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CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: This morning the Committee will continue the third phase of its work, devoted to consideration of and action upon draft resolutions on disarmament agenda items.

As was decided yesterday, the Committee will today take up the group of draft resolutions in cluster 7, namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7, L.12, L.21 and L.50.

I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to state their positions or to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's position on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7 and L.21 on the question of negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States, and also on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12 on the non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war.

With regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7 and L.21, my delegation has already had occasion to state in several forums that the question of negative security assurances continues to be approached from the narrow point of view of the security perceptions of the nuclear-weapon Powers rather than as a provisional measure aimed at providing effective guarantees pending concrete measures for nuclear disarmament.

Such a parochial view of reality presupposes a recognition of the legitimacy of the exclusive possession of nuclear weapons by the present nuclear-weapon Powers. Based on that distorted and self-serving view, the nuclear-weapon Powers seek endorsement of their self-conferred right to engage in the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both in their vertical and in their geographical dimensions, and to promote their exclusive possession of nuclear weapons and their threat actually to use those weapons in accordance with their own security perceptions. It is for no other reason that the nuclear-weapon Powers have, with only one exception, attached qualifications to their unilateral declarations of guarantees, as if the non-nuclear-weapon countries were the ones that should extend binding assurances to the nuclear-weapon Powers.
(Mr. Duarte, Brazil)

My delegation believes, on the contrary, that the credibility and efficacy of the commitments intended to ensure respect for the non-nuclear-weapon status of other nations must be subject to strict verification so as to make sure that the nuclear-weapon Powers live up to their obligations and to their responsibilities.

Finally, the Brazilian delegation wishes to state that it stands by the statement of the Group of 21 of the Conference on Disarmament on the question of negative security assurances, according to which no progress on that question can be achieved as long as the nuclear-weapon Powers maintain their present attitudes and policies. It is for those reasons that my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7 and L.21.

As for draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12, my delegation has consistently advocated multilateral action on the urgent question of the prevention of nuclear war as well as on the need for international agreement on the non-use of nuclear weapons. With regard to the draft resolution under consideration, however, we continue to believe that the idea of an international instrument of a binding character containing the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons would in effect be tantamount to a legitimization of the ulterior use of such weapons. In that sense the central concern of the draft resolution, namely, the prevention of nuclear war, does not seem to be served by the concept of the non-first use of nuclear weapons.

For that reason my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12.

Mr. NOETZEL (German Democratic Republic): After consultations with interested delegations, I should like to inform the Committee that the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, as one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12, would like to introduce a verbal amendment involving a one-word change in operative paragraph 3 of that draft resolution.

We propose replacing the word "containing" in the third line of operative paragraph 3 with the words "laying down". Operative paragraph 3, as verbally amended, will read as follows:

"Requests the Conference on Disarmament to consider under its relevant agenda item, inter alia, the elaboration of an international instrument of a legally binding character laying down the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons".
I would request the Secretariat to make the change I have just read out.

I should also like to take this opportunity, on behalf of my delegation, to explain our vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7, L.12, of which we are a sponsor, L.21 and L.50. My delegation is going to support all of those draft resolutions because we consider that they relate to a most important question, namely, the prevention of nuclear war and how to take urgent, practical and effective measures in this respect.

My first point in this connection is that relevant decisions on the question of the non-use or non-first use of nuclear weapons would definitely have a strong confidence-building effect on international relations and would pave the way for effective negotiations on nuclear disarmament. My delegation believes that all who are concerned with the question of confidence-building measures in international relations should support such draft resolutions, and we do not see any benefit to be derived from artificially opposing the concept of the non-use or non-first use of nuclear weapons with the objective of reductions in nuclear weapons.

My second point is that relevant obligations and undertakings by the nuclear-weapon States concerning the non-first use of nuclear weapons would, in the end, be tantamount to a general prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

The third point my delegation would like to stress is that we consider as especially dangerous and not beneficial to this central task arguments that proceed along the lines that the use of nuclear weapons is permitted because it is not prohibited by any international instrument.
The use of such an argument, in the view of my delegation, highlights the fact that it is urgently necessary to proceed to the negotiation and elaboration of relevant instruments on the question of non-use — and effectively non-first use — of nuclear weapons.

In this context, my delegation would also like to refer to the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter concerning this question and to recall that last year it was stated that reference to, for instance, Article 51 of the Charter in justifying the possibility and admissibility of the use of nuclear weapons would, as it has been called, be a perversion of international law. We firmly believe that it would be in the spirit, particularly, of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter to exclude once and for all the use of the most dangerous and most horrible weapons, which indeed threaten the survival of mankind.

