

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

FOURTEENTH SESSION
Official Records



**840th
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 20 November 1959,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Decision concerning the procedure of the meeting.</i>	577
<i>Agenda item 70:</i>	
<i>General and complete disarmament</i>	
<i>Report of the First Committee</i>	577
<i>Agenda item 68:</i>	
<i>Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara</i>	
<i>Report of the First Committee</i>	579

President: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

Decision concerning the procedure of the meeting

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First Committee.

1. The **PRESIDENT** (translated from Spanish): In view of this decision, interventions will be limited to explanations of vote on the draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee.

AGENDA ITEM 70

General and complete disarmament

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/4265)

2. Mr. FEKINI (Libya), Rapporteur of the First Committee, (translated from French): It is an honour and a pleasure for me to submit the report [A/4265] of the First Committee on item 70 of the agenda entitled, General and complete disarmament to the General Assembly.

3. The report contains a draft resolution which the First Committee recommends the General Assembly to adopt. Not only was this draft resolution adopted unanimously by the First Committee, but it was also sponsored by all the Members of the United Nations. I believe that it is the first time in the history of the United Nations that such a double demonstration of unanimity has occurred, at any rate in connexion with a question of such importance for world peace and security. It assuredly affords the most significant and convincing evidence of the constructive attitude adopted by the First Committee on this question, and of the hopeful and enthusiastic atmosphere which prevailed during its discussion.

4. I am certain I am expressing the feelings of all the members of the First Committee when I say that it was most gratifying to see such a unanimous desire and determination to do everything possible to achieve general and complete disarmament.

5. From the outset and throughout the First Committee's discussions, it was recognized that any proposal for general and complete disarmament deserved

serious and constructive study. Particular emphasis was laid on the need to allow the United Nations Organization to carry out its duties in this field, and to remain the most important guarantee of the determination of the peoples of the United Nations to preserve succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

6. It was generally recognized that the ten-nation disarmament committee was the appropriate body to make a detailed study of all the aspects of general disarmament. But it was also firmly asserted that the attention of Powers concerned should be drawn to the need to advise the United Nations Disarmament Commission of the progress of their discussions, thus stressing the continuing and ultimate responsibility of our Organization in this important field.

7. That is made absolutely clear by the preamble of the draft resolution which refers to the United Nations Disarmament Commission's resolution [DC/146] of 10 September 1959 and by the solemn affirmation that the question of general and complete disarmament is the most important one facing the world today.

8. The operative part of the draft resolution, after providing that Governments shall be called upon to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem, proposes transmitting to the United Nations Disarmament Commission and requesting the Secretary-General to make available to the ten-nation disarmament committee for thorough consideration, the declaration of the United Kingdom of 17 September 1959, the declaration of the Soviet Union of 18 September 1959 [A/4219] on general and complete disarmament outlined for us from this very rostrum by Mr. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union—and the other proposals or suggestions made, as well as the records of the plenary meetings of the General Assembly and of the meetings of the First Committee at which the question of general and complete disarmament was discussed.

9. I hope that all these documents will be carefully and thoroughly studied and that we shall in due course receive a complete report or regular reports on the work of the two bodies in question.

10. The operative part of the draft resolution also expresses the hope that measures leading towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control will be worked out in detail and agreed upon in the shortest possible time. That hope we most earnestly and sincerely trust will be fulfilled.

11. As the draft resolution points out, an effort to progress towards complete and general disarmament is an essential factor in promoting the creation of relations of trust and peaceful co-operation between States which will contribute effectively to putting an end to the armaments race, laying solid foundations

for a lasting peace and releasing the resources now used for armaments to achieve the moral and material well-being of all mankind.

12. I accordingly have the honour to submit the First Committee's draft resolution to the General Assembly for its consideration. I hope that it will have a very favourable reception and be adopted with the warmth and enthusiasm of a unanimous vote.

13. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The General Assembly is now considering a draft resolution expressing approval of general and complete disarmament and calling upon Governments to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem.

14. The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction that this draft resolution, which embodies the ideas put forward by the Soviet Union, received unanimous support in the First Committee. We are confident that the General Assembly will also approve this resolution unanimously.

15. This unanimity on so serious a question was made possible by a marked improvement in the international situation. The meeting of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, with the President of the United States, Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower, played a major part in the lessening of international tension. Now, as everyone acknowledges, the prospects for strengthening peace throughout the world have become more favourable.

16. In his report to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on 31 October, the head of the Soviet Government declared:

"In view of the present alignment of forces in the world arena and the achievements of military technology, no person who has not lost his sense of reality will propose anything but peaceful co-existence as the way to improve relations between States with different social systems."

17. The head of the Soviet Government showed convincingly that, at the present stage in the development of human society, peaceful co-existence of States is not just a topic for discussion but an objective necessity.

18. We are gratified to note that the principle of peaceful co-existence is finding more and more recognition among the statesmen of the Western Powers, who are beginning to understand the futility and the destructiveness of the cold war policy. In this connexion the speech of the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, on 16 November 1959 to the National Foreign Trade Council deserves attention. In that speech he said on the subject we are discussing:

"The paramount question facing our world today is how the great rivalry between political systems can work itself out in the course of history without exploding into thermonuclear war."

