

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION  
*Official Records\**

FIRST COMMITTEE  
40th meeting  
held on  
Monday, 23 November 1981  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

---

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 40TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 128 AND 135 (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

---

\* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

**Distr. GENERAL**  
A/C.1/36/PV.40  
29 December 1981

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 39 TO 56, 120, AND 135 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14/Rev.1. This draft resolution is related to agenda item 51 F. "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. nuclear weapons in all aspects". The draft resolution has 12 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the thirty-fifth meeting of the First Committee on 19 November. The sponsors are Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and Romania.

Before beginning the voting procedure, I should like to call on the representative of the German Democratic Republic, who wishes to make an oral change.

Mr. KRUEZSCH (German Democratic Republic): My delegation has had some contact with other delegations concerning the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.14/Rev.1. As a result of our contacts, I must propose two minor changes, which are very simple and could, I think, therefore be announced orally.

The first change concerns page 2 of the draft resolution, the third paragraph of the preamble, which reads: "Deeply concerned about intentions to gain strategic superiority and to resort first to the use of nuclear weapons, which will inevitably lead to an all-out nuclear catastrophe .

That paragraph should be deleted. That is the first slight change.

(Mr. Krutzsch, German Democratic Republic)

The second change is in the third line of operative paragraph 4, where the word "possible" should be deleted.

Those two proposed changes are the result of consultations. As far as the preambular paragraph is concerned we think we can go along with the proposal since its content is included in other resolutions.

As far as the other change is concerned, we think it is of a purely editorial character and needs no further comment.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14/Rev.1, as orally revised by the representative of the German Democratic Republic. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Greece, Israel, Mali, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Somalia,  
United Republic of Cameroon, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by  
23 votes to 17, with 8 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their vote after the voting.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria has consistently stressed the great importance and urgency of nuclear disarmament. In view of the present acceleration of the nuclear-arms race and the growing threat of the destabilization of the balance of détente, all approaches need to be explored that could lead to progress in this area.

The Committee on Disarmament, as the only negotiating body of the United Nations on disarmament matters, is the logical forum for negotiations on nuclear disarmament. The Austrian delegation therefore finds itself in agreement with the basic thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14/Rev.1. It would indeed welcome the establishment of a working group of the Committee on Disarmament to begin multilateral deliberations on the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and nuclear disarmament.

Unfortunately, the preambular part of the draft resolution, even in its newly revised form, is burdened by a number of rather sweeping and unbalanced elements concerning the strategic doctrines and intentions of nuclear-weapon States. The Austrian delegation has serious reservations concerning these paragraphs.

In view of our support for the main content of the operative part of the draft resolution, we have nevertheless cast a positive vote.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14, Rev.1, just adopted. We did so because in our view nuclear weapons pose the gravest danger to mankind and because we believe that the ongoing efforts to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race should be intensified. We also believe that further aspects of the nuclear-arms build-up should be brought within the scope of negotiations, including, in particular, the nuclear-arms build-up in Europe.

---

\* Subsequently, the delegations of Cyprus, Kenya, Kuwait, Malta and Senegal advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

It is of particularly grave concern that the nuclear-arms race seems to be assuming new dimensions technologically, conceptually and geographically.

With regard to the points dealt with in the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution, Finland rejects all concepts of limited nuclear war and our positive vote should be considered as an expression of a deep conviction that all doctrines -- I repeat -- all doctrines which might bring nearer the possibility of a nuclear war are viewed by my country with gravest concern. That is why we would have preferred more general formulations in the fifth, sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) (interpretation from French): Belgium voted against draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14/Rev.1. The document presents the problem of nuclear weapons unilaterally. It is based on a polemical spirit which cannot make a positive contribution to our work. We note with regret, in particular, that the principles of our Charter, which condemn the threat or use of force in international relations, and confirm just as solemnly the right to self-defence of States, are not mentioned in the preamble to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14/Rev.1. A reference to them would have been more relevant than references to so-called new doctrines on the use of nuclear weapons. As many delegations mentioned in the general debate, the doctrine of one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution is and remains the use of nuclear weapons at whatever level.

The seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs are only a polemical affirmation, which is particularly paradoxical considering that one of the co-sponsors is the only country to have pursued strategic superiority through the establishment of new nuclear-weapon systems during the period under consideration.

Belgium still considers that the Committee on Disarmament must determine its own working methods. At its 1981 session that Committee took decisions on the appropriate procedures for the thorough consideration of the question of the cessation of the nuclear arms race and of nuclear disarmament. We would not object to the Committee's continuing its work within that framework in 1982. However, we do not believe that it is appropriate at this stage to consider creating a working group on this question.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14/Rev.1. However, I wish to make the following explanation of vote.

Sweden has in principle supported the initiative in the Committee on Disarmament of seven socialist States concerning negotiations on nuclear disarmament, as set out in document CD/4.

The Swedish delegation has also contributed to efforts in the Committee on Disarmament to establish an appropriate framework for the initiation of negotiations under that Committee's agenda item entitled "Nuclear weapons in

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

all aspects". In this context it is obvious that the relative qualitative and quantitative importance of the existing arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States must be taken into account. Consequently, Sweden attaches great importance to the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, where the particular responsibility of the major nuclear-weapon States is emphasized.

The Swedish delegation appreciates that the seventh preambular paragraph has been removed. With regard to the fifth and sixth preambular paragraphs, I have been instructed to emphasize that Sweden reacts against all formal doctrines, as well as against all other measures taken by the nuclear-weapon States in terms of doctrines and weapons development and deployment, which are apt to make them more likely to resort to the use of such weapons in the event of war.

However, one-sided descriptions of these complex matters are of little value in promoting the cause of nuclear disarmament. The Swedish delegation would have preferred an accurate and balanced description of the nuclear postures and preparations of both parties.

The CHAIRMAN: We have concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14/Rev.1.

We turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.24, which relates to agenda item 51, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". The draft resolution is entitled "Status of multilateral disarmament agreements". It was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 32nd meeting of this Committee on 17 November.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote is taken.

Mr. YANG Hushan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution says that the participation of as many States as possible in the multilateral disarmament agreements concluded so far is of special importance to the attainment of their objectives.

