



# General Assembly

Seventy-third session

Official Records

Distr.: General  
10 December 2018

Original: English

---

## Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee)

### Summary record of the 22nd meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 6 November 2018, at 3 p.m.

*Chair:* Mr. Kemayah, Sr. .... (Liberia)

## Contents

Agenda item 52: Effects of atomic radiation

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Management Section ([dms@un.org](mailto:dms@un.org)), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (<http://documents.un.org/>).

18-18676 (E)



Please recycle



*The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.*

**Agenda item 52: Effects of atomic radiation**  
([A/73/46](#), [A/C.4/73/L.9](#), [A/C.4/73/L.12](#) and [A/C.4/73/L.13](#))

1. **Mr. Vanmarcke** (Belgium), Chair of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, accompanying his statement with a digital slide presentation, introduced the report of the Scientific Committee on its sixty-fifth session ([A/73/46](#)), which had been attended by all 27 members and more than 150 scientists. On an administrative note, he suggested that the General Assembly should establish procedures for handling increases in Scientific Committee membership along the lines of those drafted, after much time and effort, by Belgium and other countries.

2. During 2018, as part of its 2017 report ([A/72/46](#)), the Scientific Committee had published principles and criteria for ensuring the quality of its reviews of epidemiological studies of radiation exposure, and for evaluating epidemiological studies of cancer risk from low-dose environmental exposure. A further white paper updating thyroid cancer data from regions affected by the Chernobyl accident was disseminated just before the thirty-second anniversary of the accident and received extensive media attention.

3. Following the Scientific Committee's 2013 report on exposure levels and effects of the Fukushima nuclear accident, that body's expert group had issued white papers in 2015, 2016 and 2017 confirming the 2013 report's major assumptions and findings. That report should be updated and its post-2011 findings summarized. The Scientific Committee acknowledged the substantial contribution to its General Trust Fund by the Government of Japan, as well as important in-kind contributions from other States, to produce the 2020 report, and had agreed to use part of that Fund to hire temporary staff at its secretariat; it was also grateful for the regular contributions of some Member States to the Fund.

4. Regarding the Scientific Committee's programme of work, he recalled that its secretariat had launched an online platform for collecting medical and occupational exposure data, and had also requested that countries nominate national contact points to coordinate data collection. As of October 2018, 85 countries had nominated contact points, and he invited other countries to do so. The Scientific Committee expected to re-evaluate the data at its next session, and its secretariat would begin conducting similar surveys on public exposures from natural and artificial radiation sources.

5. At its sixty-third session, the Scientific Committee had agreed on long-term strategic directions for its work beyond 2019, to include establishing standing working groups on such topics as sources and exposure; seeking out expertise from States not part of its membership; increasing efforts to present its findings attractively without compromising scientific rigour and integrity; and enhancing links with other bodies to avoid duplication of efforts. In June 2018, the Scientific Committee had established an ad hoc working group to examine radiation exposure mechanisms and effects over the next five years. Scientists from States not part of its membership were increasingly involved in collecting and evaluating medical and occupational exposures and in reporting on lung cancer from radon exposure. Development of its public information and outreach strategy over the coming five years would require further financial and human resources. It also continued to liaise with other organizations, such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), International Labour Organization (ILO) and World Health Organization (WHO), directly and through the Inter-Agency Committee on Radiation Safety, to minimize duplication of efforts.

6. At its next session, the Scientific Committee would review reports on selected health evaluations and on lung cancer from exposure to radon; at its 2020 session, it would review reports on biological mechanisms, human exposure of patients and workers, and exposure levels and effects of the Fukushima nuclear accident. While research on second primary cancers after radiotherapy and on epidemiological studies of radiation and cancer were priorities, neither could be undertaken until a Scientific Secretary was appointed.

7. The delay in recruiting a new Scientific Secretary had reduced the operational capacity of the secretariat and compelled the postponement and shortening of the April 2018 session to four days in June 2018. Furthermore, the body's Scientific Officer had served as Acting Secretary since March 2018, with no recognition from the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Such lack of interest in and insufficient support for the Scientific Committee would severely hamper its future work and could necessitate postponing its June 2019 session. As stated in a recent letter to the Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services, included in the 2018 report ([A/73/46](#)), the Scientific Committee had asked the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) to investigate the recruitment process for the new Secretary and whether UNEP was the appropriate body to provide its administrative support. For the body to act more effectively, the roles and

responsibilities of UNEP and the United Nations Offices at Nairobi and Vienna needed clarification, and the operational costs of increasing membership also deserved attention.