In view of those aspects, my delegation would expect and strongly urge positive action on the draft resolutions now under consideration in cluster 7.

MRS. URIBE DE LOZANO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): As in previous years, the delegation of Colombia wishes to support draft resolutions which express Colombia's commitment to peace and to general and complete disarmament. On this occasion my delegation will abstain in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.12 and L.21, in keeping with the position of my country in working for the prevention of any type of war, including conventional warfare, which in the view of my delegation is also a threat which hovers over the world, especially over non-nuclear countries, and which could escalate to the nuclear level. My delegation would welcome those draft resolutions if the concept of non-first use were also to include the non-first use of conventional weapons.

MR. SHARMA (India): India will abstain in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7 and L.21. It is the considered view of our Government that the most credible guarantees of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States are nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. So long as the nuclear-weapon States have nuclear weapons in their arsenals and so long as their security policies remain predicated on the use of nuclear weapons, it will be of little use for the non-nuclear-weapon States to seek assurances of security from those States.
Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Socialist Soviet Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connection with the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12, the delegation of the Soviet Union wishes to make the following statement.

As everyone knows, for more than three years the Soviet Union has made it clear that it does not intend to be the first to use nuclear weapons. That is not a mere statement; it is a material and especially important guarantee with regard to the prevention of nuclear war. If the appeal of the General Assembly to States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons were heeded and if the example of the Soviet Union were followed by nuclear-weapon States which have not yet adopted such a commitment, that would indeed be tantamount to a general refusal to use nuclear weapons. An obligation in that connection could be undertaken unilaterally by each State possessing nuclear weapons. That would be the shortest path and would not require specific negotiations or specific agreements.

But the Soviet Union is also ready to ensure that the obligation undertaken by nuclear-weapon States with regard to the non-first use of nuclear weapons is embodied in a single document which would have the force of international law; and we have already said that we think the Conference on Disarmament should undertake negotiations in that connection. The Soviet Union has on several occasions appealed to nuclear-weapon States, in particular the United States, to follow our example and undertake that obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and each time in response we have heard "no".

Let us try to imagine for a few moments the exact opposite situation. Let us imagine that the United States has undertaken that obligation. Let us imagine that the United States is addressing us, inviting us to act in the same manner. Let us imagine that we reply "no". Let us assume that we say "no, that is not a good thing for us so we reserve our right to be the first to use nuclear weapons". In such a situation, what would the people of the United States think about our intentions?

The question of the non-first use of nuclear weapons is one of the most important questions in our work for peace, confirmed in specific acts, and it is not by accident that this item has been included in the agenda of the General Assembly. It is a question which bears a direct relationship with our task, which, as has been stressed by President Chernenko in response to questions put by a television correspondent:

"... is a question which overshadows all others - how to avert the threat
of a nuclear war, to find ways to slow the arms race, to bring about a situation in the world where peoples would have no fear for tomorrow. In this endeavour no delay is admissible."
In the light of what I have just said, the delegation of the Soviet Union
intends to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12 and appeals to all
delegations which are truly and sincerely interested in the prohibition of the use
of nuclear weapons to act in the same manner.

Mr. WEGENER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to explain the
vote of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12 and by logical extension on
is a call for a nuclear non-first-use commitment. As on past occasions, my
delegation will cast a negative vote.

Let me briefly recall the reasons: the call for a nuclear non-first-use
commitment emanates from the Soviet Union and is directed against the security of
all Western States, whether or not they are nuclear Powers. As in the case of the
freeze proposals, on which my delegation spoke on an earlier occasion, the nuclear
non-first-use issue, therefore, has to be looked at in the context of the East-West
relationship and the military situation prevailing between the North Atlantic
Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact. It is futile to look at it in
terms of abstract desirability and to remove it from the context of international
security and stability. In particular, it has to be looked at from the viewpoint
of Western Europe, which is confronted by the vast military superiority of the
Soviet Union and its allies. The nuclear non-first-use concept must be looked at
in that realistic context and it must also be judged by whether it meets the
overriding commands of the United Nations Charter and whether it prevents nuclear
war effectively.