I think that everyone is very clear about China's position. We have different views regarding certain existing disarmament conventions and agreements, therefore we have not participated in them. Accordingly the Chinese delegation cannot agree with draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.24. Therefore, we shall not participate in the vote on it.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.24. Despite the reference to paragraph 40 of the Final Document the draft resolution does not take into full account the sovereign right of every State to adhere or not to adhere to international agreements. Furthermore, the draft resolution deals only with the quantitative aspect of participation in such agreements and leaves aside the much more important aspect of the absence of compliance by the nuclear-weapon Powers with provisions on nuclear disarmament contained in agreements to which they have subscribed.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation is a party to all the multilateral disarmament agreements referred to in paragraph 1, with one exception, the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques (ENMOD). We shall vote in favour of this draft resolution because in paragraph 1 the draft resolution reaffirms the importance of the provisions concerning the question of the universality of multilateral disarmament agreements contained in the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and - this is the most important part - in particular paragraph 40. Paragraph 40 says:

"When multilateral agreements in the field of disarmament are negotiated, every effort should be made to ensure that they are universally acceptable." (A/S-10/4, para.40)

Those who were present in the First Committee in 1976 when the Convention that I have just mentioned was adopted will agree with me, I am sure, that this provision in paragraph 40 was completely overlooked. The position of Mexico concerning that Convention remains exactly as it was when we explained the negative vote which we cast on that earlier occasion.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.24.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Angola, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.24 was adopted by 91 votes to none, with 22 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): India's abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.24 is a logical consequence of our well-known position on the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which we consider to be discriminatory and therefore unacceptable.

Mr. DABO (Guinea) (interpretation from French): Our delegation would have abstained if operative paragraph 1 had been put to a separate vote. We believe that the States parties to multilateral agreements should, in accordance with past practice, persuade other States to accede to those agreements.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.24.

We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29, relating to agenda item 51 (g), "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session; non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war". This draft resolution has 30 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of India on 17 November at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee. The 30 sponsors are: Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Yemen and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.29. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire and Zambia

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Austria, Finland, Greece, Israel, Sweden

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29 was adopted by 99 votes to 18, with 5 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic): My delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29, which was just adopted. We believe that in the face of the current acute dangers of a nuclear war this proposal is a very timely one. We regard it as especially important that at the second special session devoted to disarmament every effort be made to exclude the use of nuclear weapons. But we have seen that certain States have opposed this project. It is even more incredible that among those which have cast a negative vote are nuclear-weapon States and their closest allies whose co-operation is essential in the endeavour to exclude the danger of a nuclear war.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): My Government attaches the greatest importance to measures aimed at preventing the use of nuclear weapons. In fact, it is vital for the very survival of mankind that such weapons are not used. There is also a logical link between non-use and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons that must be kept in mind.

I wish to recall what was said in paragraph 58 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly (A/S-10/2) on the question of the non-use of nuclear weapons. Deliberations on the matter during that session well illustrated the practical difficulties involved. It is all too evident that effective measures in this field must fully take into account the problems inherent in the existing military doctrines. It is, in fact, necessary to grapple with the concrete reality of nuclear forces and of the doctrines for their possible use, which go deeply into the general military preparations of the leading military Powers, and which concern their conventional forces as well.

It is my Government's firm belief that more resolute efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament are urgently needed. This should be achieved through a process of gradual and balanced reductions of nuclear weapons with the aim of their total elimination. Measures on non-use have their natural place in this context although, unfortunately, it does not seem realistic

(Mr. Lidgard, Sweden)

to expect that prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons can start such a process.

Sweden entirely shares the objectives of this draft resolution. It also shares the opinion that nuclear war most probably would have such effects as to constitute a crime against humanity. As operative paragraph 1 is worded it makes a precise interpretation of the Charter of the United Nations and thus does not seem to be entirely correct from a legal standpoint. In that light, much to our regret we have not found it possible to vote in favour of this draft resolution, since we do not think that a declaration of this kind will fulfil its purpose. Although the Swedish delegation is in strong sympathy with the general aims of this draft resolution, it has reservations of a legal nature against it and it also has some doubt as to whether a declaration of this kind will fulfil its purpose. Therefore, to its regret, my delegation has not been in a position to vote in favour of the draft resolution, but abstained in the voting.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): I do not think it is necessary for me to emphasize the opposition of my delegation to any use of nuclear weapons. Our record on the question is clear. We would consider that any use of such weapons would be disastrous for the world. It is, therefore, with deep regret that my delegation, in line with the position it has taken in the past, felt obliged to vote against the present text. We have done so because of doubts regarding the approach adopted in the resolution, doubts which we have expressed in this forum at previous sessions going back as far as 1961.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33, which is related to agenda item 51, Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session - prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 18 November 1981. The draft resolution has the following 18 sponsors: Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet

(The Chairman)

Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam, Democratic Yemen, Grenada, Mongolia, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Angola, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Sao Tome and Principe and Romania.

I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. YANG Hushan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): China has always advocated the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and opposed the nuclear-arms race carried out by the super-Powers. The neutron bomb is a product of the nuclear-arms race of the super-Powers. This is, of course, something that we oppose.

Some people allege that China is in favour of the manufacture of the neutron bomb. This is a deliberate distortion of the facts and has behind it an ulterior motive. We consider the neutron weapon to be one type of nuclear weapon. The question of its prohibition should naturally be included in negotiations on nuclear disarmament. There is no need, however, to give it separate prominence. It is not difficult to see that the Soviet Union has singled out the question of the prohibition of the neutron weapon based on its own motives. It is afraid that the other side's deployment of the neutron bomb will result in the loss of its own military superiority in the European theatre. It is also worried that its opponent will in future disarmament negotiations be in a more favourable position.

(Mr. Yang Hushan, China)

Moreover, many facts in the past have indicated that the Soviet proposals to oppose or prohibit a particular type of weapon very often are aimed at camouflaging its own development of that type of weapon rather than truly curbing the arms race.

Based on the above considerations, the Chinese delegation will not participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 requests the Committee on Disarmament, inter alia, to embark on negotiations, within an appropriate framework, with a view to prohibiting the intense-radiation weapon, the so-called neutron bomb.

The French delegation expressed its views on this subject at the last session of the Committee on Disarmament, when this proposal was put forward by the delegations of certain Member countries. We would stress once again that the intense-radiation weapon is a nuclear weapon based on the same physical principles as are all weapons of this kind. All nuclear explosions have different effects. Here, an increase in the effects of radiation is accompanied by a decrease in the power of the weapon, from which is derived the well-recognized concept of the essentially defensive nature of the weapon. Because of its nature, it is part of the over-all problems posed by the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament. There is no reason to give it any special treatment and, consequently, to provide for any specific provisions for a convention with regard to it.

The French delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33.

Mr. SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation will abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33. Brazil condemns with equal vigour all manifestations of the current acceleration of the nuclear arms race, which puts in jeopardy the security of all nations, nuclear and non-nuclear alike.