8. The Scientific Committee was valuable to the global community as a cost-effective mechanism for sharing scientific knowledge and had earned respect internationally for its objectivity, independence and quality of work, attributes which needed to be maintained going forward. For its essential work of informing decisions by governments and international bodies under the international radiation safety framework to continue, the serious issues facing the secretariat, and the Scientific Committee generally, needed to be resolved.

9. **Mr. Dabouis** (Observer for the European Union), speaking also on behalf of the candidate countries Albania, Montenegro, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process country Bosnia and Herzegovina; and, in addition, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union was satisfied with the outcome of the sixty-fifth session of the Scientific Committee, whose work and assessments were central to improving international scientific understanding of exposure to ionizing radiation and its health and environmental effects, and to making essential and authoritative scientific information available to the international community.

10. The European Union welcomed the Scientific Committee's intention to finalize work on selected evaluations of health effects and inference of risk from radiation exposure; the results of current research on lung cancer from exposure to radon and penetrating radiation; its focus on quality criteria for epidemiological studies of the effects of radiation, which had facilitated the resolution of disputes regarding import bans of goods likely to contain radionuclides and testing and certification requirements for such cases; the expected review at its sixty-sixth session of a more mature draft document on biological mechanisms influencing health effects of low-dose radiation exposure; and its intention to report on significant changes since 2006 of possible relevance for the inference of cancer risk in such exposure.

11. It also welcomed the Scientific Committee's future work on second primary cancer after radiation therapy, and the possible structural expansion of the planned document at the sixty-sixth session. However, it was concerned by the continued delay in the appointment of the Secretary of the Scientific Committee and by disruptions in secretariat staffing,

leading to the postponement of its sixty-fifth session. It thanked the Acting Secretary for his work in preparing for that rescheduled session.

12. **Mr. García Moritán** (Argentina) said that his delegation welcomed the Scientific Committee's work evaluating radiation-exposure health effects and risk inference, and supported research on the effects of low-dose radiation on human health. The Scientific Committee should prioritize risk estimation for lung cancer from radon exposure, which would influence forthcoming standards for such exposure. By providing national data, Argentina was actively collaborating in the preparation of the secretariat's progress report on the collection, analysis and dissemination of data on radiation exposure of patients, workers and the general public.

13. The Scientific Committee's public-information activities and dissemination of its risk and dose estimates were of vital importance, and should include and even focus on the difficult task of attribution over risk inference. In its future programme of work, the Scientific Committee must pay special attention to second primary cancers following radiotherapy.

14. The General Assembly had frequently cited the vital need for appropriate staffing, sufficient, secure and predictable financing and efficient management of the Scientific Committee. The failure of UNEP to hire a new Scientific Secretary was concerning, and a new candidate with the highest qualifications must be appointed without delay. His delegation fully supported the request for an internal audit and an OIOS investigation, and reiterated its position in favour of unconditional in-kind and financial contributions to be used according to the Scientific Committee's priorities.

15. **Mr. Mohsin** (Pakistan) said that his delegation appreciated the foundation provided by the Scientific Committee for Member States to formulate international standards to protect workers, patients and the general public from ionizing radiation. The excellent quality and impact of the Scientific Committee's evaluations were the fruit of its highly competent contributors and the hard work of its leadership team, particularly that of former Scientific Secretary Malcolm Crick. The Scientific Committee must be adequately staffed and resourced to continue to carry out its duties, and his delegation shared the concerns expressed by some Member States over the delay in appointing a new Scientific Secretary.

16. As nuclear technology came into increasing use for peaceful purposes, Pakistan was applying it to power production, healthcare, agriculture, biotechnology, pharmacology and industry. His Government regularly

used the Scientific Committee's reports and IAEA standards to develop robust national policies and procedures to protect workers, the environment and the general public. Procedures and policies to protect against the harmful effects of radiation, along with comprehensive environmental radiation-monitoring programmes, were required in all Pakistani nuclear facilities. His Government was firmly committed to further enhancing its infrastructure, capacity and personnel training, in collaboration with relevant international organizations.

