

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**  
FORTY-FIRST SESSION  
*Official Records\**



**FIRST COMMITTEE**  
38th meeting  
held at  
10 November 1986  
at 3 p.m.  
New York

**VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 38th MEETING**

Chairman: Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic)

**CONTENTS**

**CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS (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 DC2.750, 2 United Nations Plaza, 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.

30p

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

AGENDA ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND 144 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT ITEMS AGENDA  
ITEMS 46 TO 65 AND L44 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon the Committee will take decisions on draft resolutions listed under cluster 4 and it is hoped, those under cluster 5 as well, of the informal paper distributed to the Committee, namely, draft resolutions A/C. 1/41/L. 31, L. 37, L. 39, L. 40, L. 45, L. 65, L. 14, L. 16, L. 18, L. 32, L. 60 and L. 68.

Before proceeding to take action on draft resolutions included in the first cluster, I shall call on those representative who wish to introduce draft resolutions.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden) : I have asked to speak in order to introduce draft resolution A/C. 1/41/L. 31, entitled "Comprehensive study on the military use of research and development". In this draft resolution the Secretary-General is requested to present that study, as available, with an indication where consensus could not be reached.

As members of the Committee will recall, the General Assembly in resolution 37/99 J decided that a comprehensive study should be carried out on the scope, role and direction of the military use of research and development, the mechanisms involved, its role in the overall arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, and its impact on arms limitation and disarmament, particularly with relation to major weapons systems, such as nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, with a view to preventing a qualitative arms race and to ensuring that scientific and technological achievements may ultimately be used solely for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Ekensweden)

Pursuant to that resolution, the Secretary-General appointed the Group of Experts on **Military** Research and Development in early 1983. The Group held **five** substantive sessions - two in 1983 and three in 1984. In that year the Chairman Of the Group reported that, although substantial **progress** had been made in the preparation of the report, certain **issues** remained to be resolved which could be done through an extension of the time period of the study. In resolution 39/151 F, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue the study and to submit the report to the General **Assembly** at its fortieth session.

By a letter dated 10 May 1985 the Chairman of the Group of Experts informed the Secretary-General that agreement had been reached on all outstanding paragraphs with the exception of one sentence. **Even** the text of that **sentence** had been accepted in another part of the draft report. However, a **consensus** could not be confirmed in the last days of the Group's work. As it was thus not **possible** to reach agreement on the draft report as a whole, the Chairman transmitted the text of the study as it **stood** at the end of the final session of the Group. The sentence of disagreement **was** indicated in brackets. After receipt of the Chairman's letter by the Secretary-General, further ways were explored to reach a **possible solution**, but those did not lead to a conclusive result.

As **is** evident from what I have related above, this is indeed a unique situation. A **major** United Nations study of 140 **pages** is unavailable because at the last moment one **single** sentence could not be agreed upon. The study **is** highly topical for the work of this Committee, **for** the work of the Conference on Disarmament, especially as it relates to **such items** as the creation of the **nuclear-arms** race and the prevention of an arms **race** in outer **space**. It is also important for **deliberations** in other forums on new **technologies** in conventional warfare. **My Government** would like to have this study available at least for the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

The study contains the valuable input of experts from the five permanent members of the Security Council, and from countries allied to them, and also important contributions and assessments from a number of non-aligned countries.

The value of the study is, in the view of my Government, not lost as a result of the disagreement on one sentence, since all basic concepts and approaches regarding the military use of research and development were agreed upon in the Group of Experts.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

Its availability as a document of the General Assembly at its forty-second session would assist Member States in their further endeavour to understand the impact of research and development on arms limitation and disarmament, as well as to prevent a qualitative arms race. It would also be of great importance to have the result of the study available to the forthcoming Conference on Disarmament and Development. In draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.31, the Secretary-General is therefore requested to present the available material with an indication where consensus could not be reached.

It is the sincere hope of my delegation that this draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia) : I should like to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/41/L.52, on "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations".