(Mr. Souza e Silva, Brazil)

We believe, however, that it serves no useful purpose to single out in a draft resolution of this kind any particular aspect of the nuclear arms race. My delegation is convinced that urgent steps must be taken to halt or reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects and that the nuclear-weapon Powers should refrain from increasing the size and sophistication of their arsenals far in excess of their security needs.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): The United States wishes to express its strong opposition to this draft resolution as one of the most misguided and hypocritical draft resolutions to come before this Committee.

In this explanation of vote, I wish to present the hard facts, which present a rather stark contrast to the misleading statements contained in this draft resolution.

First, the draft resolution expresses the standard Soviet desire to "contribute to halting the arms race". As such, this would not be objectionable were it not for the relentless Soviet military expansion the unprecedented magnitude of which has forced others to respond in defence of their interests and in defence of their values. Nowhere is this more evident than in the case of the so-called neutron weapon, more accurately called the reduced-blast weapon. The motivation for the United States to begin to assemble this weapon lies, quite simply and quite urgently, in the massive Soviet build-up sustained over many years - a build-up which has turned the European theatre balance against democratic societies. Moreover, the reduced-blast weapon is an anti-tank weapon and purely defensive in purpose, as the representative of France has just mentioned.

Moreover, today the Warsaw Pact forces have expanded their inventory of tanks to some 50,000, as compared to our 11,000 - an advantage of approximately five to one. Such an increase necessitates the modernization of the deterrent forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as well as of our own capability to deter Soviet threats in other theatres.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

Secondly, the draft resolution wishes us to be:

'Aware of the inhumane effects of that weapon, which constitutes a grave threat, particularly for the unprotected civilian population .

This Soviet infusion of moral considerations into foreign policy, and particularly into arms policy, just cannot be taken seriously. None the less, I ask my fellow representatives to consider the morality issue for a moment. Suppose, for a moment, that it were possible to increase the military effectiveness of a battlefield weapon and at the same time to reduce substantially the number of civilians who would be killed by its use just because they were unfortunate enough to live near the area of the conflict. Suppose, for a moment, that the weapon were designed to stop a massive invasion by enemy armour that might otherwise roll in blitzkrieg fashion across democratic Europe and the territory of our principal allies. Suppose, for a moment, that in addition to the weapon's ability to help blunt an invasion of Europe and save thousands of innocent civilian lives, it was safer, had increased range and better security and replaced older weapons on a less than one-for-one basis, so that the total number of weapons would actually decline, would such a weapon be objectionable on moral grounds? Would it deserve to be singled out as inhumane?

This is precisely the case with the reduced-blast weapon. It offers significant improvements in military effectiveness over existing battlefield weapons while, simultaneously, dramatically limiting the damage normally associated with nuclear weapons. With the same radiation effects as current nuclear weapons, it produces greater reduced thermal and blast effects. Consequently, the risk of casualties to civilian populations would be significantly reduced. In addition, the weapons have better accuracy, longer range and more rapid response and improve safety and security. In sum, their production is fully consistent with the United States Government's goal of ensuring the most effective, damage-limiting and credible deterrent possible.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

This is the summary of the facts on reduced-blast weapons. Given these facts, I completely fail to understand the morality argument of this draft resolution, even if it were not made by the Soviet Union, that is, even if the morality argument were not made by the country which has developed and deployed the SS-20 mobile missiles, which even in the most moderate estimate is some 2,000 times more devastating in its explosiveness than the neutron warhead, with the SS-20s designed to strike at populated cities and not at tanks of attacking armies, and even if the morality argument were not made by a country whose own leader, President Leonid Brezhnev, told a group of 12 visiting United States Senators in Moscow in November of 1978 -- that is, three years ago -- that the Soviet Union itself was testing a neutron weapon. We know that the Soviet Union tested this weapon as early as 1978.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

Thirdly, this draft resolution would have us believe that the introduction of neutron weapons "significantly lowers the threshold to nuclear war, thereby increasing the danger of such a war". This argument is patently false. The claim it makes is that the reduced-blast weapon, precisely because it would not entail massive civilian fatalities near the battlefield, is more likely to be used than the weapons it may replace. A logical conclusion of that reasoning is that we should all make our weapons as indiscriminately damaging as possible, so that we would be deterred from using them. That certainly is not the sort of deterrence that will keep the peace.

Surely, the reduced-blast weapon is not designed, nor would its effect be, to make nuclear war more thinkable, but rather to make aggression less so, for the most important characteristic of these weapons is their reduction of the likelihood that, even in a crisis, the Soviets would be tempted to launch an attack on our allies. The weapons thus promise to add to the credibility of our deterrence. Because they would do that, they actually reduce the likelihood that nuclear weapons would ever be used in a European, or any other, conflict.

Fourthly, and finally, this draft resolution conveys the false notion that the reduced-blast weapons are being deployed. The fact is that these weapons will be stockpiled on American territory and not dispersed or deployed. We have no plans at present to deploy these weapons outside of United States territory.

The historical facts of the case should by now be rather clear. When President Carter decided in 1978 to defer production of this reduced-blast weapon, he made it quite plain to everyone that the United States expected similar restraint by the Soviet Union. Instead of reciprocal Soviet restraint, however, we have witnessed the massive Soviet military build-up which I have discussed repeatedly in this Committee. It is that build-up, and not the counter-measures it has provoked, which deserves to be called inhumane. It is that build-up which my delegation and my country sincerely hope can be addressed in the forthcoming arms negotiations with the Soviet Union that President Reagan so fervently desires. As the President stated last week, the United States seeks real reductions in nuclear weapons: real reductions and not just limitation. We are serious and we are sincere, and we hope that others are sincere as well.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving my delegation the opportunity to make this statement in strong opposition to this draft resolution. The vote we take today on this draft resolution cannot be divorced from the serious arms control discussions which will soon be held. We also take this vote as a serious indication of the credibility of this Committee and, indeed, of the United Nations itself. The vote on this draft resolution will help indicate whether this world Organization is to aid the Soviet Union in perpetuating an outrageous propaganda assault, thereby adding another black mark against its reputation, or whether the First Committee and the United Nations are actively to contribute to efforts for true arms reduction, as urged by President Reagan.

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): We are against nuclear arms in all their aspects. This includes the nuclear arms race, whether it be quantitative or qualitative, whether it involves the neutron weapon or whether it involves the SS-20 missile.

We feel that our very serious concern in this regard, which we share with an overwhelming majority of countries, is taken care of in other draft resolutions before the First Committee. I should like to point out in particular: draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13, on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.14, on nuclear weapons in all aspects; and draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29, on non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war.

It is our view that draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 makes an invidious distinction by singling out one particular weapons system, and we will therefore abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

Mr. SYLLA (Senegal) (interpretation from French): My delegation has just voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29 on non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war, a draft resolution in which we ask that the question of an international convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons in all aspects be studied by the appropriate bodies. Since the nuclear neutron weapon mentioned in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 falls within the framework of

(Mr. Sylla, Senegal)

the concerns that motivated our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.29, we see no reason for giving special treatment to one particular category of nuclear weapons. Therefore, my delegation feels itself obliged not to participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33.

Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): We too would like to express our views on the draft resolution which will be soon put to the vote. We support the draft resolution and shall vote in favour of it.

The Soviet Union has consistently favoured, and continues to favour, the exclusion from the arsenals of States of new types of weapons of mass destruction. As everyone knows, it was possible at one time, as a result of the forward-looking and vigorous actions of peace-loving forces, to call a halt to the implementation of plans to deploy in the nuclear neutron weapons in western Europe. Now once again attempts are being made to suspend the sword of Damocles constituted by this weapon particularly over the countries of Europe, and this has given rise to a new, broad wave of protests.

Now why do we want the adoption of a separate resolution banning the neutron weapon? It has been said here that the Soviet Union fears the United States coming into possession of the neutron weapon while the Soviet Union does not possess it. No, it is not that which we fear; it is not that about which we are apprehensive. What we are apprehensive about is a new spiral in the arms race. From the rostrum at the twenty-sixth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, President Brezhnev stated, absolutely clearly, that we will not begin to manufacture this weapon. There is no contradiction between what was said by President Brezhnev this year and what was said here by one of our representatives: we will not begin to manufacture the neutron weapon if it does not come into the possession of other States. We have said that we are ready to conclude an agreement prohibiting the manufacture and deployment of the neutron weapon.

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

What answer did we get? Are talks going on anywhere on prohibiting the nuclear neutron weapons? They are not. Are there any plans for bilateral or trilateral or five-sided talks on prohibiting the nuclear neutron weapon? There are none.

The SS-20 weapon is mentioned. Yes, it is a terrible weapon. But there are other dangerous types of weapon - the Pershing, the cruise missile and others. But negotiations are to start in a week or so on nuclear arms in Europe. We are ready to engage in these negotiations. What we are now calling for is to start negotiations also on prohibiting the nuclear neutron weapon.

Is the United States willing to hold bilateral talks on the matter? It is not. Whom then should we apply to? To the Special Committee Against Apartheid? No, but obviously to the Committee on Disarmament.

We are told we should not single out this particular issue. But we did single out inhumanitarian types of weapons within the framework of conventional weapons. Why could we hold separate talks on booby-traps and mines and not be able to hold talks on nuclear neutron weapons? Where is the logic here? Why could we hold talks on radiological weapons, one of the varieties of new weapons of mass destruction, but cannot have talks on the nuclear weapon? We are told: This must be considered within the framework of discussion of questions of nuclear disarmament. We have no objection, but we want this weapon, which we continue to consider one of the most dangerous - and this is shown by the mass demonstrations against it in Europe and throughout the world - to be discussed, we want negotiations to prohibit it, in the same way as there will be negotiations on medium-range missiles.

As far as concerns the statement of my United States colleague, who put questions to me, I can only hope that he reads The New York Times, which stated yesterday, for example:

(spoke in English)

"The Reagan Administration has told allied Governments in recent days that it expects Soviet-American relations to enter a new phase marked less by polemics and more by concrete discussion of arms control and further issues."

(Mr. Issraelyan, USSR)

(continued in Russian)

The statement of the United States representative demonstrates that he has not yet received new instructions and that he is continuing this unworthy line of polemics in every statement he makes. In conclusion, I only want to say that mankind will be grateful to us if we succeed in prohibiting this type of weapon too, the nuclear neutron weapon which is a weapon of mass destruction.

We shall therefore vote in favour of this draft resolution and we call on everyone also to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote before the voting, we shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burma, Central African Republic, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Lebanon, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 was adopted by 58 votes to 13, with 40 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes after the voting.

Mr. NAMBIAR (India): India's affirmative vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33, which has just been adopted, is in line with our Government's consistent opposition to all nuclear weapons, including neutron weapons.

As far as the question of dealing with this issue in the Committee on Disarmament is concerned, our position is that it is up to that Committee to determine the best means to deal with this subject.

Mr. DJOVIC (Yugoslavia): Yugoslavia has always endeavoured and continues to endeavour most energetically to work for a halt to the nuclear arms race as well as for the complete prohibition and destruction of all nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. It also most resolutely advocates urgent negotiations conducive to the realization of such goals and aspirations to halt the nuclear-arms race and launch the process of nuclear disarmament

Yugoslavia deeply believes that the continuation of the qualitative and quantitative development of nuclear armaments most directly damages the essential interests of the international community in ensuring and promoting peace and security in the world.

(Mr. Djovic, Yugoslavia)

We have had an opportunity on several previous occasions to express our views in regard to the prohibition of neutron weapons. The neutron weapon is one of the nuclear weapons of mass destruction, the prohibition of which in general we most resolutely advocate, as we have already stated.

Therefore, in our opinion, the issue of the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon should be considered and resolved within the over-all problem of the prohibition of nuclear weapons. Otherwise, to single out only one system of nuclear weapons - this time the nuclear neutron weapon - and to demand its separate prohibition might seem that we are reconciled with the existence and further constant sophistication of other systems of nuclear weapons, the use of which would also have inconceivable consequences.

Hence, we cannot support the request contained in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution that the Committee on Disarmament should start without delay negotiations in an appropriate organizational framework with a view to concluding a convention on the prohibition of the production, stockpiling, deployment and use of nuclear neutron weapons.

Those are the basic reasons which motivated my delegation to abstain in the vote on that draft resolution.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria, as a non-nuclear-weapon State is the most heavily armed region of the world, has a vital interest in nuclear disarmament. We are firmly convinced that the goal of the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons can only be reached through a step-by-step process of progressively more important and comprehensive balanced and verifiable agreements on the limitation and reduction of nuclear arsenals. We therefore welcome the decision by the United States and the Soviet Union to open negotiations on theatre nuclear forces and note with satisfaction that both parties seem to be ready for an early resumption of talks on strategic nuclear weapons.

We would also greatly welcome the beginning of negotiations between the nuclear-weapon States on qualitative and quantitative limitations on tactical nuclear weapon arsenals. These are the weapons most likely to be used first in the course of a military conflict in Europe. We are aware that the escalation triggered by the use of tactical nuclear weapons would lead to the destruction of Europe, if not to all-out nuclear war.

We strongly feel, however, that the approach proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 - namely, negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament on a specific convention prohibiting one particular type of tactical nuclear weapon - is not capable of leading to real progress in this area.

The Austrian delegation therefore had to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33.

Mr. FEIN (Netherlands): The Netherlands abstained in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.33 concerning the neutron weapon.