First, the Charter does not condemn nuclear war alone. It condemns all wars.
A non-first-use concept limited to one weapons system, as in the present draft
resolution A/C.1/39/L.12, substantially weakens the interdiction of force as
contained in the Charter. The 16 nations of NATO and the participants in the
Williamsburg Summit meeting have therefore solemnly pledged never to use any of
their weapons except in the case of armed attack. A mere nuclear non-first-use
promise beclouds the necessity of preventing wars of all kinds. The fact that
draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.12 and L.21 make no reference to conventional wars, as
are currently being fought in various parts of the world, is not a chance
omission. In singling out one particular mode of warfare one implicitly condones
other modes of waging war. They would appear less stigmatized, or even moderately
acceptable. Anyone who limits the non-first-use promise to only one weapon
system -- albeit a system of a particularly terrifying nature -- obviously intends to reserve his right to use other weapons. That is the attitude of a Power which feels it has superiority in those other weapons. Nobody can expect the inferior side to applaud such a position.

Secondly, I should again like to recall in this context that the Federal Republic of Germany, upon acquiring sovereignty, signed an agreement renouncing nuclear weapons. By virtue of this we insist on the right not to be threatened by such weapons, and if that threat persists, to secure the protection of an ally. That is why the nuclear non-first-use proposal is not acceptable to my country, whose security, given the overwhelming nuclear and conventional threat hanging over it, ultimately depends on the full range of defence options, as guaranteed by the NATO alliance, and specifically the United States.

To live under the threat of Soviet military superiority has not been our voluntary choice. Obviously, my country would prefer to live in an environment without the threat that emanates from the military superiority of the East. We would be relieved to live without the present concerns for our security. We would be relieved to be able to dispense with a nuclear shield. I find it disconcerting that countries that are more happily positioned, in voting on past non-first-use proposals, have displayed such disregard for our security concerns, asking 300 million free Europeans to renounce the effective means for the prevention of attack and the exercise of their legitimate defence in case of attack, and to leave themselves open to the prospect of a loss of their freedom.

Thirdly, by reinforcing existing imbalances, the nuclear non-first-use concept makes the outbreak of war more probable and negates the inherent dangers of escalation as much as the devastating effect of conventional weapons of our days. If the Western alliance had to renounce its present defence posture, wars in Europe would again become feasible and possible. In addition, the nuclear non-first-use concept - like the freeze - provides no incentive to deal with existing nuclear arsenals - indeed, it preserves them at their present level. The threatening effects that emanate from these weapons would thus for ever stay with us.

The Soviet Union has recommended the adoption of a nuclear non-first-use policy for many years and undertook a public commitment to that effect in 1982. Again on this issue it is instructive to compare the words and the deeds of the
Soviet Union. Has the Soviet Union lived up to its own precepts? Have the Soviets themselves reduced their reliance on nuclear weapons? Have they contributed to a more acceptable balance of conventional forces in Europe? Have they undertaken visible and verifiable action to restructure their armed forces in conformity with their own professed nuclear non-first-use policy? The answer to all these questions is, unfortunately, no.

For all we know, it is true that the Warsaw Pact countries have not increased the numerical strength of their troops in Eastern Europe, but these troops have been restructured and equipped with an astounding panoply of the most modern weapons, making them a highly mobile fighting force with multiple deep-strike capabilities and the logistic underpinnings to enable rapid and decisive advances throughout the entirety of Western Europe. There is no question that during these years the conventional balance in Europe has further deteriorated to the detriment of the NATO alliance.

At the same time, however, the Soviet Union has increased its reliance on nuclear weapons, not only by its unprecedented build-up of new long-range and intermediate-range nuclear weapons, but also by clearly overtaking the NATO alliance in the field of theatre nuclear weapons.

During the same time, however, NATO has consistently worked on lowering its reliance on the nuclear option and on trimming its nuclear arsenals to the minimum required to dissuade others from attacking it. I should only like to recall the decision of the Council of Ministers of NATO at their 1983 meeting in Montebello to eliminate a high percentage of their theatre nuclear weapons, in addition to those already destroyed unilaterally at an earlier stage.
In conclusion, the nuclear non-first use commitment is a declaratory policy. In order to be credible, it would need confirmation by a consistent pattern of verifiable action. This action has not been forthcoming on the Soviet side; verbal assurances are not sufficient. The Soviet Union calls for the adoption of a similar policy by NATO, but there is a strange inconsistency here. The solemn undertaking by the NATO countries never to be the first to use any of their weapons would, at first sight, equally be of a declaratory character, not different, to that extent, from a less complete commitment relating to nuclear weapons alone.