Later on, he said:

"Thus, it will take courage of a high order and strong nerves over a long time to construct a new relationship between the antagonistic systems. But that must be done if civilization is to survive." ^{1/}

^{1/} Mr. Herter's statement appeared in The New York Times of 17 November 1959.

19. These sensible words show a recognition of the necessity for seeking a peaceful settlement of controversial international questions. I wish also to stress that any concrete steps taken by States to apply the principles of peaceful co-existence will certainly receive the warmest support from the Soviet Government.

20. But there can be no peaceful co-existence without a reasonable and enduring foundation. If the arms race is in full swing, if guns and missiles are constantly at the ready and if ever greater numbers of aircraft carrying atomic and hydrogen bombs are constantly flying through the air, there can be no durable peace nor can people be assured of a tranquil life. People want to live without fear for their future or for the future of their families. They do not want to think, when they go to sleep, that that night may be their last peaceful one or that the conflagration of a new world war, with all its frightful consequences, may break out at any minute.

21. Therefore, the disarmament problem is the most important problem of our times. In Mr. Khrushchev's words:

"Now the problem of disarmament is not merely the subject of diplomatic conversations and investigations by experts; it is the most important issue of the social struggle in which the overwhelming majority of mankind is participating."

22. Consequently, it is easy to understand why the Soviet Union's new proposals [A/4219] for general and complete disarmament received such tremendous response from the broad masses of the people throughout the world, from many States and statesmen, from the most diverse political, social and religious leaders and from numerous public organizations. Every sensible person realizes that all States and persons will profit, and no one will lose, from the complete abolition of all means of waging war and the dissolution of all armed forces at firmly established dates and under strict international control. People will come to believe that the danger of aggression and armed attacks is past and they will be able to direct all their efforts and resources to peaceful ends.

23. The debate on this question in the Assembly has shown that the overwhelming majority of States represented in the United Nations recognize the importance and timeliness of the Soviet proposals; they have expressed in one form or another a positive attitude towards the idea of general and complete disarmament. This is very gratifying. And the draft resolution to be adopted today by the General Assembly will undoubtedly be an important advance towards a practical settlement of the problem.

24. But we should not be so pleased with our accomplishments as to forget that there are still influential forces that will try to hinder the carrying out of practicable measures for general and complete disarmament. As in the present circumstances they do not dare to speak openly against the proposals for general and complete disarmament, they have had and will have recourse to roundabout tactics; they will pile up the obstacles and will try to sow doubts about the possibility of achieving complete disarmament.

25. In submitting the idea of general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Union, as it has said many

times, is prepared to consider and discuss amendments and additions to its proposals, as well as other proposals for solving the disarmament problem. Touching on this question again in his speech of 31 October 1959, the head of the Soviet Government stressed that peaceful co-existence of States generally presupposes a mutual consideration of interests and mutual concessions in the interests of peace, and he said:

"Let us take the disarmament problem, for example. The Soviet Government introduced a proposal for general and complete disarmament. We believe that the execution of this proposal will guarantee peace for all peoples. However, we are prepared to consider other proposals in the interest of reaching mutually acceptable solutions to the disarmament problem. This is a concrete example of our willingness to make concessions when it is still not possible to settle the problem as a whole, that is, in the way we regard as the most correct."

26. It is perfectly clear that practical questions relating to putting the programme of general and complete disarmament into effect stand in need of careful study and agreement. The ten-nation disarmament committee, which will meet at the beginning of next year, should devote itself to this task. But the Committee should not allow itself to be distracted from the substance of the task before it, which is the most important problem of the day, and led into fruitless discussions concerning various far-fetched questions.

27. It must be hoped that common sense will prevail. As was pointed out in the address to the parliaments of all the countries of the world adopted on 31 October 1959 by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR,

"No political, economic or other reasons would justify the continuation of the arms race. Only those circles which put their mercenary aims first and which are at odds with the aspirations and desires of the people, oppose disarmament. But the opposition of these circles must be overcome. The vital interests of mankind urgently demand that this opposition be broken."

28. As the address of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR emphasizes, the Soviet Union in accordance with the will of the Soviet people will do everything in its power to settle the disarmament problem and to transform the present atmosphere of lessened international tension into a durable peace.

29. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The effort to make progress toward real disarmament has occupied the United Nations ever since 1946. The United States hopes that the unanimous action on the question of far-reaching disarmament will mark a historic step forward. If all proceed in good faith, we may hope that we can start down the rocky road to true disarmament. Clearly, we have a long way to go.

30. The United States stands ready to work as hard on this problem and to go as far as anyone else. We stand ready to take small measures or large ones. What we do require is that whatever action is taken be significant and that it be safeguarded. This simply means that as we lay down our arms, we must be certain that effective control measures exist which ensure that all other nations will do likewise. Otherwise, there would be no true disarmament, merely a hollow mockery.

31. The draft resolution on which we are about to vote calls upon Governments to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of the problem of disarmament. As the Soviet representative says, it covers ideas of the Soviet Union. But it also covers ideas put forward here [798th meeting] by the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. Lloyd, and such other ideas as were suggested in the debate, or which may be proposed later on at the meeting of the ten-nation disarmament committee. The United States is not only ready, it is eager to join in this important effort.

32. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Does any other member of the Assembly wish to speak on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee? Since apparently no other representative wishes to speak, if there is no objection I shall take it that this draft resolution, unanimously recommended by the First Committee and contained in its report [A/4265], is adopted unanimously by the General Assembly also.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 68

Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/4280)

33. Mr. FEKINI (Libya), Rapporteur of the First Committee, (translated from French): I have the honour to place before the General Assembly the report [A/4280] of the First Committee on item 68, entitled Question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara. The report contains a draft resolution that the First Committee recommends for adoption.

34. The First Committee heard the representatives of the independent African States describe the deep anxiety caused to each of their Governments and peoples by France's declared intention of conducting nuclear tests in the Sahara. Basing their arguments upon the conclusions of scientists and atomic experts, of the bodies competent in the field of radioactivity, and of qualified medical authorities, and in particular upon the report [A/3838] of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, those representatives drew attention to the dangers involved for the peoples of the areas bordering on the region of the planned test, for their own peoples, for the peoples of Africa and for the world in general by France's declared intention of conducting nuclear tests in the Sahara.

35. The First Committee [1043rd meeting] also heard the technical arguments of the French representative to the effect that the proposed French tests constituted no threat to the health of the populations near to, or far away from, the test area; he also stated that every precaution had been taken to eliminate any kind of danger.

36. After hearing the views of the three nuclear Powers and discussing the various aspects of the question at considerable length, the First Committee approved the draft resolution now before the General Assembly. This resolution expresses the great concern felt throughout the world and repeatedly expressed in the United Nations over the prospect of further nuclear tests and their effects upon mankind; it notes the declared intention of the Government of

France to undertake nuclear tests in the Sahara, and remarks upon the deep concern felt over the dangers and risks which such tests entail. The draft resolution then refers to the significant progress being made in the negotiations now proceeding at Geneva concerning the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests and the establishment of an international control system, and expresses the hope that, in the same spirit which inspired the present voluntary suspension of tests, no State will initiate or resume tests of this kind. Lastly, the draft resolution, after recognizing the anxiety caused by the contemplated tests in the Sahara among all peoples, and more particularly those of Africa, expresses the grave concern of the United Nations over the intention of the French Government to conduct nuclear tests and requests France to refrain from such tests.

37. I believe that I am interpreting the general feeling of the First Committee in stating the hope that this expression of the concern felt by the United Nations, and of its earnest desire, will meet with an understanding and an acceptance which will make it possible to put an end to the anxiety of the parties concerned, help to attain the objectives to which I have referred, and open the way to disarmament in international understanding and harmony.

38. Therefore I have the honour of submitting to the General Assembly for its consideration the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee.

39. Mr. VELAZQUEZ (Uruguay) (translated from Spanish): The delegation of Uruguay would like very briefly to explain why it will not be able to vote in favour of the draft resolution relating to the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara.

40. I must first say that my delegation has no wish either to call in question the right of France or of any other State to carry out experiments of the type planned, or to attribute to France intentions other than those clearly explained to us by its representative in the First Committee [1051st meeting]. To quote the first preambular paragraph of the draft, however, it shares "...the great concern throughout the world repeatedly expressed in the United Nations over the prospect of further nuclear tests and their effects upon mankind".

41. Making common cause with the peoples of Africa in their grave concern, we voted in the First Committee for the fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs of the preamble, thus affirming and sharing without reservations the hope that, "...in the same spirit which inspired the present voluntary suspension of tests, no State will initiate or resume tests of this kind".

42. Although aware of certain difficulties of principle, we shall, for the same reasons, support the draft resolution relating to agenda item 67, the Prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons, as well as the appeal to the States taking part in the Geneva negotiations and all States in general to continue the present voluntary discontinuance of tests or to refrain from holding such tests.

43. We cannot vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole for the following reasons. Firstly, the third, eighth and ninth paragraphs of the preamble of the draft resolution contain statements that are far too categorical with respect to the danger to which the peoples of Africa would be exposed. To our way of thinking, those statements do not accurately reflect

the conclusions which might legitimately be drawn from the discussion. Secondly, operative paragraph 1, in the absence of any concrete reference to the place where the tests are to be held, appears to go beyond the specific terms of the question we are here discussing, and implicitly to sanction discrimination against a particular State. Thirdly, it would have been preferable to relate the decision now proposed to the resolution [1252A (XIII)] on the cessation of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests adopted by this Assembly at its thirteenth regular session. Although it could not be considered as binding on the Government in question—since strictly speaking it is addressed only to the States taking part in the Geneva negotiations—in the absence of a general decision, it constitutes an expression, at least in spirit, of the Assembly's view with regard to the undesirability of the resumption of that type of activity by the States in a position to do so.

44. My delegation would have preferred a draft resolution which, like the amendments submitted in the First Committee by five Latin-American countries, was worded in more conciliatory terms and did not contain words or phrases which the Government in question might consider as detracting from its dignity as a sovereign nation. We believe that such a draft resolution would have better served that purpose of the United Nations which seeks to promote the development of friendly relations among nations.

45. Mr. SANDLER (Sweden) (translated from French): In the First Committee the Swedish delegation would have preferred to have had the chance of voting in favour of a draft resolution couched in more moderate terms, like the amendments proposed by five Latin American countries. No such opportunity having arisen, owing to the conditions of the vote, we did not have the free choice we would have desired.