We wish to place on record that our reasons are the following. The Netherlands does not intend to have the neutron weapon stationed on

(Mr. Fein, Netherlands)

Netherlands territory. At the same time, however, it is obvious that the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/36/L.33 is politically inspired. Furthermore, we are in fact not interested in a convention prohibiting this weapon system specifically.

Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt): Egypt abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33. The delegation of Egypt has always called for the total cessation of the nuclear arms race, in both its qualitative and quantitative aspects. Egypt is for the prohibition of all new nuclear weapons of any type. Our abstention, therefore, was based on the following reasons.

First, the draft resolution seeks to single out a particular nuclear weapon. Secondly, we believe it is not practicable for the Committee on Disarmament to address itself to each nuclear weapon on an individual basis. It is our view that the question of the neutron bomb should be discussed together with that of all other nuclear weapons within the framework of the long-awaited working group of the Committee on Disarmament on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament.

Mr. DE LA FUENTE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Peru would have liked to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33, because we believe with the utmost conviction that it is contradictory in principle to oppose international condemnation of those that have decided to manufacture one more instrument of mass destruction, the emergence of which can in no way contribute to international peace and security.

But, unfortunately, my delegation had to abstain because of the mistaken idea conveyed by this draft resolution. To begin to adopt

(Mr. de la Fuente, Peru)

draft resolutions of this type is not methodologically valid because it means singling out one weapon from among the multiplicity of nuclear weapons. For that reason it only contributes to distracting our attention from the essential actions which should be carried out by the international community in order to preserve international peace and security.

Furthermore, my delegation does not understand the more or less humanitarian nature of the manufacturing of a device of mass destruction because, as is well known, my country condemns all processes that contribute to the escalation of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, the mere existence of which in the hands of either of the poles of power is in itself detrimental to the survival of humanity, without any attenuating circumstances.

Finally, the results of the vote make clear the very reduced contribution to the solution of the problem of disarmament of this draft resolution which has just been approved.

Mr. MICHAELSEN (Denmark): The Danish delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 and would like to state the following. The Danish Foreign Minister made the following statement on 9 August of this year:

"The position of the Danish Government as to the production of the neutron weapon is still unchanged, and it goes without saying that Denmark, as part of an area which is free from nuclear weapons, will not accept this weapon on its territory."

He further expressed surprise that it has been felt to be necessary to make that decision at a time when the very important negotiations on theatre nuclear forces in Europe were to be initiated.

(Mr. Michaelsen, Denmark)

The draft resolution just adopted seems to constitute an undisguised attempt to split the Western allies on a very important area of defence policy. In these circumstances, Denmark decided to abstain on the draft resolution.

Mr. SIDIK (Indonesia): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33, entitled, "Prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon". It is the considered policy of the Government of Indonesia to support any draft resolution that attempts to do away with all kinds of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons.

It is also a matter of record that the delegation of Indonesia has always voted in favour of proposals which aim at the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling, deployment and use of such weapons of mass destruction.

The delegation of Indonesia takes the view that the nuclear neutron weapon is a nuclear weapon, and that as such, it is a weapon of mass destruction. Paragraph 47 of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly states:

"Nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind ... It is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons."

(A/S-10/4, para. 47)

As to the means and the modality and procedure by which these nuclear neutron weapons should be considered and negotiated by the Committee on Disarmament, my delegation believes that it would be better left to the discretion of that Committee to decide.

Mr. WRIGHT (Niger) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Niger wishes to explain as briefly as possible why it voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 prohibiting the nuclear neutron weapon.

The Government of Niger pursues a policy of supporting any decision of our Organization aimed at prohibiting nuclear weapons. We believe that nuclear weapons, whether they be termed offensive or defensive, represent the same danger for mankind. We therefore consider that the neutron weapon, which is recognized as a nuclear weapon, presents the same danger as all other kinds of nuclear weapons. That is why we support this draft resolution.

But I would go further. It has been said here that the neutron weapon would not be stationed outside the country producing it. But that statement hardly provides us with the necessary guarantees that this weapon will not proliferate beyond the territory in question. We know that the nuclear weapon appeared in 1945 and since then has multiplied practically ad infinitum. There has been both horizontal and vertical proliferation since that time. That is why we supported draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33, whose purpose is in fact to prohibit the development, deployment and stockpiling of that weapon anywhere.

Mr. BALETA (Albania) (interpretation from French): In explanation of our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33, the delegation of Albania would like to state the following.

The invention, production and stockpiling of neutron weapons represent another extremely dangerous step in the unbridled arms race and the endless search to perfect nuclear weapons engaged in by the super-Powers - the United States and the Soviet Union. We have always condemned and continue to condemn those activities of the two super-Powers. We condemn any effort, whether by the United States or by the Soviet Union, to perfect nuclear weapons in general, and the neutron weapon in particular.

Our delegation did not take part in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 because we believe that it was submitted in the context of recent attempts to use neutron weapons as part of polemics or in bargaining which has nothing to do with real nuclear disarmament. In addition, our attitude towards that draft resolution is determined by our general position of not taking part in

(Mr. Baleta, Albania)

the voting on most disarmament draft resolutions. My delegation has on other occasions already explained why we have taken this position and we will not repeat that explanation here now in detail.

Regarding the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon, we wish merely to say that neither draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 nor the conclusion of a convention on the subject covered by it, as is requested, would serve any useful purpose since neutron weapons are already part of the nuclear arsenals of the super-Powers. As is well known, the United States has already openly declared that it has not only produced the nuclear neutron weapon, but is producing it in large quantities and has every intention of stockpiling it on the territory of other countries. The Soviet Union, too, has declared that it is capable of producing the neutron bomb and that it will produce it in order to counterbalance that of the United States. The two super-Powers, it is clear, have already chosen this weapon and their race in this regard has already begun.

Experience shows that resolutions or conventions calling for a prohibition of the production or stockpiling of new weapons has never stopped the imperialist super-Powers from pursuing their plans. We recently heard language by the super Powers engaging in blackmail and pressure here in this Committee to camouflage their dangerous intentions. For those reasons, the delegation of Albania did not participate in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): We voted for this draft resolution for many reasons. The first one is that we are on principle against the production of nuclear weapons and we could not remain indifferent to a draft resolution that called for the cessation of nuclear weapon production. Secondly, it cannot be considered that this weapon is singled out and that therefore we are indifferent to the other weapons; not at all, because we have repeatedly adopted resolutions against the production of nuclear weapons and we cannot be misunderstood as wanting only this weapon not to be produced.

Thirdly, and most important, this is a new weapon. So to the existing variety of nuclear weapons there is a new one to be added now, and we could not remain indifferent to the addition of a new weapon to the existing arsenal of weapons having a fifteen-times overkill capacity.