But apparently the Soviet Union places no value on the NATO commitment since it consistently attributes sinister aggressive schemes to the NATO countries and, most particularly, to the United States. This shows the very relative value of a declaratory approach to disarmament. Yet, the NATO commitment has been fully put into effect as evidenced by the manifestly defensive structure of all NATO forces in Europe and their designed incapacity of waging war or to fight, in the exercise of the right to self-defense, on somebody else's territory.

Mr. MEISZTER (Hungary): My delegation wishes to explain its vote with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.50, dealing with the non-use of nuclear weapons. The non-use of nuclear weapons is the clue to preventing a nuclear war, which is, as it is well known, accorded top priority in the foreign policy of the Hungarian Government. Any serious evaluation of the objectives of an eventual nuclear war, or even the mere threat of it, proves that such a war can serve no rational purpose whatsoever, whether political, military, economic or otherwise. At the same time, the order of magnitude of the destruction ensuing from a nuclear catastrophe are incomparable to anything ever experienced before. And with all the prediction power of modern science, they are unimaginable.

Therefore, there can be no task more urgent for mankind than to elaborate and take measures in this direction.

Analysing the array of possible actions to be taken in this respect, and taking into account the urgency factor and feasibility, or possibility, we cannot stop arguing that an agreement for international conventions prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances would be of paramount importance.
In the same way of thinking, we are convinced that an unconditional commitment by all nuclear-weapon Powers not to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances could be a first step - and I underline it, a first step - in that direction.

Those who argue that such declarations have no real value, that the obligations so taken can easily be violated, are only expressing indirectly their own doubts about being able or ready to comply with such obligations. To speak about conventional war when we are searching for clues to prevent nuclear war, and vice versa, to make allegations about nuclear superiority when conventional arms are discussed, is only a feeble attempt to circumvent direct questions, an attempt to avoid a direct response to a clearly put question.

The Hungarian delegation wholeheartedly supports draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.50, and in particular the operative part of this draft resolution, which truly reflects an endeavour pursued by my delegation. The Hungarian delegation is ready to make every effort to implement the operative part of this draft resolution in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. We are equally convinced of the usefulness and possibility of creating a legally binding international document containing voluntarily taken obligations not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. On the basis of these considerations, we urge all delegations to support the draft resolutions aimed at achieving these goals.

Mr. CARASALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I would like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7, L.12 and L.21.

With reference to draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7 and L.21, which refer to the conclusion of effective international agreements to offer guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, as was done last year by my delegation, we will abstain this year as well. We will abstain because we consider that the process described in these negotiations, which follow similar guidelines, have been shown to be ineffective. These draft resolutions repeat, practically without changes, resolutions which have been adopted in previous years, which outline a way in which to achieve these effective arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States, as necessary. As I say, this process has been seen simply to lead to a path where there is no chance of success.
If we follow what we have done in the past and then this work goes to the Conference on Disarmament in the future, knowing that possibilities for making progress are non-existent, we think, therefore, that there is no point in insisting on this way and that new ways must be sought to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of such weapons. We think that in the final analysis those assurances will be given only by eliminating nuclear weapons from the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon States. Any other type of arrangement, especially when declarations of intent, which have been issued by nuclear-weapon States, are, with a single exception, statements of rhetoric difficult to understand with regard to the situations where they may or may not apply, ultimately amounts to lack of assurances, because those statements are impossible to verify. As long as there is no total change in the process, and especially in the attitude of the nuclear-weapon States, I repeat that it is pointless to proceed in this way.

For that reason, my delegation has abstained and will continue to do so with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7 and L.21.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12, which deals with the non-first use of nuclear weapons, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution because we see it as a positive step and if all nuclear-weapon countries were to issue statements on non-first use, and if these could later on be combined to form an international instrument, the situation would improve to a certain extent. But my delegation sees perfectly clearly that declarations of non-first use, even by all nuclear-weapon Powers, are not a solution. The solution, as in the case of the previous questions I mentioned, will come only when nuclear weapons are totally eliminated from the face of the earth.
So it is in full awareness of the limitations of the policy of non-first use that my delegation will vote in favour, because we consider that in any case it is a positive step towards the solution of the security problems which are of concern to all countries.

Mr. VEJVODA (Czechoslovakia): Allow me to make a brief statement concerning the draft resolutions in the limited cluster 7, namely, those which deal with the problem of the non-first use of nuclear weapons.