No question is more important today than that of the maintenance of peace and security in the world. Whether or not we halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race, whether or not we solve peacefully the crises that beset the international community, will have a significant bearing not only on the directions that international developments take but also on the very survival of mankind. To paraphrase the Appeal addressed by non-aligned countries from their Eighth Summit Conference in Harare, Zimbabwe, the alternative today in the nuclear age is, therefore, not between war and peace, but between life and death, which makes the prevention of nuclear war the principal task of our time.

The international community has followed the recent contacts between the two leading Powers in the field of disarmament with keen interest and renewed expectations. It welcomed the agreement reached between the Soviet Union and the United States last year to start negotiations on nuclear and space weapons. The agreement was received as a sign of their determination to conduct, side by side with multilateral negotiations, their bilateral negotiations on substantial

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

issues concerning reduction and limitation of nuclear arms and on nuclear disarmament, as well as the recognition that open questions of our time can be solved only through dialogue and co-operation and that negotiations are the only answer to the challenges we are now faced with. Every summit meeting between the leaders of the two major Powers raises new hopes that their dialogue will give impetus to the solution of key issues of the present-day world and bring concrete results in the interest of all. Every failure, however, causes new concern and apprehension.

The fact that the recent summit meeting in Reykjavik brought no concrete results - rightfully expected by the international public - has caused widespread disappointment, all the more so since both sides averred that their positions on a number of major issues of the reduction of nuclear arms had been significantly harmonized at this meeting and that no major historic agreement on arms limitation and reduction had ever been so close at hand.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.52 - Algeria, Bangladesh, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Yugoslavia - are guided by a sincere desire to give full support to the negotiation8 of the Soviet Union and the United States on nuclear and space weapons. They would like to underline that international peace and security can be ensured only through general and complete disarmament under effective international control and that one of the most urgent tasks is to halt and reverse the arms race and to undertake concrete measures of disarmament, particular ly nuclear disarmament .

(Mr. Djokic, Yugoslavia)

The principal goal of the sponsors of this draft resolution is to encourage the Soviet Union and the United States to conduct, pursuant to their special obligations and responsibilities as leading nuclear-weapon States, their bilateral negotiations with the greatest resolve with a view to achieving agreements on concrete and effective measures for the halting of the nuclear arms race, the radical reduction of their nuclear arsenals, nuclear disarmament and the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

It is therefore the sponsors' earnest hope that, with the goals they have in mind, the realization of which would be in the greatest interest of all nations regardless of their size and military might, their draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

I take this opportunity to point to a slight error which occurred in the title of this draft resolution as circulated in document A/C.1/41/L.52. The correct title should read: "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations." The sponsors did not insist that a new text be published containing this correction, since this would have incurred additional costs. However, they request the Secretariat to take account of this correction and to make the necessary change, so that the title reads; "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations" and not "Bilateral and nuclear-arms negotiations" as it reads now.

Mr. MARTYNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): In this statement the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is introducing draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.65 on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

systems of such weapons. We do so on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, the Lao Peoples Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam and our own delegation.

Before this draft resolution was completed, the Byelorussian SSR delegation consulted a large number of delegations, as is indicated by the list of sponsors of this draft. Up to the very last moment, we had expected some constructive reaction to our compromise proposals from certain Western countries as well, and this explains why the statement introducing this draft resolution has to be made at the present stage of the Committee's work.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.65 believe that the development of modern science and technology faces mankind with the real danger of the creation of new forms of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons, based on new scientific principles. What type of dangers these might pose and what the consequences might be were pointed out by the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR in a statement it made on 29 October in the First Committee. The sponsors of the draft resolution believe that machinery should be set up making it possible for developments in this area to be kept under constant surveillance. Such machinery could most usefully be considered within the context of the Conference on Disarmament, which is the multilateral body for disarmament talks, of course in the light of existing priorities.



(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

Specifically, these matters could be considered by a group of experts convened periodically. If necessary, the Conference on Disarmament could recommend specific talks on new identified types of weapons of mass destruction.

That machinery would act as a kind of alarm clock, which would draw the attention of the world community to new dangers in the sphere of weapons of mass destruction. With today's accelerated developments in science and technology, particularly in the military field, such machinery is absolutely essential if mankind - already grappling with the existing manifestations of the evil genie that threatens its existence - is not to lose sight of new types of such weapons.