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Furthermore, if one side adds this weapon surely the other side will also produce it. So we would be encouraging the arms race, against which we stand.

For all these and other reasons, we are against the production of any nuclear weapons, and in particular against adding a new one to the existing range of nuclear weapons.

Mrs. da SILVA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation has always been in favour of prohibiting all nuclear weapons. We consider that negotiations pertaining to the prohibition of a certain type of nuclear weapon, such as neutron weapons, should take place within the context of negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Committee on Disarmament.

For these reasons, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): Sweden abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33 and I wish to explain why my delegation took that position in this matter.

The Swedish Government has on a number of occasions strongly condemned plans to develop and produce neutron weapons ever since such plans became known. It has emphasized the grave risks of lowering the nuclear threshold which these weapons entail. My Government's position remains unchanged as far as such weapons are concerned. The development, testing and production of all nuclear weapons, including the neutron weapon, should be prohibited. As a matter of principle the Swedish Government therefore has reservations against the idea of prohibiting one specific nuclear weapon while omitting other nuclear weapons in the same category from the prohibition.

I should like to add that my delegation has noted that operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution does not envisage the prohibition of the development of the neutron weapon.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I regret to have to contribute to a prolongation of this long series of explanations of vote with one more statement. Such statements, being very brief, are often made in simplistic terms about complex issues. This is a typical case.

Given those constraints, however, I should like to make some comments to explain my delegation's position on the subject. Our task is easier because our position is similar to the positions taken by many delegations.

My delegation has said many times that we are completely opposed to any kind of nuclear weapon. However, we abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33, for the reason so often stated already, that, whatever the special features of the neutron weapon, it is basically no different from other nuclear weapons. Consequently, at least in my delegation's opinion, this type of weapon does not deserve treatment different from that of other weapons. They should all be prohibited, within the framework of the negotiations being pursued in the Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Successive Irish Governments have been deeply concerned about the continuing arms race and most particularly its nuclear aspect. We hope that those States which are actually developing, or are in a position to develop, the particular nuclear weapons which are the subject of the draft resolution will be able to agree to halt their development.

At the same time, in our view a comprehensive approach to nuclear disarmament is what is required. For that reason, earlier today we supported a resolution calling for negotiations on the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and on the gradual reduction of stockpiles, up to and including their total destruction.

Like the Swedish and Austrian delegations, whose representatives have already spoken, my delegation believes that it is extremely difficult to isolate one particular type of nuclear weapon and deal with it separately from all other types of nuclear weapons. The various nuclear weapons and weapons systems are interrelated, and in our view each should be dealt with in the general context.

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

Although we can share many of the concerns which have prompted this draft resolution, we have been unable to give it our full support, because we consider that this approach, which singles out one aspect of the complex of nuclear weapons, is unlikely to lead to the result we desire.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now concluded our action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.33.

We move now to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.47, which relates to agenda item 51 (c), entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". The draft resolution is entitled "Programme of research and studies on disarmament". It has five sponsors, and was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 37th meeting of the First Committee on 20 November. The five sponsors are Argentina, Canada, Pakistan, Philippines and Poland, who have suggested that it be adopted without vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.47 without vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.47 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: If no delegation wishes to explain its position, we have concluded our action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.47.

We now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.12, which relates to agenda item 51, entitled "Review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session". The resolution is entitled "International co-operation for disarmament". It has 28 sponsors, and was introduced by the representative of Czechoslovakia at the 31st meeting of the First Committee on 16 November. The 28 sponsors are: Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mali, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Viet Nam, Yemen, Congo, Niger and Sao Tomé and Príncipe.

(The Chairman)

A recorded vote has been requested.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote is taken.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I am speaking on behalf of the ten Member States of the European Community. Members of the Ten abstained on General Assembly resolution 34/88, which first brought this topic to the attention of the General Assembly. The Ten believe that the content of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.12 adds nothing to the principles already enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations or to the carefully worked out formulations in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

We see no need for the General Assembly to consider the elaboration of a further set of principles which would offer no real improvement in the chances of our achieving greater success in the negotiation of specific, balanced and verifiable arms control agreements. The Ten have therefore decided to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.12.

Mr. YANG Hushan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation is in favour of the concept of strengthening co-operation amongst countries of the world to promote progress in disarmament. In our view, certain ideas proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.12, such as calling upon States to carry out disarmament negotiations with full responsibility and in the spirit of co-operation, are of positive significance. However, the draft resolution contains certain ambiguous formulations - for example, the words:

"not to hinder possible progress in negotiations on disarmament by the discussion of unrelated issues".

(Mr. Yang Hushan, China)

What does the reference to so-called unrelated issues mean? The meaning of this is not clear and this could easily cause misunderstanding. Over a long period of time at disarmament meetings we have heard people say that they consider that the incidents of super-Power aggression on the international scene have nothing to do with disarmament negotiations. We cannot agree with such a statement. In fact, it is precisely these incidents of aggression which undermine the international climate of trust necessary for disarmament negotiations. It is not only natural but also necessary to bring up these questions at disarmament meetings, so to point out the real reasons for disarmament negotiations having been hampered is, of course, conducive to the promotion of negotiations.

On the basis of the aforementioned views and considerations, the Chinese delegation has decided not to participate in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.12.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/36/L.12.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian

Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.12 was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan): My delegation voted in favour of this draft resolution, but I should like to take this opportunity to state that we have important difficulties with the concept behind the third preambular paragraph. It reads: "Deeply concerned over the growing danger of a new round of the arms race which would seriously aggravate international stability ...". In our view it is the increasing use of force which is leading to international tensions and one manifestation of the international tension is the arms race. However, since we are in agreement with the basic thrust of the operative paragraphs of this draft resolution, we voted in favour of it.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.12 for the reasons for which we abstained in 1979 on the draft resolution which was adopted as resolution 34/88 and which is mentioned in this draft resolution. I shall therefore not repeat those reasons.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): Two years ago my delegation had ample opportunity to explain some strong misgivings we had as far as certain elements in the Declaration on International Co-operation for Disarmament were concerned. Given the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.12 is heavily based on the said Declaration, especially in operative paragraph 1, my delegation consequently abstained in that vote.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey): Our views on the substance of the Declaration referred to in this draft resolution were expressly stated in detail at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly when the said Declaration was adopted. Those reservations as explained then remain valid for us now as well. Consequently, although Turkey is among the countries that have on all occasions demonstrated full dedication to international efforts to achieve co-operation in the very broad field of disarmament, my delegation has felt itself obliged to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.12.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13, which is related to agenda item 48, Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic at the 35th meeting of the First Committee on 19 November 1981. The draft resolution had 28 sponsors, as follows: Afghanistan, Benin, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Hungary, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam, Yemen, Jordan, Angola, Niger, Sao Tome and Principe and Burundi.