17. **Mr. Misra** (India) said that while concerns based on the "linear no-threshold" hypothesis persisted among the public and the scientific community regarding harm at all dose levels, an increasing body of evidence refuted that model. Integrated radiobiological and epidemiological studies should be carried out at the international level to collect more systematic information on the health effects of low-dose radiation. Patients or medical practitioners should not defer justified medical examinations for fear of low-level radiation exposure risks, as clear scientific evidence remained rare in that area.

18. The Scientific Committee must take proactive steps toward the appointment of a Secretary. His delegation welcomed the potential membership increase for that body, which would enhance United Nations regional networks in Asia and Africa. As radiation-exposure risk evaluation strongly influenced public perceptions, his delegation appreciated the scientific background on atomic radiation provided by the Scientific Committee.

19. **Ms. Romero López** (Cuba) said that Scientific Committee studies could respond to specific demands from the scientific community and inform national and international standard-setting for protection against ionizing radiation's harmful effects. Seventy-three years after the criminal atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, nuclear weapons remained a latent threat. Cuba reaffirmed its position that the total elimination of nuclear weapons was the only effective way to guarantee that humanity never again suffered their terrible effects, and was fully committed to achieving the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world. Accordingly, in January 2018 Cuba had become the fifth country to ratify the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, effectively contributing to the maintenance of international peace and security.

20. Despite economic difficulties stemming from the cruel economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed on Cuba, her country had assisted the brotherly people of the Ukraine following the Chernobyl accident

through a humanitarian programme in Taratá. In addition to providing care to over 20,000 people affected by atomic radiation, the programme was important scientifically, as the data collected had been disseminated at major scientific events and used by several agencies and institutions of the United Nations system. It was important to maintain and strengthen collaboration between the Scientific Committee and bodies such as WHO, IAEA and UNEP. Benefits of such cooperation had been visible through the application of technological advances, particularly in health and environmental protection.

21. The contribution of nuclear energy and technology to the socioeconomic development of nations was incontestable. Cuba therefore reiterated the right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy without discrimination, and was convinced that serious and wide-ranging cooperation on the peaceful use of nuclear energy was the only path to eliminating the potential dangers associated with ionizing radiation.

22. **Ms. Fedorovich** (Belarus) welcomed the growing interest of Member States in the work of the Scientific Committee, in having their scientists appointed to it, and in having its documents translated and disseminated. Belarus was largely satisfied with the results of that work, despite the recent administrative difficulties, and supported the procedure for incorporating new members proposed under draft resolution [A/C.4.73/L.9](#), which would reduce the potential for conflict that had been evident in past decades.

23. Belarus also welcomed the recently-published white paper on post-Chernobyl thyroid cancer, which had received media coverage around the world, as well as the Scientific Committee's continued treatment of the increasing incidence of thyroid cancer in Belarus, the Russian Federation and Ukraine resulting from the accident as a priority requiring ongoing study. Her country fully concurred with the recommendation of the Scientific Committee that further studies and research on biomarkers for radiation-induced thyroid cancer be undertaken, and hoped that it would find data collected in the regions affected by the accident useful.

24. **Ms. Oku** (Japan) said that Japan had long been committed to nuclear safety, particularly following the 2011 Fukushima nuclear accident. It commended the work of the Scientific Committee to broaden knowledge and deepen understanding of the levels, effects and risks of ionizing radiation exposure, based on independent and scientific evidence.

25. Noting the importance of disseminating the Scientific Committee's findings, her delegation welcomed the publication of the report, white papers

and annex on the levels and effects of radiation exposure after the 2011 great east-Japan earthquake and tsunami. Japan had contributed approximately US\$640,000 to support its critical nuclear-safety activities that year. However, the failure of UNEP to appoint a new Secretary to the Scientific Committee jeopardized its work and should be resolved in a timely manner. Japan remained committed to supporting the Scientific Committee's efforts to deepen understanding of ionizing radiation's effects.

26. **Mr. Khaldi** (Algeria) said that atomic energy's increasing use in everyday life entailed potential risks that States must bear in mind. His country had experienced the impact of radioactive contamination first-hand as a result of the nuclear tests conducted in the Algerian Sahara in the early 1960s, which had left the affected regions uninhabitable. His Government had enacted legislation to curb the effects of atomic radiation and monitor its sources. The Algerian Atomic Energy Commission ensured compliance with the existing regulatory framework and standards for radiation sources, and organized regular training sessions for operators of equipment using them. In coordination with Government entities representing various sectors, the Commission granted licences to import and use such equipment in accordance with stringent safety regulations on handling radioactive materials.