A natural, and necessary, addition to this alarm system should be a readinean on the part of all States, immediately following the identification of any new type of weapon of mass destruction, to commence negotiations on its prohibition with the simultaneous introduction of a moratorium on its practical development. All States should refrain from any action which could adversely affect the efforts aimed at preventing the emergence of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons. The intention of this draft resolution is that States should undertake efforts to ensure that ultimately scientific and technological achievements may be used solely for peaceful purposes.

Those purposes and proposals constitute the substance of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.65. As I said before, up until the very last moment we had expected constructive reaction from certain Western countries, which at an earlier stage in the Committee's work had been shown a compromise draft resolution, with a view to the desirable goal of agreeing on a text that could be adopted by consensus.

At the fortieth session of the General Assembly, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR took into account proposals by a number of Western States, which were dissatisfied by the idea of a preventive, comprehensive ban, but preferred a

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

ban on new types of weapons of mass destruction already identified. But only two Western countries reacted positively to this fundamental change. The others did not maintain the spirit of compromise, but put forward major new amendments to the text of the draft resolution.

As shown by the records of the fortieth session of the General Assembly, it was at that time only a question of technical details. There was disagreement about establishing a group of experts under the Conference on Disarmament and about the formulation of the moratorium on practical efforts to develop new identified types of weapons of mass destruction, although there was mutual agreement that States should refrain from manufacturing identified types of such weapons.

Continuing to act in a spirit of co-operation, and based on there having been consultations at the fortieth session with the representatives of a number of Western countries which had been active in this matter in the past, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR declared its readiness to take account of those wishes this year, along with a number - and I stress, a number - of other ideas put forward by Western delegations in the course of the consultations.

With that in mind, we drafted an informal compromise text, which included word for word some of the formulations earlier put forward by Western delegations. But it was rejected once again. But this time it was no longer just a question of technical details, since the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR had expressed its readiness to settle all these in a compromise variant text it proposed to certain Western delegations. We were told that the very concept of new forms of weapons of mass destruction based on new scientific principles and achievements had become unacceptable to those members of the Western group with which we were holding consultations. We would note that this is precisely the concept of new weapons of mass destruction that is contained in paragraph 77 of the Final Document of the

(Mr. Martynov, Byelorussian SSR)

first **special session** of the General Assembly devoted to **disarmament**, which, as we all know, **was** adopted by **consensus**. Moreover, we were prepared to include in the text of the compromise draft resolution the reference proposed by Western delegations to the **definition** of a weapon of mass destruction adopted by the United Nations in 1948.

In these circumstances, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR wonders what to do. Should we **just** throw out the baby with the bath water? We think that would be unconscionable, and the vast majority of the international community thinks the same way, as indicated by the results of the voting at last year's **session** on the draft resolution on the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, which was supported by all non-aligned, developing and socialist countries without exception.

We continue to be open to co-operation in subsequent **stages** of our work. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR thanks the other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.65 for their valuable **co-operation**; we also thank the wide range of other delegations which **expressed** support for it during the consultations. We call on the **members** of the Committee to support **this** draft resolution. If implemented, it would protect present and future generations from the threat of new forms of weapons of mass destruction.

The **CHAIRMAN**: I now call upon the Secretary of the committee.

Mr. KHERAJI (Secretary of the Committee) : I should like to inform **members** of the Committee that delegations have become sponsors of draft resolutions, as follows: draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.27, Greece; A/C.1/41/L.60, New Zealand and Nepal; and A/C.1/41/L.65, Benin, Burkina Faso, Mozambique and the Syrian Arab Republic.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action upon draft resolutions listed in cluster 4. However, the following draft resolutions in cluster 4 will not be taken up at this time; action upon them will be postponed: A/C.1/41/L.37, because of ongoing consultations; and A/C.1/41/L.39, because the report on programme budget implications is still being finalized.

I call now upon those delegations wishing to make statements on draft resolutions in cluster 4.