46. In abstaining from voting on some paragraphs of the preamble of the draft resolution, we showed that we did not rate as highly as our African Member States understandably did the risks involved in the Sahara tests, that is to say the risks which would continue to exist even if all necessary precautions were taken by France.

47. Essentially, our position was, and still is based on the general considerations which have been expressed during the debate of recent days on a general cessation of nuclear tests. Moreover, our attitude should be judged in the light of the fact that, in the First Committee, we voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Italy and the United Kingdom, which had, in our opinion, considerable influence on future developments.

48. Mr. ORMSBY-GORE (United Kingdom): It will be clear from the long discussion in the First Committee that the United Kingdom, in company with many other delegations, sees objection to the draft resolution adopted by that Committee. We feel that it is in some ways inaccurate and misleading, especially as regards the actual risks to life and health involved in the proposed Sahara tests. In fact, the suggestion that these risks exist is not borne out by our own experience.

49. We also feel that the draft resolution is in certain respects misconceived. As I said during the Committee debates, if the United Nations in years gone by had simply called upon an individual nation to stop a par-

ticular test, I do not believe it would have brought us one inch nearer to a comprehensive ban. Indeed, if the Assembly had thought it would have been useful, they would no doubt have passed a resolution designed to stop first of all the United States tests, then to stop the Soviet tests, and then to stop the United Kingdom tests. But the Assembly has never previously embarked on this course, no doubt because it recognized that it was not the main issue.

50. It is, therefore, the hope of my delegation that the General Assembly will not adopt the draft resolution recommended to it by the First Committee.

51. Mr. MOCH (France) (translated from French): I shall not repeat from this rostrum the arguments which I have twice explained before the First Committee. However, in a few moments the representatives of almost all the States of the world will vote on a proposal directed at my country, and my country alone, and having, therefore, the unusual, exceptional, and discriminatory character which Mr. Ormsby-Gore has so rightly pointed out. No one will, therefore, be surprised that, after carefully weighing each word, I should wish to make quite dispassionately a brief statement which will, I hope, impress itself on your minds.

52. The draft resolution which is submitted to you is the same as that which failed to obtain a two-thirds majority in the First Committee, and which I said was totally unacceptable to my country. I am sure that the consciences of the representatives who were opposed to this text in the Committee will oblige them to vote against it in this Assembly. I therefore urge all those who showed their friendship for my country by refusing to vote in favour of the African-Asian draft resolution to abide by their attitude of yesterday.

53. Our Rapporteur, speaking in a French which I always admire, made a statement which, and I say this in all cordiality, was sufficiently slanted as not to conform rigorously to the traditional objectivity of our Rapporteurs. I shall not linger over this because the proposed draft resolution stands on its own without the discreet support given to it by the Rapporteur of the Committee. I shall not repeat my previous explanations in connexion with this text; but I should like to emphasize, dispassionately, I repeat, but firmly, that this draft resolution is totally unacceptable to France and that it is both scientifically inaccurate and deliberately offensive.

54. It is scientifically inaccurate to say that the tests planned in the Sahara create risks and dangers, as the third paragraph of the preamble alleges.

55. It is scientifically inaccurate, as I have showed, and it is politically odious—I use the word deliberately—to assert, as the eighth paragraph of the preamble does, that France is creating, and the presumption is, deliberately, "conditions of danger in Africa".

56. It is scientifically inaccurate to assert, in the ninth and last paragraph of the preamble, that France cannot assume the responsibility for "the health, safety and well-being of the peoples...of Africa"—I am quoting from the text—"threatened by such tests". At this point I should like to tell my old friend, Mr. Sandler, who has just indicated that he would have preferred a more moderate draft resolution, that abstention from voting is no solution in the face of such an outrage, when the vote is determined by the major-

ity of the ballots cast, not counting abstentions. If Mr. Sandler—and I know his feelings of friendship for my country—cannot accept the preamble which I have just analysed once more, he will allow me, in all friendship, to tell him that he should vote against it and not wash his hands of it like Pontius Pilate.

57. Lastly, the draft resolution before you is inadmissible because of the injunction made to France in the last operative paragraph which, as I have already said, France will not accept.

58. I hope, therefore, that this draft resolution will not obtain a two-thirds majority here, any more than it did in the First Committee, for the following three reasons which I should like very briefly to set forth.

59. The first reason, which is self-evident, is the discriminatory and offensive character which this draft resolution still possesses.

60. The second reason is the best interests of the United Nations, to which I remain profoundly attached. These interests demand that we should conclude this debate without adopting any text. What advantage is there in deliberately putting our Organization in a difficult position? I am expressing here my inmost thoughts. Why adopt a resolution which cannot alter the conditions of a test which the French Government, relying on the best advice of its own experts and of those of other countries, remains convinced is without risk? Why emphasize that a recommendation is not a decision binding in international law? Why, by means of a vote without any practical effect, go beyond the means at the disposal of the United Nations and the limits set by the Charter to the powers of our Assembly? I am convinced that, in voting this recommendation, the Assembly would be making a mistake and would be undermining its own authority.

