, with 12 abstentions.

47. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the second, third and fourth preambular paragraphs of sub-amendment 1 taken as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Federation of Malaya, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Belarus, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia.

Against: France, Honduras, Italy, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Australia, Belgium, Dominican Republic.
Abstaining: Greece, Haiti, Israel, Netherlands, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United States of America, China.

The paragraphs were adopted by 60 votes to 11, with 10 abstentions.

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fifth preambular paragraph of sub-amendment 1.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The United Arab Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.


Against: Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa.

The paragraph was adopted by 44 votes to 12, with 26 abstentions.

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the sixth preambular paragraph of sub-amendment 1.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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


Against: Chile, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Abstaining: Cambodia, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Laos, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela.

The paragraph was adopted by 36 votes to 29, with 17 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the seventh preambular paragraph of sub-amendment 1.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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


Against: Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Portugal.

Abstaining: Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela, Austria, Costa Rica, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay.

The paragraph was adopted by 40 votes to 26, with 16 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on operative paragraph 1 of sub-amendment 2.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya.

Against: France, Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador.

Abstaining: Greece, Haiti, Laos, Thailand, Turkey, Australia, Austria, China, Denmark.

The paragraph was adopted by 45 votes to 28, with 9 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on operative paragraph 2 of sub-amendment 2.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia,
Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philipines, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Yugoslavia.


Abstaining: Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Panama, Paraguay, Turkey.

The draft resolution was rejected by 38 votes to 24, with 20 abstentions.

56. Mr. PLMSOLL (Australia) said that his delegation had been unable to support the twenty-two-power draft resolution, as amended, because it had not agreed with the assumption that nuclear tests must inevitably have harmful effects on human health, since it was known that it was in fact possible, provided adequate precautions were taken, to avoid the spread of dangerous radio-active fallout. As to the important issue of principle relating to the emergence of new nuclear powers, which had been implicitly raised by the draft resolution, the Prime Minister of Australia, speaking in the Australian House of Representatives on 19 September 1957, and the Australian Minister of State for External Affairs, speaking in the General Assembly on 25 September 1958 (75th plenary meeting), had both said that the danger of war would be greatly increased if States other than the three which now had them should have the capacity to manufacture nuclear weapons; Australia still held that position whatever the identity of any State that might aspire to join the ranks of the nuclear powers. Although General Assembly resolution 1232 (XIII) had been addressed only to the existing nuclear powers, his delegation would not think it right that a fourth country should be free to conduct a nuclear test while the three nuclear powers were under constraint.

57. The final draft resolution had raised certain issues which went beyond the question of French nuclear tests and which might more properly be discussed in connexion with agenda item 59 (suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests). For example, the phrase "no State will initiate or resume tests of this kind" contained in the draft resolution had been so loosely worded that its meaning and intention were far from clear, and it had never been the subject of specific discussion during the debate. In the light of the various factors involved, his delegation had felt obliged to abstain in the vote. It had supported the three-power draft resolution because, in the event that France proceeded with its nuclear test, the United Nations should express the hope that France would associate itself with the arrangements that might be worked out at Geneva.

58. Mr. NAUDE (Union of South Africa) said that, while his delegation was as anxious as any other to see disarmament and the cessation of nuclear testing, those ends should be achieved by means of general agreements embodying effective control rather than by calling upon individual countries to refrain from developing
nuclear weapons. The concern expressed by the sponsors of the twenty-two-Power draft resolution and the two-Power sub-amendments should be allayed by the reassuring statements of the French, United Kingdom and United States representatives and by the fact that Belgian and Italian scientists were satisfied that the projected French test involved no danger. It was regrettable that the Soviet delegation had not given the Committee the benefit of its Government's experience and scientific knowledge on the question under discussion.

59. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria) said that his delegation would have preferred to vote for a draft resolution that took the explanations offered by the French representative more fully into account; it had therefore abstained on several paragraphs and voted against the sixth preambular paragraph of the first of the two-Power sub-amendments. However, in view of his Government's policy of opposing nuclear tests, with their attendant dangers, it had felt bound to vote for the final draft resolution.

60. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland) said that his delegation regretted that the Committee had dealt separately with the question of French nuclear tests even though the agenda contained another item relating to nuclear testing in general. In casting its vote, it had been motivated by the desire to prevent the number of nuclear Powers from increasing; no question of discrimination against France was involved.

61. Mr. RITCHIE (Canada) said that, despite the close bonds which united his country with France, his delegation had voted for the twenty-two-Power draft resolution, as amended, because of its concern over the hazards to mankind implicit in any further increase in the world-wide level of radiation.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.