Mr. HALACHEV (Bulgaria) : The Bulgarian delegation would like to express some considerations before the Committee proceeds to vote on agenda item 60 (f), "Naval armaments and disarmament: report of the Disarmament Commission". As is known, Bulgaria has shown considerable interest in the question of curbing the naval-arms race, the reduction of naval armaments and the extension of confidence-building measures to seas and oceans.

At our initiative a separate item was included in the agenda of the last session of the General Assembly. With other countries co-sponsoring, my delegation has submitted draft resolutions under this agenda item at several sessions of the General Assembly. The fact that at the current session we have not done so does not mean that our interest in this item has lessened. We continue to be convinced that the cessation of the naval-arms race and its reversal and the extension of effective confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans are assuming increasing importance for the strengthening of international peace and security.

On the understanding that this problem can be resolved through the collective efforts of all States, the People's Republic of Bulgaria has been actively participating in the work of the Disarmament Commission and in the consideration of the item in this Committee. We attach major importance to the substantive consideration of all aspects of this issue in the Disarmament Commission as an important step towards the identification of feasible confidence-building measures and measures for curbing the naval-arms race and for disarmament, which would become the subject of consultation and negotiation in the relevant forums on bilateral, regional and multilateral levels.

Proceeding from that understanding, and guided by the desire for co-operation and concerted action with all interested Member States, we have decided to join efforts within the context of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.45. We regret that the draft resolution does not include some ideas and proposals we would have liked to

Mr. Halachev, Bulgaria)

have seen in it, but we consider, none the less, that the text reflects the cardinal necessity at this stage. The draft resolution provides an auspicious basis for continuing the collective efforts of Member States aimed at curbing the naval-arms race as part of the efforts for achieving general and complete disarmament.

Our decision not to submit a draft resolution will also contribute to limiting the number of draft resolutions in the Committee. However, we consider that this should not deprive Member States of the right to submit draft resolutions under any specific agenda item, whenever they deem it necessary.

Mr. HADDAWI (Iraq) : In response to suggestions made to my delegation by a number of friends and delegations, and in a spirit of flexibility and co-operation with the Chair, my delegation has made the following amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.40, as reflected in A/C.1/41/L.40/Rev.1.

First, we propose the deletion of the last part of the third preambular paragraph) that paragraph should now read as follows:

"Recalling also that Additional Protocol I of 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 prohibits attacks on nuclear electricity generating stations".

The second amendment my delegation is submitting incorporates operative paragraph 1 into the preambular part of the draft resolution, making it the fifth preambular paragraph, and its text is somewhat revised to read as follows:

"Firmly convinced that the Israeli attack against the safeguarded nuclear facilities in Iraq constitutes an unprecedented danger to international peace and security".

My delegation is hopeful that, owing to the merits of the draft resolution, it will receive the largest possible support from the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon delegations that wish to speak in **explanation** of vote before the voting on all draft resolutions in cluster 4.

Mr. TAYLHARDAT (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation intended to explain ~~its~~ position on two of the draft resolutions in this cluster. However, it has been announced that draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.37 will not be before us for a vote today, and we would therefore like to reserve the right to voice our views on that particular draft resolution once we are aware of the final text.

However, I would like to make a few comments on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.40/Rev.1, which has just been introduced by the representative of Iraq. My delegation has certain misgivings with regard to two of the paragraphs in that draft resolution. We recognize, of course, the danger of the threat of a military attack on a nuclear installation. This is a danger that has clearly been demonstrated by the aftermath of the regrettable accident at the Chernobyl installation. We also recognize the very serious repercussions an attack on a nuclear installation might have, repercussions that in certain circumstances could be compared to - and might, indeed, have even worse consequences than - the detonation of a nuclear weapon.

My delegation therefore has some doubts about the advisability of stating, as the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution does, that "military attacks against nuclear facilities . . . could be tantamount to the use of radiological weapons". Based on that same argument, we also have doubts with regard to operative paragraph 1, in which the same statement is no longer couched as a possibility but rather categorically, as an affirmation. The paragraph says that a military attack of any kind against nuclear facilities is tantamount to the use of radiological weapons.