61. The third reason is the effects of such an outcome on French public opinion, not, of course, because it might bring pressure to bear on the French Government to alter its decision—it will not—but because the adoption of the text under discussion might arouse in France, a country which shared in the creation of the United Nations, a deep feeling of disaffection towards our Organization, a feeling which it is the duty of all of us to prevent from arising or developing. It goes without saying that I shall remain a defender of the cause of the United Nations; but the adoption of this draft resolution might well jeopardize the influence of all its friends.

62. I have spoken these words with full awareness of my national responsibilities and of my attachment to the international ideal. I feel profoundly the obligation to assert our common interest, namely to avert any decisive vote by a two-thirds majority at the end of this debate. This alone prompts me to make a last appeal to those whom once again I thank for their attitude in the First Committee, and to those who abstained yesterday but might be tempted to join the camp of our opponents.

63. Whatever the outcome of this debate, France's attitude will remain broadly as follows: convinced that it is not endangering the life of any human being, and certainly not those of its African friends, France knows and has established that its tests will be without risk; and this has been confirmed by the representatives of four Powers rich in atomic scientists and in highly developed nuclear studies. I thank the

representative of the United Kingdom, who twice reaffirmed his conviction, and those of the United States, Italy and Belgium.

64. France professes the doctrine of the equality of the rights of nations. She will accept no clandestine monopoly, no indirect discrimination. If nuclear weapons are to continue to exist temporarily, France has the same right as others to possess them. Do its own interests command it to exercise this right? This is a question which cannot be discussed here, as I have said, but only among Frenchmen since the French action harms no one. Is the exercise of this right in the next few months expedient? Might it not jeopardize the Geneva negotiations on the cessation of tests?

65. I can not allow my country to be treated as a scapegoat. The three delegations which are meeting in Switzerland represent Governments which have discovered the secret of the military atom in the course of 131, 55 and 21 experimental explosions respectively. While discussing the cessation of tests—of which I approve—these Governments are piling up weapons and improving means for delivering them. Is that what you call a decisive step toward disarmament?

66. Let us hear no more about the influence our decision may have on the Geneva conversations. The fate of those negotiations will depend solely on the interests of the three Powers concerned. We hope that they will reach an agreement; we hope that they will agree to abandon the tests they have so frequently carried out; but if agreement fails to be reached, it will not be because of our test. If, in the unfortunate case of continuing disagreement, one or other of those Powers resumed testing, as is already being proposed in certain authoritative quarters, this would be the result of disagreement among themselves and not of our action.

67. Lastly, France remains resolutely and passionately attached to the cause of genuine disarmament, universal but not unilateral disarmament. For three years I have been stressing here the continuity of France's attitude, regardless of its Government, and its readiness to accede at once to any treaty initiating general nuclear disarmament, as distinct from an instrument closing the door to some but leaving the door wide open to others in the sphere of atomic armaments.

68. The most authoritative spokesman for France, President de Gaulle, has reaffirmed this unvarying position of my country. The heads of two African Republics, members of our Community, have spoken here in the same terms. I would not have come here again this year, after so many others, if I had not been certain that my continuous effort for disarmament still reflects the will of the Government of the Republic.

69. But, above all, I wish to repeat that France has kept the same visage that so many of you know, respect, and love. Terribly mutilated three times within three-quarters of a century, having lost the best of its sons, its towns and countryside devastated, France wants peace, seeks no conquests, leaves its overseas territories free to decide on their own future, and declares today, like yesterday, that it rejects any discrimination based on race, religion or doctrine. France remains the same country which first proclaimed the rights of man

and abolished slavery; the country which endeavoured to carry freedom beyond its frontiers when, attacked by absolute monarchs, it declared war on feudal strongholds and proclaimed peace for cottages; the country which, during the Revolution, inscribed on a bridge over the Rhine the proud motto: "Here begins the land of freedom"; the country, in a word, which cannot tolerate an injustice, whoever be the victim. Our Marseillaise remains the song of all the oppressed.

70. We now intend to transfer the struggles which we have carried on for human freedom from the plane of individuals to the plane of nations. For us freedom can only exist in a world devoted to peace, in the security of controlled disarmament. We remain uncompromisingly faithful to that supreme aim. We hope that our test will prove to everyone the vanity of military and scientific pseudo-secrets, that it will demonstrate the dangers of the policy now being followed, and that it will bring closer the day when we shall sign together an agreement instituting, for France and for everyone, the beginning of nuclear disarmament.

71. That is why you will once again reject this draft resolution relying on France's determination to continue its offensive for genuine disarmament. That is why, as the voting draws near, I do not fear history's verdict on my country. History will recall that for the last ten years, we have been determined, as we still are, to undertake controlled disarmament to whatever extent the other Powers would accept, for the only future worth living is one which will spare our grandchildren worse horrors than those we have lived through and allowed to be inflicted on our children, and which will save the parents of tomorrow from the griefs which have left an indelible mark upon us.

72. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (translated from French): When my country requested the United Nations to include in the agenda of the current session the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara, it believed that for two different reasons, it was expressing its confidence both in the United Nations and in France: first, by complying with the rule that our Organization should only be appealed to when all direct conciliatory approaches to France through diplomatic channels had been exhausted, and, secondly, these approaches having failed, by placing its full confidence in the only international body empowered to settle such a question.