I now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): On behalf of the ten member States of the European Community I wish to make the following comments on the draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13 before us entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons".

As the Committee is aware, in 1978 two separate resolutions were presented on this subject. In that year the member States of the European Community voted for resolution 33/66 A and abstained on resolution 33/66 B. Both resolutions covered similar ground but differed in the details of their approach to the solution of the problems involved. The voting reflected those differences.

During the present session, as in 1979 and 1980, the sponsors of resolution 33/66 A have not submitted their own text to this Committee. We again believe however that the approach adopted in the present draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13 is not a realistic one.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

Clearly there is no dispute within this Committee on the need to prohibit any and all new weapons of mass destruction which are identified as such. The point at issue is simply the choice of means in seeking most efficiently to pursue that objective. The Ten, together with many other States, believe that new weapons of mass destruction and their technologies, if they are to be effectively and permanently prohibited, must be the subject of specific verifiable agreements. This fundamental consideration, however, has not received the necessary emphasis in the present draft resolution. Moreover, the special importance given in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution to the negotiation of a single blanket prohibition on the development and manufacture of new weapons of mass destruction does not appear in our view to be warranted.

A comprehensive agreement could not in the first place adequately distinguish between peaceful research without any military implication, and areas of research which could eventually be given military application. Its verification would furthermore require detailed international supervision of the many and various civil research activities in many States with a view to determining whether particular research areas could lead to the development of new weapons of mass destruction. This is neither feasible nor realistic. Not least, those engaged in peaceful academic or industrial research expect that their efforts should not be impeded. And in the absence of verification - and it is generally accepted that a comprehensive prohibition could not be verified - confidence and certainty in the long term would be traded for optimism in the short term and the door would be opened to suspicion, recrimination and divisive debate unhelpful to larger disarmament objectives.

While not believing that a generalized prohibition offers a practical solution to the problems involved, the Ten fully recognize the need to continue international discussions with a view to identifying potentially dangerous developments in science and technology so that early necessary controls can be introduced. In July of this year informal discussions took place in the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva between qualified governmental experts, and might be followed up in the future. Such further discussions may produce results leading to the conclusion of individual verifiable agreements where dangerous new weapons possibilities are seen to emerge.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

The Ten believe that the definition established by the Commission for Conventional Armaments of 5 August 1948 continues to provide a valid ground for the negotiation of individual agreements. According to this definition weapons of mass destruction are: (a) atomic explosive weapons; (b) radioactive material weapons and lethal chemical and biological weapons; (c) any weapons developed in future which might have characteristics comparable in their destructive effect to those of the atomic bomb or other weapons mentioned above.

This appears to us to be the most realistic, practical and productive approach to the problems involved. Each weapon and weapon system has its own particular characteristics which require detailed separate negotiation. Only through the conclusion of separate agreements rather than a blanket prohibition can we ensure that adequate verification arrangements are established so that all prohibitions will be fully effective and durable.

Only through the conclusion of individual agreements dealing with specific weapon systems, rather than a global convention affecting many branches of science and technology, can we adequately meet the need to distinguish between peaceful research and weapons development. We firmly believe that such agreements should be designed and implemented in such a way and manner as to avoid hampering the economic or technological development of States parties to those agreements. We do not, however, insist that a resolution such as the present one should emphasize only this particular approach to the problem. Indeed, we would have hoped in the interests of establishing a basis of consensus that a formulation which sought to keep all possibilities open and avoided giving priority to one approach over another would have been provided.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

This year's draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13, in addition to proposing a comprehensive agreement, suggests that the States permanent members of the Security Council as well as other militarily significant States make solemn declarations identical in nature in which abstention from the creation of new types of weapons of mass destruction is pledged and which declarations would thereafter be approved by a decision of the Security Council.

Given the approach to this problem I have already described, the Ten differ with the sponsors of this draft resolution on this score also. We do not consider the proposed action in and by the Security Council as a first step towards the conclusion of a comprehensive agreement or in itself as an effective measure to prevent the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles and achievements, as in paragraph 77 of the Final Document.

It is because the Ten fully support the need for effective and lasting prohibition of new weapons of mass destruction that they cannot endorse the approach of the present draft resolution and will therefore abstain.

Mr. TAVARES NUNES (Portugal) (interpretation from French): My delegation abstained last year in the vote on resolution 35/149, on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons.

Today we have before us draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13, which deals with the same subject. Unfortunately, my delegation will have to abstain this time as well, for the same reasons which motivated its vote at the thirty-fifth session.

Among these reasons, three are in our view of particular importance. As in the past, the draft resolution makes no reference to the whole problem of verification. My delegation feels that any measure prohibiting the production and development of any kind of weapon should provide for appropriate verification machinery.

(Mr. Tavares Nunes, Portugal)

Furthermore, this draft resolution recommends the preparation of a draft comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. My delegation considers that the objectives of disarmament would be better served by concrete measures relating to well-defined and clearly-identified weapons or types of weapons.

We note in addition that the concept of weapons of mass destruction has not yet been sufficiently defined to be accepted by all States. The draft resolutions before us are rendered ambiguous by this inadequacy.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): I shall be brief. I merely wished to point out that this draft resolution is another in a seemingly endless series of propagandist ploys, and we shall abstain on this particular draft resolution. But this should not mask the facts of what has been going on in the world over recent years with regard to these types of weapons.

I would point out to the First Committee that since the signing of the SALT I agreement in 1969 the Soviet strategic offensive threat against the United States, according to various measurements, has increased seven-fold, the Soviets have flight-tested or deployed 11 new or modified land-based missiles and seven new or modified submarine-launched ballistic missiles. The Soviet Union has developed and deployed its fourth generation of land-based missiles, which are capable of threatening our land-based systems, as well as its Backfire bomber and its modernized strategic defence system, which includes a major civil-defence programme.

To show the massiveness of this drive, one United States research institute, the Rand Corporation, estimates that from 1973 to 1980 the Soviet Union out-spent the United States in the strategic nuclear realm alone by some \$100 billion. Had the United States allocated that staggering sum, which, again, is the difference between Soviet and American strategic nuclear spending,

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

Rand believes the United States could have funded:

"... the entire B-1 program; the baseline MX program (missiles and shelters); all of the currently programmed Trident submarines and missiles; the roughly, 7,000 XM-1 tanks we now plan to acquire, together with a matching number of infantry fighting-vehicles, and the once-planned buy of AMBT's to provide them with intra-theater mobility; and still left enough money over to buy all the F-14's, F-15's, F-16's, F-18's and A-10's now planned for Air Force and Navy tactical air modernization."