We hear that the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization feel unable to follow the obligation accepted by the remaining nuclear-weapon States not to use nuclear weapons first. My Government supports fully the measures that should be used in order to bring about a decrease in international tension and the non-first-use obligation is one of the most important among them. Therefore it is very disappointing to us that countries which, in words, support the so-called measures for confidence building, see in them only so-called openness and transparency and refuse to accept measures which are really significant.

Finally, with respect to the claims which we have heard here again about the so-called vast nuclear superiority and vast military superiority of the socialist States, we have to state again that there is no proof that such superiority really exists and we are afraid that these claims serve only to build a smoke-screen around the plans of the Western countries for a so-called limited nuclear war and so on. The possibility of the use of nuclear weapons therefore plays a role in Western strategic plans, notwithstanding what is being stated here. We think that all draft resolutions advocating the obligation of the non-first use of nuclear weapons should be treated very favourably by this Committee and this will be done by my delegation.

Mrs. OSODE (Liberia): My delegation will support draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.12 and L.21. However, we would like to express our view that we appreciate and accept the declarations of the non-first use of nuclear weapons and we also appreciate and accept the declaration that a nuclear war cannot be won and should never be fought. We do not believe that declarations have necessarily to be identical. We are more interested in commitments by States than in declarations, for declarations or utterances could be reversed or abrogated by any one party.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on individual draft resolutions in the first group in cluster 7.
The first one is draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.7, which was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 35th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, Guinea-Bissau, India, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.7 was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Guinea on a point of order.

Mr. DOUKOURE (Guinea) (interpretation from French): I just wish to bring it to the attention of the Committee that the representative of Guinea-Bissau is not present in the room. The voting machine indicates that that country is abstaining in the voting.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12, as orally amended, which was introduced by the
representative of the German Democratic Republic at the 35th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November, and is sponsored by Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary and Romania.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

**In favour:** Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, 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 Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

**Abstaining:** Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Philippines, Uruguay, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12, as orally amended, was adopted by 95 votes to 19, with 15 abstentions.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.21, which was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 34th meeting of the Committee and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Mongolia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.
A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Brazil, Burma, China, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, India, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Malaysia, Sweden, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.21 was adopted by 88 votes to 19, with 16 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.50, which was introduced by the representative of India at the 40th meeting, held on 15 November. It is sponsored by Algeria, Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Romania, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi,
Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, 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 Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

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

**Abstaining:** Austria, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Japan

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.50 was adopted by 113 votes to 17, with 5 abstentions.

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

**Mr. Sutowardoyo** (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation wishes to explain its votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.12 and L.21.

My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12, since we believe that the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons, besides being a unilateral measure showing good will, can also help to improve conditions for the resolution of disarmament issues. Although we voted in favour of the draft resolution, my delegation would like to emphasize Indonesia's long-established position that any use of nuclear weapons must be proscribed, not only the first use. Additionally, my delegation has difficulty with the way in which the eighth preambular paragraph is drafted, since it does not fully reflect the complexities of this particular issue.

My delegation voted in favour also of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.21, since we fully agree with its general thrust, as reflected particularly in operative paragraphs 1 and 5. However, my delegation is of the view that guarantees not to use or to threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States under any circumstances must be given by the nuclear-weapon Powers unconditionally. Accordingly, my delegation has difficulty with the way in which the fifteenth preambular paragraph is formulated. Had a separate vote been taken on that paragraph, my delegation would have abstained.

**Mr. Austad** (Norway): I should like to explain the Norwegian vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12. The Norwegian delegation cast a negative vote. We
did so this year for the same reasons which led us to vote against previous draft resolutions along these lines, since this draft resolution, in our view, is directed at the defensive strategy of an alliance to which my country belongs.

I should like to stress, however, that the Norwegian Government too is in full support of efforts to reduce the importance of and dependence on nuclear weapons. In fact, all our efforts in our own alliance and in international disarmament forums are directed towards that goal. I should like to add that this view has received broad support in the Norwegian Parliament and among the Norwegian public.

I should like to conclude by mentioning that my delegation is among the sponsors of another draft resolution which underlines fundamental commitments undertaken by members of the alliance of which Norway is a member, including the commitment never to use any of their weapons except in self-defence.

Mr. Imai (Japan): Japan voted against draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.21, entitled "Conclusion of an international convention on the strengthening of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", for the following reasons.