73. Twenty-two of the most highly respected Powers collaborated with the Moroccan delegation in drafting a text which has been described by Mr. Jules Moch as "odious". I apologize to my colleagues who have supported this cause if, today, although they approached the question in good faith, the only outcome of their labours is to have the text described by the French representative as "odious". I hope they will forgive me if they feel somewhat distressed about it.

74. I also apologize to the representative of a very great Power who, despite its prestige and the high principles on which its régime is based and which also determine its diplomacy, heard himself compared today to Pontius Pilate. I also ask the representative of this Power to believe that I sympathize with his distress, as the representative of a Government and a people, at hearing himself stigmatized as a Pontius Pilate from this rostrum.

75. Mr. Moch has defended France as a true Frenchman. I do not believe that anyone here can have thought

that Mr. Moch was forced to defend France, which did not need to be defended; but he chose, although he was neither a member of the Government nor a civil servant, to come here to defend a bomb, which is indefensible.

76. There could be no better tribute to the fine qualities and virtues to which Mr. Jules Moch has referred repeatedly with some acrimony, and which we have acknowledged freely and sometimes even with pride, than that paid by those representatives who have spoken in support of the Moroccan delegation's views.

77. We are told that France is waiting today for the verdict and that the decision which is taken may well cause such resentment among the French people that it will lose faith in this Organization. We have been reminded that France helped to create the United Nations. I would only say that it was not so that it might become a tool at its service. We remember the circumstances in which it was created and we know that it was designed to serve the small States. That is why we have been able today to appeal to it against a great State.

78. The draft resolution which we have submitted is the conscientious expression of a conviction. Both the French and English texts have been drafted to embody the greatest possible moderation and common sense. If at the last moment we are still told that it is unacceptable, it will be our conviction and not our text which is rejected. It is in fact our conviction which we are defending in the draft resolution and we genuinely believed that the text gave adequate expression to it.

79. I would not wish to be condescending or disdainful towards those who have genuine misgivings. Mr. Moch seems to take it for granted that there is no danger. We regret that we are not among those who believe that it does not exist. That is what has led us to the conviction that is being considered here today. That conviction was shared by forty-six States in the First Committee. Forty-six respected States declared themselves in favour of the draft resolution. I do not believe that today any appeal can have any effect and I shall not make one. Those who are sitting in this conference room are not waiting for me to speak in order to carry out their duties conscientiously. I hope they will forgive me if I do not make any appeal to them. My silence is in itself an appeal. We do not want to tell those who had one view of the truth yesterday that they should have a different one today. As Paul Claudel said, it is quite possible that "truth has nothing to do with numbers". In this Organization the truth and the number of those believing it are also a reflexion of the principles to which they attach importance.

80. The draft resolution which is before you reflects the anxiety of a whole continent, whose peoples France wishes to count among its friends. As France knows well enough, they are worthy to be so counted. Just now Mr. Jules Moch referred to the inscription on a bridge over the Rhine. I shall recall the words of a great French writer who once said that if France had to choose between the Rhine and the Mediterranean as the axis of its destiny it would have to choose the Mediterranean. Choose it then, Mr. Jules Moch, but with an awareness of the dignity of those whom you would have as your friends. You reminded us that you had given liberty to the world, that servitude had ended. Then bear in mind the aspirations and anxieties of young States, of nations which are no less noble than others

but whose memories of a recent past are still too vivid for them not to be apprehensive.

81. In conclusion, I would remind you of a proverb for whose triviality I apologize. We want France to be great but, as the proverb says, it is a good gourmet that chews his own garlic.

82. Mr. QUAISON-SACKEY (Ghana): I have come to this rostrum for two reasons: first of all, because of the new complexion which has been given to the whole situation by the revelations made by the representative of Sweden, and secondly, because this is my country's last appeal to the representatives in this Assembly.

83. My delegation is a co-sponsor of the draft resolution which was adopted by the First Committee and which we are certain the Assembly will now approve with a large majority. During our discussions in the First Committee on the question of French nuclear tests in the Sahara, my delegation stated quite categorically its opposition to these tests. Therefore, in this plenary meeting I shall merely confine myself to reiterating my delegation's lack of conviction with regard to the case made by those who sought in the First Committee to argue away the dangers inherent in these French tests and thus, in effect, grant the French Government licence to explode its bomb in the Sahara, on the African continent, a continent more sinned against than sinning. It is significant that none of the delegations that support the French tests in the Sahara have been able to tell us that the effects of the French experiment in the Sahara will be beneficial to the Africans of the neighbouring territories.

84. After all the statements of those who supported the French tests have been shorn of their eloquence and special pleading, we are left far from reassured and are even disturbed that, where the effects of radiation, both natural and artificial, are concerned, even the most eminent scientists do not know for certain. However, the most prominent scientists in this field admit that the balance of probability is that the effects of such radiations are likely to be dangerous and that every effort should be made to avoid the accumulation of nuclear debris in the world's atmosphere.