(Mr. Taylhardat , Venezuela)

For those reasons, my delegation will be forced to **abstain** in the voting on draft resolution **L.40/Rev.1**, **should** it be submitted to a vote. We feel, furthermore, that assertions such **as** those contained in the paragraphs I have **just** mentioned could influence the work being carried out by the Conference on Disarmament on this very **matter**.

Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet **Socialist** Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution **A/C.1/41/L.31** for the following reasons.



(Mr. Timerbaev, USSR)

In **this** document, reference **is** made to a **study** on which work **has** not been completed because it **was impossible** to reach agreement on **matters** of fundamental importance. It **is** true, **as** the sponsors of the draft **themselves** pointed out, that the area of disagreement **was** narrow, but **this** fact, we are convinced, does not **give** that study any particular **status**. Furthermore, the draft **proposes** that the General Assembly should not only take note of this **as** yet **incomplete** study but should also request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to present available material with an indication where **consensus** could not be reached. In **this** way, a precedent would be created which would have an extremely dubious **effect** on studies that are being carried out on disarmament **matters**, as well **as** any **possible** future **studies** the Organization might undertake.

We expressed all **those reasons** to the **sponsors** of the draft **resolution** in the course of unofficial **consultations**, but, to our great regret, **these** points were not taken into account and the **sponsors** have **insisted** on its being put to a vote. We cannot fail to take **this** into account in the vote on draft resolution A/C. 1/41/L. 31. Hence we shall abstain in the vote on this draft resolution, and we call on other delegations to do likewise.,

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): We have heard the **representative** of the **Byelorussian SSR** making **some** comments just now on L.65 - on new types of weapons of **mass destruction** - which I do not entirely **share**. This draft resolution has a number of **real** problems consultations could not resolve.

Speaking now on behalf of the **12 states** members of the **European Community**, I should like to **explain** our joint vote on that **draft resolution**, entitled "**Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons**".

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

The **subject** of **new** weapons of mass destruction has a long history. The member **States** of the **Twelve** took an active **part** in the **consideration** of the **item** in the **1970s**, both in the **General Assembly** and in the then Committee of the Conference on Disarmament, ~ the predecessor of the Conference on Disarmament. When the subject **was** considered at that time, no such prospective weapons were **identified**. The item **remains** on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament with general support and is considered each **year**. **This** regular **consideration** has reached the same conclusion as in the **1970s**, and that **remains** the **situation** to date.

It therefore continues to be **our** view that **there** are at present no **indications** that new types of weapons of mass destruction are imminent. The Twelve would naturally regard it **as** a most **serious development** if any new kind of weapon of **mass** destruction **were** to be invented and deployed, and we believe that the subject should continue to be kept under **regular** review.

**However**, in the present circumstances, there seems to us no point in elaborate and unnecessary action by **the** Conference on Disarmament of the sort called for in the **draft** resolution.

In addition, this year's draft resolution suggests, in one of its **preambular paragraphs**, an extension of the definition of new weapons of **mass** destruction going beyond that established by the United Nations in 1948 and subsequently endorsed in the Final Document of the first special **session** of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978. The suggested **formulation** is also **nebulous** and imprecise. Therefore, that seems to us to be unhelpful and **confusing**, notably in detracting **from** the main considerations that have formed the **basis** of our examination of this issue hitherto.

**For** those **reasons**, the 12 States members of the European Community will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.65.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 4, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.31. This draft resolution is submitted under item 60, "General and complete disarmament", and entitled "Comprehensive study on the military use of research and development". It was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 10 November 1986 and is sponsored by Sweden.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: 8 United States of America

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet. Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/L.30 was adopted by 116 votes in favour, 17 abstentions.\*

---

\* Subsequently the delegation of Malawi advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: We come now to draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "~~General~~ and complete disarmament: prohibition of the ~~development,~~ production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons". It was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 5 November and is sponsored by Iraq.