27. To help States improve their radiation-safety regulatory framework and promote regional and international cooperation, Algeria had organized training workshops in cooperation with African, Arab and international organizations. His delegation welcomed improvements in disseminating the results of epidemiological studies of cancers caused by low-dose radiation exposure. While the Scientific Committee's media and communications activities to raise public awareness on the issue were commendable, insufficient human and financial resources and the delay in appointing a new Secretary, as requested by the General Assembly in resolution 72/76, had regrettably hampered their execution. A new Secretary should be appointed as soon as possible to ensure their continuation, and the Scientific Committee should reconsider its strategy for 2020-2024. Steps such as the establishment of a joint United Nations fund among agencies dealing with atomic radiation could also be considered. Additionally, the Scientific Committee should expand its international collaboration to include the African Commission on Nuclear Energy.

28. **Mr. Ahidjo** (Cameroon) said that his delegation commended the valuable ongoing work of the Scientific Committee, and reiterated its support of and cooperation

with that body. By adopting a radiation-protection law in 1995 and establishing a national radiation protection agency in 2002, his Government had joined the international community's efforts to face the threat of ionizing radiation. Those measures remained relevant in the current climate of insecurity in central Africa, particularly in Cameroon. It had also introduced measures regulating ionizing radiation-source use; importing, exporting and transporting radioactive materials; radioactive waste management; and dosimetric monitoring of workers. Cooperating closely with IAEA, Cameroon had signed its second Country Programme Framework for 2014–2018 with that body. The Scientific Committee should continue to keep the international community informed of the harmful effects of ionizing radiation on human health and the environment.

29. **Mr. Lozinskiy** (Russian Federation) said that his country had actively participated in the Scientific Committee's work since its inception and continued to support its work. The delay in appointing a Secretary to the Scientific Committee should be resolved swiftly to avoid further adverse impact. The procedure proposed for broadening its membership would enable it to fully unleash, in a depoliticized atmosphere, the scientific potential of all interested Member States while minimizing any financial and administrative obstacles that might hinder the Scientific Committee from undertaking international research. Involving countries with expertise on atomic radiation effects in the Scientific Committee's work would only enhance its quality. Accordingly, Algeria, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Norway and the United Arab Emirates could make a significant contribution as full members of the Scientific Committee.

30. **Mr. Sahraei** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that Iran stood ready to actively participate in and contribute to the Scientific Committee's work. Despite the benefits of nuclear energy in such areas as health care and food preservation, the international community should beware of atomic radiation's harmful effects on human beings and the environment, and it was essential to disseminate information and share best practices to ensure safe use of nuclear technology.

31. As a body promoting wider knowledge and understanding of radiation's risks, the Scientific Committee should benefit from the contribution and knowledge of all countries possessing high levels of relevant expertise and potential. His delegation welcomed all measures aimed at strengthening and enhancing the work of the Scientific Committee and rejected any politicization of its technical work. It also

fully supported draft resolution [A/C.4/73/L.9](#) regarding membership of that body.

32. **Mr. Kazi** (Bangladesh) said that his delegation appreciated the Scientific Committee's substantive scientific evaluations on ionizing radiation's risks and effects, especially as related to the natural environment, public health and occupational safety. The reports of the Scientific Committee since the previous session and its decision to update its 2013 report on the Fukushima nuclear accident were positive measures. His delegation was particularly interested in the Scientific Committee's evaluations of radiation-exposure health effects and risk inference and of lung cancer from radon exposure. Given the cross-cutting relevance of that body's work, coordination with other relevant United Nations entities, including IAEA, WHO and ILO, was crucial. The Scientific Committee's online medical and occupational exposure data-collection platform would facilitate such collaborations. UNEP should address the administrative challenges faced by the Scientific Committee, and Member States should facilitate the appointment of that body's Secretary by ensuring adequate resources and increased voluntary contributions to its Trust Fund. He welcomed its ongoing initiatives to promote the dissemination and accessibility of its work, and efforts to streamline publication of its reports, including on its website. While adopting a procedure to increase the membership of the Scientific Committee would be beneficial, discussions on that matter must not deflect attention from substantive work.