85. In this regard, I should like to refer to the very pertinent statement made by the representative of Sweden yesterday in the First Committee. In his statement he indicated that the researches of his country's scientists have brought out the fact that new and potentially dangerous by-products accompany nuclear explosions and that the rate of radioactivity "... has been proved to be so high that it signifies a deadly dose for cells coming in direct contact with these so far unknown particles".^{2/} The representative of Sweden also brought out at the same meeting the fact that, indeed, fall-out comes down to earth more speedily than had earlier been supposed. "This means ... that short-lived fission products ought to receive more consideration than has been the case before." This is a revelation which must be emphasized in this Assembly. It emphasizes the point I made in my statement on this item in the First Committee [1044th meeting] early this month to the effect that, where the hazards accompanying nuclear explosions are concerned, "When in doubt, don't."

^{2/} This statement was made at the 1057th meeting of the First Committee, the official record of which is published only in summary form.

86. We in Africa are convinced that the cumulative poisoning of the atmosphere with nuclear debris cannot but be harmful to every living organism. We know that what the French propose to do on our continent cannot be beneficial to us. We find in the proposed French tests in the Sahara a threat to the welfare of present populations in Africa and probable serious genetic harm to generations of Africans as yet unborn. We, therefore, earnestly appeal to the General Assembly to request the French Government to desist from its proposed nuclear tests in the Sahara.

87. At the end of the debate on this item in the First Committee, the representative of France said that the vote on this item at that time would indicate to his Government who France's real friends are. I can say here and now that millions who live on the continent of Africa may also take the same stand and decide by this vote today in this Assembly who their real friends are. The prospect of nuclear pollution of our atmosphere is a matter of the most vital concern. It is not political to us in Africa, and we are not going to be fobbed off by empty assurances which no one can today substantiate in the long run. Of what avail is our Organization's stand against nuclear tests, of what avail are our vows for peace if we fail to respond to the appeal made before the bar of our conscience today? We in Africa are waiting for the Members of the General Assembly to stand up and be counted on this issue of both principle and practical reality, a reality which will no doubt affect very crucially the welfare of humanity.

88. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I give the floor to the representative of Libya, to exercise his right of reply.

89. Mr. FEKINI (Libya), Rapporteur of the First Committee, (translated from French): I do not intend to comment on the excited statements which the distinguished representative of France has made; he has thought fit, in an impassioned outburst in which he has subordinated everything to the support of his argument, to question the impartiality of the statements I have just made in submitting the First Committee's report on the question we are now debating.

90. I would merely say that, in the report, I explained what had happened in the First Committee, and that I did so with the maximum of objectivity and sincerity. The greater part of it I devoted to the views of France, and I described the arguments advanced by the French representative. I also gave a faithful account of the views of the African countries' representatives. I am prepared to let the General Assembly and the First Committee which invested me with the function of Rapporteur, be the sole judges of these accusations.

91. The French representative said that my statement was discreetly "slanted". I reject most firmly all these accusations and suggestions. As to the alleged "slant", whether discreet or blatant, I think that this Assembly and the First Committee know full well from where it comes, on this as on previous occasions.

92. Mr. JHA (India): It was not our intention to participate in the debate in the Assembly on this subject. Much has been said in the First Committee during the discussion on this item and the chairman of our delegation made a very full statement in the course of the debate [1057th meeting]. There is only one point in respect of which I feel it my duty to come to the rostrum and say a few words.

93. We heard in the statement of the representative of France that he made a vote on this draft resolution, which has emerged from the First Committee and is now before the General Assembly, an acid test of friendship to France. According to him, if a vote is cast for the draft resolution, it is an unfriendly act towards France, and if a vote is cast against the draft resolution it is a sign and proof of friendship towards France. It is on this proposition that I would like to explain the approach of my delegation to this question.

94. We believe that this is not the right way to look at the views of the delegations and at the votes they will cast on the draft resolution. There is no question of friendship or unfriendliness towards France. I do not have to say much about the way we will vote on this draft resolution, but we will do so not because we are unfriendly to France but because we are inimical to nuclear tests. As a matter of fact, it is well known—and I am sure the representative of France knows it—that my country has the most friendly and the closest relations with France. Our relations have developed very satisfactorily during the years since we gained our independence, and we look forward to even closer relations in the future. However, that will not prevent us from voting for this draft resolution, which is no more than what is demanded by the highest principles of justice and morality.

95. The views of my Government on this question are well known. They have been stated before this Assembly and before the world for many years. We will vote for this draft resolution as an act of faith, as adherents to the basic principles which we have held, and I would like to assure the representative of France that it will not be an act of unfriendliness towards France. As a matter of fact, to our delegation it seems that the fact that France is concerned in this matter is merely an accident. If it had been any other country, we would have had exactly the same view. We are sorry that France is involved in this matter. We would have liked France not to be in this position and to have declared openly in this Assembly that it will listen to the appeals and to the views that were expressed in the Committee.

96. There is one other point which I would like to make in this connexion. In certain statements in the First Committee and also here this morning, it has been said that the great defect of this draft resolution is that a particular country, France, has been pinpointed. That was inevitable because the item relates to the French nuclear test in the Sahara. However, I would like to remind the Assembly that this is not the first time that the question of nuclear tests has come up. It came up not in the Assembly itself but in one of its organs with reference to tests by a particular member. I would like to remind the Members of the Assembly of the very detailed discussions in the Trusteeship Council in the year 1958 in reference to the United States atomic and hydrogen bomb tests in the Pacific Islands, with respect to which the United States is the Administering Authority. At that time, too, this whole matter came up. Although it is true that the draft resolution which my delegation, supported by one or two others, moved in the Council was lost, ^{3/} the fact remains that on that occasion, even though, as is well known, our relations with the United States were very friendly, we did not hesitate on a matter of principle to bring up this

^{3/} Official Records of the Trusteeship Council, Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 3, document T/L.856.

matter even though it involved a single and a particular country.