There has been, in our view, a sort of common understanding among all the members of the Conference on Disarmament regarding the conduct of work of the Ad Hoc Committee on Negative Security Assurances that a common approach should be sought to the solution of this issue. That common understanding has at least been appropriately addressed in last year's General Assembly resolution 38/67, in the voting on which Japan abstained and explained its vote.

This year's draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.21, however, seems to have abandoned this common understanding by no longer even referring to a "common approach acceptable to all" in its paragraph 3. We feel that draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.21 does not accurately reflect the results of the work on this issue carried out so far by the Conference on Disarmament.

We also have considerable difficulties with some of the preambular paragraphs, which contain lop-sided assertions regarding one side, which we cannot support.

On the whole, we find draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.21 to be unbalanced and not objective; we were thus unable to cast a favourable vote. The draft resolution is especially unbalanced and not objective compared with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.7, which we voted in favour of, although, I should add, we had some reservations about the references made in certain of its operative paragraphs to a specific modality for negative security assurances, which would seem to prejudge the work of the Conference on Disarmament.
Mr. KEISALO (Finland): Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12. By doing so, we wished to record the declared policy of the Government of Finland that nuclear weapons should never be used, in any circumstances.

Mr. MacFHIIONNBHAIRR (Ireland): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/39/L.12, on the question of the non-first-use of nuclear weapons. In this connection my delegation wishes to recall that at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament Ireland proposed that the nuclear-weapon States needed to consider what methods or agreements they might work out to provide against the first use by any of them of nuclear weapons. With that approach in mind Ireland, at the past two sessions of the General Assembly, supported resolutions 37/78 J and 38/183 B, which give support to the need for serious consideration by the nuclear-weapon States of commitments that would lessen the prospects of recourse to nuclear weapons.

However, my delegation has noted a new element contained in this year's draft resolution on this question - namely, the proposal contained in operative paragraph 3, which calls upon the Conference on Disarmament to consider the elaboration of an international instrument containing the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. While Ireland continues to regard as necessary the serious consideration of modalities to entrench and clearly define the fire-break that exists between all other kinds of conflict and any use whatsoever of nuclear weapons, we believe, none the less, that we must remain mindful, in our search for progress on this question, of the gap between aspiration and reality.

For example, when the Soviet Union announced its non-first-use pledge at the second special session devoted to disarmament, in 1982, we expected that there would be visible consequences for all to see in terms of force postures. However, such consequences still remain to be identified. The value and the credibility of the Soviet commitment is placed in some doubt by deployments of nuclear weapons in Eastern Europe, including the recent deployment of theatre nuclear weapons in the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia. As the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) has pointed out in a recent examination of this question:

"any such declaration that raises expectations which are not matched by subsequent changes in military force structures is bound to be discredited".

In conclusion on this matter, I wish to state that we have voted in favour of this draft resolution with some reservations regarding operative paragraph 3 and
the activity which is foreseen in that paragraph for the Conference on Disarmament and which appears to my delegation to be an impractical approach in present circumstances.

I wish to address myself also to the question of negative security assurances.

Ireland abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.21. I should like to stress that my Government wishes to see progress in the important field of security assurances. Ireland would therefore have preferred to be in a position to support that draft resolution. However, in my Government's view, it does not take into account the possibility of different approaches to the achievement of international arrangements in this matter. Furthermore, the draft resolution clearly favours the idea of an international convention, which would seem to imply further obligations for non-nuclear-weapon States.

It is our view that States that have already acceded to the Non-Proliferation Treaty should not be required to enter into such further obligations. Therefore, we have doubts about the approach adopted in this draft resolution.

For those reasons, my delegation, regretfully, abstained in the vote on this draft resolution.

Mr. Ekern (Sweden): I wish to explain the Swedish delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12. Sweden voted in favour of this draft resolution, which was introduced by the German Democratic Republic.

Let me first reiterate that the Swedish Government views unilateral declarations by the nuclear-weapon States committing themselves not to be the first to use nuclear weapons as an important concept in the efforts to reduce the dangers of an outbreak of a nuclear war. We hope that all nuclear-weapon States will find it possible to make such declarations. The establishment of a rough parity in conventional forces on a lower level would obviously facilitate such commitments.