33. **Mr. Charters** (Observer for the Holy See) said that the nuclear accidents in Chernobyl and Fukushima were reminders that the use of nuclear energy sometimes entailed severe risks. The international community must therefore take great precautions in using it for peaceful purposes. The Scientific Committee's analyses could also be used to assess the radiological impact of nuclear weapons, particularly on cities. The deaths and injuries sustained from ionizing-radiation exposure in Hiroshima and Nagasaki must remain the only such casualties caused by nuclear weapons. His delegation looked forward to the Fukushima disaster update in order to learn more about the long-term effects of radiation exposure, and welcomed the Scientific Committee's close collaboration with IAEA, WHO and ILO in providing the international community with new data on radiation's effects on humans and the environment. While the international community had initially underestimated ionizing radiation's effects in the peaceful use of nuclear energy, the Scientific Committee's work had bolstered current understanding of its effects.

34. **Ms. Khan** (World Health Organization (WHO)) said that her organization relied on Scientific Committee radiation-risk data to inform its standard-setting, policy positions, guidance, and research priorities for the protection of patients, workers and the public. WHO had cooperated with the Scientific Committee since the foundation of that body, in the fields of medical, occupational and public exposure to ionizing radiation, and commended the Scientific Committee for providing reliable information on the sources, levels and effects on humans of exposure to ionizing radiation, and looked forward to continuing their collaboration.

35. **Ms. Brown** (International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)) said that her organization was required by its Statute to "establish or adopt... standards of safety for protection of health and minimization of danger to life and property". Working closely with the Scientific Committee helped IAEA to ensure that its own safety standards were soundly based on scientific principles and internationally peer-reviewed scientific findings, as those standards served as a global reference for protecting people and the environment and thereby contributed to harmonizing a high level of safety worldwide.

*Draft resolution [A/C.4/73/L.9](#): Effects of atomic radiation*

36. **The Chair** drew attention to the statement of programme budget implications contained in [A/C.4/73/L.13](#).

37. **Mr. Vanmarcke** (Belgium), introducing the draft resolution, said that it mainly proposed a clearly-defined procedure for future increases in Scientific Committee membership. Six new States members had been designated in the most recent increase in 2011, followed in 2017 by four countries designating scientist-observers prior to full membership in 2021. The proposed procedure, hammered out during two years of consultations in Vienna, struck a delicate balance between the principle of equitable geographical distribution and the need to ensure the effectiveness and quality of the Scientific Committee's work.

38. The text also noted with concern the delay by UNEP in selecting the Secretary of the Scientific Committee and the challenging relationship between the two bodies. The high number of sponsors reflected the widespread support for the embattled Scientific Committee. He hoped that the draft resolution, which gave the Scientific Committee a mandate for its important work in the coming year, would be adopted by consensus.

39. **Ms. Sharma** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and



Herzegovina, Brazil, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Slovakia, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

40. **The Chair** drew attention to the proposed amendment to draft resolution [A/C.4/73/L.9](#), contained in [A/C.4/73/L.12](#).

41. **Mr. Wagner** (United States of America), introducing the draft amendment, said that his Government would continue to support and participate in the Scientific Committee's valuable work. However, his delegation believed that the language regarding the criteria for new members of the Scientific Committee was insufficient. While it was important to establish criteria for the experts nominated by Member States to serve on that body, the record of those Member States in terms of their support for the Organization's overall mission must also be taken into account. The amendment reminded Member States, when voting to appoint members of the Scientific Committee, to evaluate the adherence of the nominating Member State to the principles of Articles I and II of the Charter of the United Nations in support of international peace and security. The amendment was not controversial and did not prejudice the work of the Scientific Committee. Delegations should be able to support a straightforward reference to the Charter, based on the belief that any country seeking Scientific Committee membership must uphold the aims of the Organization.

42. **The Chair** said that the proposed amendment had no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested on the proposed amendment.

*Statements made in explanation of vote before the voting*

43. **Mr. Bachman** (Israel) said that his delegation supported the draft amendment.