97. As I said before, it is regrettable from our point of view that we have to vote on a draft resolution which has specific reference to a very friendly country. But I would like to say this: that my Government has never hesitated to raise its voice of protest wherever it was possible against any nuclear test, whether it was by the Soviet Union, the United States or the United Kingdom, and we shall always continue to do so so long as we have any strength in our voice and any part in the counsels of the United Nations.

98. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): If no other speaker wishes to explain his vote we shall proceed to the vote on the draft resolution contained in the document before us [A/4280]. It has been requested that the eighth and ninth paragraphs of the preamble of this draft resolution be voted on separately by roll-call. In accordance with this request I shall first put to the vote these two paragraphs.

99. Mr. KESTLER (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): My delegation would also like to have a separate vote taken on both the operative paragraphs 1 and 2.

100. Mr. MOCH (France) (translated from French): For the reasons which I have just stated, I request—and I trust the Assembly will bear with me in this—a vote by division, similar to that taken in the Committee. It is important for us that the third preambular paragraph for instance, in which there are what I have called scientific errors, should be the subject of a separate vote.

101. Therefore, availing myself of a right which, I believe, is in accordance with the rules, I request a separate vote on the third preambular paragraph, and then on the seventh, eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs, which are the last three preambular paragraphs before the operative part.

102. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Since the representative of France asked for separate votes on the third, seventh, eighth and ninth preambular paragraphs, I wish to inform the Assembly that we shall vote first on the third preambular paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Greece, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

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

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

Abstaining: Greece, Haiti, Laos, Mexico, Paraguay, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia,

China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland.

Paragraph three of the preamble was adopted by 45 votes in favour, 20 against and 17 abstentions.

103. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The next paragraph on which we have to vote is the seventh preambular paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Ceylon, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ceylon, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, 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, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada.

Against: Colombia, Dominican Republic, France, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Union of South Africa, Brazil.

Abstaining: Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Italy, Laos, Mexico, Netherlands, Paraguay, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia.

Paragraph seven of the preamble was adopted by 44 votes in favour, 10 against and 28 abstentions.

104. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall now vote on the eighth preambular paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, 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.

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

The result of the vote was 36 in favour, 30 against, and 16 abstentions.

The eight preambular paragraph was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

105. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the ninth preambular paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

Against: Chile, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Honduras, Israel, 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, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

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

The result of the vote was 39 in favour, 25 against and 18 abstentions.

The ninth preambular paragraph was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

106. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Since the representative of Guatemala has asked for a separate vote on both the two operative paragraphs of the draft resolution I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 1.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Thailand, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

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

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

Abstaining: Thailand, Turkey, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Denmark, El Salvador, Greece, Haiti, Laos, Norway, Paraguay.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 48 votes in favour, 19 against and 15 abstentions.

107. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

Against: Belgium, Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, France, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Chile, China, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, Greece, Haiti, Laos, Paraguay, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 51 votes in favour, 17 against and 14 abstentions.

108. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Cuba, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, 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, Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon.

Against: Dominican Republic, France, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Belgium, Brazil.

Abstaining: El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Laos, Paraguay, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica.

The draft resolution as amended, as a whole, was adopted by 51 votes to 16 with 15 abstentions.

109. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico was able to vote in favour of the resolution we have just adopted because the main reasons for our abstention in the First Committee no longer existed. The most important of those reasons was that we could not then be sure whether the draft resolution concerning the Question of French

nuclear tests in the Sahara would be the only draft resolution relating to the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests likely to be adopted by the General Assembly. If that had been the case, the present resolution would have continued to appear to us both as inadequate and as open to the criticism that it was discriminatory.

110. That difficulty was removed yesterday afternoon, 19 November 1959, when the First Committee adopted two draft resolutions [see A/4290] relating to the suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests, and submitted by twenty-four Powers, by the overwhelming majority of 60 votes in favour, 1 against and 17 abstentions. Operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution B contained a general and all-inclusive appeal "to the States concerned in the Geneva discussions to continue their present voluntary suspension of tests, and to other States to desist from such tests".

111. We have also been enabled to vote in favour of the resolution we have just adopted because of the

rejection of the eighth preambular paragraph, regarding the accuracy and pertinence of which we had serious doubts.

112. In conclusion, I should like to point out that my delegation's vote was wholly in keeping with the line of conduct we have invariably taken with respect to nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests. The vote was based on principle, and of course had nothing to do with the country to which the resolution is addressed—a country to which we are linked by traditional ties of sincere friendship and for whose contribution to mankind's cultural and social development we have the deepest admiration. We doubly regret, therefore, having felt compelled to vote as we did and wish to place on record the fact that—as a representative in the First Committee so aptly put it—it is not a question of France, but of the bomb.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.