In this context, it is worth recalling that the Swedish Government has lent its support also to the concept of prohibiting, in an international convention, as proposed by India, the use or the threat of the use of nuclear weapons. My delegation has taken note of the statement of the representative of the German Democratic Republic in the general debate of this Committee in which, in the context of non-first-use of nuclear weapons, he referred to the proposal to conclude a treaty on the non-use of force containing the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.
My delegation recalls that the question of concluding a treaty on the non-use of force containing, inter alia, an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has been discussed in the Sixth Committee since 1977. So far, no agreement has been reached on the need for such a treaty. In fact, the Swedish Government considers that the prohibition of the use or the threat of the use of force in international relations, as laid down in Article 2 of the United Nations Charter, is mandatory and sufficient. What is required is, rather, improved compliance by Member States with the existing prohibition and with the obligation, also laid down in the Charter, to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. On these grounds, the Swedish delegation has abstained in the Sixth Committee on draft resolutions concerning a treaty on the non-use of force.

My delegation is not of the opinion that the work of the Conference on Disarmament would benefit from the transfer of the question of a treaty on the non-use of force from the Sixth Committee to the Conference, or by its being dealt with in a parallel manner in both bodies. A firm commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, made through an international instrument of legally binding character dealing solely with this issue and promoting concrete measures for the implementation of effective non-first-use policies, would in the view of the Swedish Government be an important contribution to successful efforts to prevent nuclear warfare. It would thus be an important task for the Conference on Disarmament to address this issue under the item entitled "Prevention of nuclear war".

Allow me also to explain Sweden's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7 and A/C.1/39/L.21, on effective international arrangements to ensure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or the threat of the use of nuclear weapons.

Let me stress that satisfactory and effective negative security assurances can represent nothing but an interim measure, pending effective nuclear disarmament. But since nuclear weapons exist we certainly have to take them into account. The most fundamental element of an effective negative security assurance is obviously legally binding undertakings by the nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. These States should not be obliged to make any further commitments than their positively declared choice to be and to stay nuclear-weapon-free.
This choice may have been or may be made by adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to a treaty on a nuclear-weapon-free zone or in some other way to be defined, giving it international legal effect.

For this reason my Government has reservations as to the idea of an international convention, which seems to imply further obligations to be imposed on non-nuclear-weapon States. My delegation, therefore, has abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.21, which is clearly aimed at the conclusion of such a convention in its very title. Although draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.7 also refers to the idea of such a convention, it gives consideration to other proposals designed to secure the objective of providing the non-nuclear-weapon States with effective negative security assurances by the nuclear-weapon States. My delegation has therefore supported draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.7.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.50, my delegation will revert to this item when we have voted on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.66 on a related issue.

Mr. SHARMA (India): India has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12 because our delegation is in favour of the main thrust of that draft resolution, which is the prevention of nuclear war. We would like to reiterate, however, that pending the achievement of complete nuclear disarmament the best course of action for preventing the outbreak of a nuclear war is completely to forswear the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances whatsoever.

Mr. ERDENECHULJUN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): The Mongolian delegation earlier expressed its support for the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/39/L.12 and L.50, which have just been adopted. They relate to a matter of extreme importance, namely, the non-use of nuclear weapons. The Mongolian People's Republic has consistently supported all efforts aimed at outlawing the use of nuclear weapons. The commitment not to use nuclear weapons, particularly not to be the first to use such weapons, were it to be undertaken by all nuclear-weapon Powers, would in our opinion decisively promote the creation of conditions favourable to the adoption of practical measures to bring about the cessation of the nuclear-arms race and disarmament.

We cannot agree with those who have said that the obligation not to use nuclear weapons is purely rhetorical or that it cannot be verified. The obligation not to use nuclear weapons, backed up by genuine deeds, would help to strengthen mutual confidence and trust, about which the Western countries are so fond of
speaking. The Mongolian delegation therefore favours the request that the Conference on Disarmament proceed, as soon as possible, to elaborate an international instrument of a legally binding character dealing with this issue.

Mr. GVARCE (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): With regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.7 and L.21, which relate to assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, my delegation considers that, with a single exception, the statements and decisions taken on this item at the Conference on Disarmament have shown a lack of political will on the part of the nuclear Powers to provide effective guarantees in this regard. Furthermore, it could even be said that there is a distortion of the concept involved.

In spite of that, my delegation has voted in favour of both draft resolutions as a way of showing the concern and interest of a non-nuclear-weapon country in strengthening ways and means to give political, legal and practical content to the obligation of nuclear-weapon States towards those that have rejected the nuclear option, while recognizing, at the same time, that the best guarantee possible would be the progressive reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons.