44. **Mr. Misra** (India) said that draft resolution [A/C.4/73/L.9](#) provided for any interested Member State to join the Scientific Committee in a transparent manner, if the country in question had demonstrated the scientific potential to contribute to that body's work. Any further criteria for membership in a fundamentally technical body would introduce unnecessary complexity and subjectivity into the decision-making process. As a founding member of the Scientific Committee, India fully supported the existing approach of making scientific potential the sole criterion for membership, and would therefore vote against the proposed amendment and in favour of the draft resolution in its current form.

45. **Mr. Soemirat** (Indonesia) said that the proposed amendment to draft resolution [A/C.4/73/L.9](#) risked upsetting the well-crafted and painstakingly-negotiated balance struck in the draft resolution. While his delegation was a strong proponent of the Charter of the United Nations and its spirit of multilateralism, citing the Charter in respect of a particular paragraph in the draft resolution might give the false impression that the remainder of the resolution was not based on the Charter. Moreover, as time constraints had prevented delegations from properly considering the amendment, his delegation would therefore abstain from voting on the draft amendment.

46. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment to draft resolution [A/C.4/73/L.9](#), contained in document [A/C.4/73/L.12](#).*

*In favour:*

Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Israel, Peru, Ukraine, United States of America.

*Against:*

Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Zimbabwe.

*Abstaining:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda,

United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

47. *The proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.4/73/L.9, contained in document A/C.4/73/L.12, was rejected by 17 votes to 7, with 114 abstentions.*

48. **Mr. Nguyen Nam Duong** (Viet Nam) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the amendment to the draft resolution because it believed that Member States should work towards consensus on the draft resolution itself. Viet Nam favoured expanding Scientific Committee membership to achieve equitable geographic representation in its ranks, and further emphasized the importance of enhancing developing countries' capacities regarding the effects of atomic radiation, and of narrowing the technological and knowledge gap between developed and developing countries in that area.

49. **Mr. Khaldi** (Algeria) said that his delegation had voted against the proposed amendment to the draft resolution because it believed that the annual resolution on the effects of atomic radiation was strictly technical and scientific in nature. As such, the resolution did not extend to issues beyond the Scientific Committee's mandate, so as not to hinder that body's mission and activities. Furthermore, the draft resolution had been drafted and negotiated in Vienna, the appropriate forum for that process. Algeria would spare no effort to strengthen its activities in and research on the vital issues under the purview of the Scientific Committee.

50. **Mr. Sahraei** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the Scientific Committee should be able to benefit from the contribution and knowledge of all countries, particularly those countries interested in participating in its work. No political, financial or logistical justification or pretext should prevent those countries from joining the Scientific Committee. In order to ensure a broader representation of Member States, including developing countries, which were seriously underrepresented, his delegation urged that body to abide by the principle of equitable geographical distribution in its composition.

51. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.4/73/L.9, and said that a recorded vote had been requested on paragraph 21(e) of the draft resolution.

52. **Mr. Wagner** (United States of America) said that he had requested a recorded vote on paragraph 21(e) of the draft resolution because it was vital that the records of Member States in support of the United Nations mission of maintaining international peace and security be taken into account when appointing new members to

the Scientific Committee. As the language in paragraph 21(e) was insufficient in that regard, he urged all delegations to vote against it.

53. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 21(e) of draft resolution A/C.4/73/L.9.*

*In favour:*

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

*Against:*

Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:*

Honduras, Peru, Sudan, Togo.

54. *Paragraph 21(e) of draft resolution A/C.4/73/L.9 was adopted by 136 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

55. *Draft resolution A/C.4/73/L.9 was adopted.*



56. **Mr. Wagner** (United States of America) said that the United States had joined consensus on the overall text in order to demonstrate its support for the work of the Scientific Committee, of which it was a founding member. However, his delegation had been forced to dissociate itself from the language of paragraph 21(e) regarding criteria for Scientific Committee membership, as that language was insufficient and did not adequately acknowledge that Member States that undermined regional security and United Nations objectives must not be part of the Scientific Committee.

57. **Ms. Oku** (Japan) said that because it attached great importance to the work of the Scientific Committee, her delegation had joined consensus on and sponsored the draft resolution. While Japan supported the enhancement of that body, it was disappointed that the Committee had been unable to identify the resources necessary to absorb the additional reclassification costs entailed thereby. Her delegation hoped that efforts to seek absorption of the additional cost within existing resources would continue when the matter was referred to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly.

*The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.*