Hence, the United States could have, in short, modernized all three legs of the strategic triad at once, strengthened the United States ground combat capability and modernized its Air Force and naval tactical power.

I would just remind the Committee once again that the signs indicate that momentum has been built for a continuing build-up in this area. According to various evaluations, the Soviet military is increasing its share of highly skilled labour, even though perhaps more than half of its research-and-development scientists and engineers are already thought to be working on military projects. Their impressive efforts, marshalling increasingly scarce roubles, seem to signal a wish to persist in acquiring larger and more capable military forces.

Such activities also propel the Soviet society and economy into additional military endeavours, thereby feeding arms-related institutions and spawning military-oriented activities that over time gain a momentum of their own.

The draft resolution before us is one thing of course, and the facts of what happens in the real world are something else again.

Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): By way of explanation of our vote in connexion with draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13, I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that this draft resolution speaks not only of

(Mr. Gurinovich, Byelorussian SSR)

a comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, as stated in operative paragraph 1. That paragraph also mentions that agreements should be prepared on particular types of such weapons, that is, account is fully taken of the concern expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

With regard to the problem of verification, that will of course be discussed and resolved when the problem is settled in substance.

And finally, the representative of the United States in his statements tangles the new with the old and keeps on introducing new elements into the discussions of this Committee as compared with the earlier efforts of this body. It is not worth commenting on them since they are not relevant to the question under discussion.

Mr. ZAIMI (Morocco) (interpretation from French): I did not wish to interrupt the Foreign Minister of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, but I did not understand within what framework he was speaking, because the Byelorussian SSR is a sponsor of the draft resolution before us. Could you explain to my delegation within what framework the Foreign Minister was speaking?

The CHAIRMAN: I take note of the observation of the representative of Morocco and will return to the point later.

We shall now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13 was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 27 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

Mr. OKAWA (Japan): My delegation would like to reiterate its view that it is not appropriate for the Committee on Disarmament, as requested in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13, to negotiate with a view to preparing a draft comprehensive agreement on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, because the scope of such an agreement, including the weapons that it would encompass, is far from clear, and because it would present difficulties, for example, in verification.

Furthermore, in the view of my delegation, the approach in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which calls upon the States permanent members of the Security Council as well as upon other militarily significant States to make declarations, identical in substance, concerning the refusal to create new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, seems to be unrealistic for the same reasons as I have just mentioned. We still consider it more appropriate at this stage to keep the question under review in the Committee on Disarmament so that negotiations can be started whenever specific new weapons of mass destruction which can be identified come into the picture.

In view of these considerations, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): India voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13 because it supports all efforts directed towards the prohibition of the development of new weapons of mass destruction.

It is our firm belief that the achievements of science and technology should be used for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind. Our affirmative vote, however, should not be construed as support for the setting up of an ad hoc working group of governmental experts under the aegis of the Committee on Disarmament. My delegation believes that it is up to the Committee itself to decide, through mutual agreement, on the best means for dealing with the question.

We also have reservations about the relevance of an interim measure such as that outlined in paragraph 3 of the draft resolution. The history of interim or partial solutions in the field of disarmament has not been a particularly happy one. It is our conviction that the Committee on Disarmament should negotiate practical and mutually binding measures on this item, and that we should not be sidetracked into taking interim steps of dubious value.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): The Swedish delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13, and I wish now to explain the reason for this. Sweden is deeply convinced of the importance of preventing at an early stage the use of scientific and technological achievements for the development of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

My Government is therefore strongly in favour of the main objective of the draft resolution, which is to take effective steps to ensure that new major scientific discoveries be used solely for peaceful purposes.

With respect to operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, I wish to recall the doubts Sweden has expressed on numerous occasions about the idea of a general prohibition in this field.

My delegation notes with satisfaction that draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13 requests the Committee on Disarmament to prepare specific agreements on particular types of new weapons of mass destruction. Sweden will continue to support all efforts to reach specific agreements on individual types of new weapons of mass destruction that may be identified and, not least, to exert every effort to find practical solutions concerning the disarmament aspects of scientific and technological advances in the military field.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): This morning, when the First Committee voted on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.10, my delegation had the opportunity to express its grave doubts about the value of non-verifiable unilateral declarations as a source of significant commitments in the field of disarmament. The same is true with regard to measures which the Security Council might adopt on this basis. For this reason, my delegation, despite its having voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13, would like to state that if there had been a separate vote on paragraph 3 of the draft resolution, which refers to such unilateral declarations, my delegation would have abstained.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The Finnish delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.13 because we believe that all approaches to the problem of preventing the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction should be explored. That includes the possibility of an agreement or agreements on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of such weapons.

In 1978 Finland had the opportunity to support both resolutions 33/66 A and 33/66 B, which were adopted by the General Assembly at that time. Today, three years later, when only one draft resolution was presented, we continue to support all efforts aimed at the prevention of the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction, including the endeavours to reach agreement on a convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons.

## ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: We have completed action today upon 12 draft resolutions, which is a fair average. There now remain 14 draft resolutions for tomorrow and another 13 for Wednesday. According to the sponsors' wishes, we would take up the following draft resolutions tomorrow: A/C.1/36/L.15, A/C.1/36/L.16, A/C.1/36/L.20, A/C.1/36/L.28, A/C.1/36/L.31, A/C.1/36/L.32, A/C.1/36/L.35, A/C.1/36/Rev.1, A/C.1/36/L.44, A/C.1/36/L.42, A/C.1/36/L.46, A/C.1/36/L.21 and A/C.1/36/L.30.

Then, on Wednesday, 25 November, we shall be taking up the following: A/C.1/36/L.2/Rev.1, A/C.1/36/L.3, A/C.1/36/L.5, A/C.1/36/L.17, A/C.1/36/L.18, A/C.1/36/L.19, A/C.1/36/L.23/Rev.1, A/C.1/36/L.27, A/C.1/36/L.34, A/C.1/36/L.41/Rev.1, A/C.1/36/L.43, together with the amendments in document A/C.1/36/L.50, A/C.1/36/L.45/Rev.1, and draft resolution A/36/29, on the Indian Ocean.

I would suggest that it would definitely be desirable for us to conclude our action upon these draft resolutions by Wednesday as Thursday is a holiday in the host country.

While the achievements of Friday and today may not be cause for rejoicing, I think we can be moderately satisfied with ourselves.

I would remind representatives that the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group of the First Committee on the draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States, the representative of Guyana, has appealed to all those delegations desiring to present amendments to the draft submitted by the non-aligned countries to do so, if possible, by Wednesday, 25 November.

The meeting rose at 6.00 p.m.