A Separate recorded vote on operative paragraph 1 ~~has~~ been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Central African Republic, France, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted by

75 votes to 4, with 44 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.40/Rev.1, as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

---

\*Subsequently the delegations of the Central African Republic and Iceland advised the Secretariat that they had intended to abstain.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour : Afghanistan, **Algeria**, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, **Beni** , Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei **Darussalam**, Bulgaria, Burkina **Faso**, Burundi, Byeloruesian Soviet **Socialist** Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, **China**, **Comoros**, Congo, Cuba, **Cyprus**, **Czechoslovakia**, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, **German** Democratic Republic, Ghana, **Guinea**, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao **People's Democratic** Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, **Libyan** Arab **Jamahiriyah**, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, **Mexico**, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, **Niger**, **Nigeria**, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, **Tunisia**, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab **Emirates**, Viet Nam, **Yemen**, Yugoslavia, Zambia, **Zimbabwe**

Against France, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, **Bahamas**, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, **Burma**, Canada, Chile, Colombia, **Côte d'Ivoire**, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, **Italy**, **Jamaica**, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, **Norway**, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C. 1/41/L. 40/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 90 votes to

3, with 35 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.45, entitled "General and complete **disarmament**: naval armaments and **disarmaments**". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the 37th meeting of the First Committee on 10 November 1996. The **sponsors** are Australia, Austria, **China**, Finland, France, Iceland, Indonesia, Mexico, the Netherlands, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sweden and Yugoslavia .

A recorded vote has been requested.

● Subsequently the delegation of Malawi advised the Secretariat that it had intended to **abstain**.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, LAO People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad And Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain And Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: India

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.65 was adopted by --, with -- 1

abstention.\*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.65, entitled "Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapon of mass destruction And new systems of **SW** weapons". This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR At the

---

\*Subsequently the delegation of Malawi Advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(The Chairman)

38th meeting of the First Committee, on 10 November 1986. The sponsors are Afghanistan, Angola, Benin, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, the Lao People's the Democratic Republic, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.



A recorded vote was taken.

In favour Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakirtan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.65 was adopted by 102 votes to 1, with 30

abstentions.\*

---

\*Subsequently the delegation of Malawi advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the votes have been taken on all draft resolutions in cluster 4.

Mr. TEJA (India): My delegation has abstained in the vote on draft resolution L.45, on naval armaments and disarmament, since we do not believe that disarmament measures or even limited arms reduction efforts should be confined to a narrow category of weapons such as naval armaments. The consideration of the naval arms race does not appear to make a positive contribution to the process of general and complete disarmament, in particular arresting and reversing the nuclear-arms race. Pursuing that consideration further in the Disarmament Commission would thus distract us from the more immediate and higher priority areas of disarmament.

Mr. BUTLER (Australia): As a member of the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva, Australia has taken an active part in the work of the Conference on the subject of radiological weapons. As is well known, part of the work of the Conference on that subject considers the issue of the bringing into existence of radiological weapons as a result of an attack against a nuclear facility. That is an important issue and one which we would wish to see, or hope to see, draw to a conclusion as soon as possible - that is, resulting in an international agreement prohibiting such attacks upon nuclear facilities.

In these circumstances, my delegation would have wished to be able to vote positively for the draft resolution introduced under item 60(d) of the agenda, the text of which was given in document L.40/Rev. 1, on which a few moments ago the Committee voted. But we were instead obliged to abstain in the vote because of the lack of technical precision and accuracy involved in its operative paragraph 1. That was something we regretted. Nevertheless, it was something we were obliged to do.

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

However, we wish it to be understood that we continue to attach importance to the earliest possible conclusion of an international agreement on the prevention of attacks against nuclear facilities.

Mr. BARTHELEMY (United States of America): My delegation would like to explain its vote on two draft resolutions in this cluster: L. 31 and L. 39. The United States shares the disappointment of the sponsor of draft resolution L. 31 that the study on military research and development could not be completed. That was due to the completely unreasonable position of one of the participants. Consequently, the Secretary-General was unable to submit it to the General Assembly.

At the same time, as it stated in its submission on to the Secretary-General on the question of United Nations studies in the field of disarmament, the United States believes that the elaboration and the adoption of study group reports should be governed by the essential principle of consensus among members of the group. Furthermore, we should like to point out that, since any consensus document should be a balanced one, none of its portions can be regarded as finally agreed until all of them have been agreed.

Unfortunately, this draft resolution runs counter to this basic position of principle of the United States. Therefore my delegation has been unable to support it.

The United States delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution L. 39, pertaining to the report entitled "Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and Military Expenditures".

Delegations will recall that the United States opposed the adoption of resolution 40/150 on this subject last year. Our opposition at that time was based on our conviction that an update of the report in question was both unnecessary and financially unwarranted. Nothing has taken place in the intervening year to alter

(Mr. Butler, Australia)

our position on this matter. For those reasons, the United States voted against draft resolution L.39 today.

Mr. MOREL (France) (interpretation from French) : I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.40/Rev.1. Within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva, France takes part in the negotiations on the prohibition of radiological weapons, which have been carried out for some years now. No progress has been made at the recent sessions of the Conference, especially since those negotiations have been tied to extraneous questions, such as, for example, a ban on attacks on nuclear facilities. The latter question does not, in our view, come under the purview of disarmament, but should be seen within the framework of humanitarian law.

That is why in the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva, France does not take part in the specific discussion on a ban on attacks against nuclear facilities. We cannot therefore subscribe to the juxtaposition made in the second preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution L.40/Rev.1, between radiological weapons and attacks against nuclear facilities.

Nor can we go along with the appeal made to the Conference on Disarmament in operative paragraph 2 to reach an agreement prohibiting military attacks against nuclear facilities.

That is why we voted against draft resolution A/C.1/41/L.40/Rev.1, because of both operative paragraph 1 and the text as a whole.

Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom): I should like to explain our vote on draft resolution L.31, which has just been adopted by the Committee. The United Kingdom participated in the United Nations study on the military use of research and development. Our expert co-operated fully in providing relevant information about military research and development in the United Kingdom and contributed actively in other ways to the completion of the study.

(Mr. Edis, United Kingdom)

Unfortunately, such efforts were not matched by others. One expert - in fact it was the Soviet expert - declined to provide material on comparable activities in his country. That would have led to an unbalanced and misleading study. Therefore the experts were unable to agree on their report.

We congratulate the Swedish Chairman, Mr. Bjonerstedt, on his skill and patience. Unfortunately, his efforts to overcome this problem proved unsuccessful.

T should like to underline that the United Kingdom is broadly content with the study, but we felt it was unreasonable to allow a selective application of ground rules agreed upon by experts on a particular study when one of the experts so chooses. That is disappointing to those concerned. But the fact remains that there is no agreed report.

We believe it would not be conducive to the conduct of future studies to make available reports on which experts themselves have failed to reach agreement. In our view, that would establish an unhelpful and possibly dangerous precedent. For that reason alone we abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document L.31.

The CHAIRMAN: Since no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote after the voting? If not, we have thus concluded consideration of and action upon draft resolutions listed in cluster 4, except for draft resolutions A/C.1/41/L.37 and A/C.1/41/L.39, which will be considered and voted upon at a later stage.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN: At the beginning of this afternoon's meeting, I expressed the hope that the Committee this afternoon would be in a position to take action on draft resolutions listed in cluster 5, but during our deliberations this afternoon I have been approached by a number of delegations that are not this afternoon in a position to take action. Therefore we shall have to defer cluster 5 until tomorrow.

Today, our very first day of taking action on draft resolutions on disarmament items as a whole, we have adopted 15 draft resolutions. This is a good result of our work today but, as I have already indicated, we should proceed with a certain amount of flexibility. What I have in mind is that if delegations, because of ongoing consultations on draft resolutions or, in some cases, because they are trying to merge certain draft resolutions or withdraw or amend others as a result of negotiations, we should not press them to a vote, since it would be in the interests of the Committee as a whole to conclude such negotiations successfully. However, I appeal to delegations to be prepared during the next few days to consider a number of clusters before us in a more organized manner.

As members know, tomorrow we shall hold two meetings, and it is my intention to take up the following clusters: 5, 7, 8 and, possibly, 9, as well as one of the draft resolutions that have been deferred this morning, namely, A/C.1/41/L.9/Rev.1, listed in cluster 3.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.