Mr. GURINDVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic supported draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.12 on the non-first use of nuclear weapons. We think that this is an extremely important step for the prevention of nuclear war. If all the nuclear Powers were to undertake such a commitment there would be no subsequent nuclear strikes — in other words, no nuclear war whatsoever.

Attempts to detract from the importance of this step indicate that the opponents of the non-first use of nuclear force are not prepared for disarmament and, particularly, for nuclear disarmament, and thus they jeopardize the safety of their own peoples. The same is true of those countries that, heedless of the will of their people, have allowed their territory to be used for the deployment of American nuclear first-strike weapons.

It should be pointed out that the undertaking of the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has also been backed up by other important proposals. A treaty on the non-use of force in international relations has been concluded, and a draft treaty between the countries members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact on the non-use of force, either nuclear or conventional, has been put forward. Unfortunately, the NATO countries have not responded to such proposals. They have no grounds for saying that an
undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is designed to give the Soviet Union some kind of superiority in other areas. Their reluctance to support these Soviet initiatives cannot be concealed by attacks on the Soviet Union.

My delegation also supported draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.50, submitted by India and other States, on the elaboration of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, as well as the draft resolutions on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon countries. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was one of the sponsors of the draft resolution on the conclusion of a convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States that do not have such weapons stationed on their territories.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no other speakers wishing to speak in explanation of vote after the vote. The Committee has therefore concluded its consideration of and action upon the draft resolutions upon which we have voted so far.

As decided yesterday, the Committee will not for the time being take up a group of draft resolutions in cluster 7 but will do so in due course. Those draft resolutions are A/C.1/39/L.22, L.40, L.64, L.66 and L.69.
As we also decided yesterday, we shall now proceed to the draft resolutions in cluster B: A/C.1/39/L.6, L.14, L.44, L.45 and L.51. We shall not take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.45 in this group of resolutions until we have received clarification about the financial implications of that draft resolution. So we shall now proceed to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.6, L.14, L.44 and L.51.

I shall now call on those delegations which wish to state their position or explain their vote on this group of draft resolutions on which the Committee is about to take action.

Mr. Sob (Cameroon) (interpretation from French): The delegation of the Republic of Cameroon would like to speak on behalf of the African Group to submit an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51. This amendment was prepared after lengthy consultations, with a view to obtaining broader support for the draft resolution. The amendment relates to operative paragraph 6, which should now read as follows:

"Calls upon all States, corporations, institutions or individuals to terminate forthwith all forms of military and nuclear collaboration with the racist régime."

So the words "military and nuclear" would be inserted before the word "collaboration". Then, of course, one would delete "including" and so on.

We would like to draw the attention of the Secretariat to a correction made to the sixth preambular paragraph. I think the amended text has already been transmitted to the Secretariat.

Mr. Dhanapala (Sri Lanka): As in previous years it is necessary for my delegation to explain its vote in respect of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.6.

The Sri Lanka delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution. We do so in the context of our well-known policy of support for all nuclear-weapon-free zones in the world.

The Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in paragraphs 60 and 61, recognized that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones constituted an important disarmament measure, which should be encouraged with the ultimate objective of achieving a world entirely free of nuclear weapons. The greater the area covered by these zones, the better the chances of having a nuclear-weapon-free world, provided that the nuclear Powers respect the zones and abide by them.
Those views were reiterated recently in the Final Communiqué of the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Non-Aligned Countries to the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly, held in New York from 1 to 5 October 1984. At the same time we must note that the Final Document specifically stated:

"In the process of establishing such zones, the characteristics of each region should be taken into account." (S-10/2, para. 61)

Conditions in various zones differ, and while the evolution of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in one part of the world has developed in a particular manner it does not follow that that example can be replicated. It is vitally important that we take into account special characteristics, historical, political and other, when creating a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The importance of these special characteristics is recognized by us in the path towards regional economic co-operation. The path now being followed in South Asia, for example, is not the same as that followed in other regions.

It is also obvious that a nuclear-weapon-free zone cannot be a success unless it enjoys the full consent and support of all the States in the region. The States of the region must consult each other and share a consensus on the need for a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

We fully sympathize with those who insist that nuclear-free zones must take into account the harsh realities of the world we live in, with its ever-present and ominous danger of a nuclear war. Nuclear-weapon Powers must respect nuclear-weapon-free zones and not station nuclear weapons in or around them or in any way threaten the zones.

My delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.6 and will vote in favour of it.

Mr. LOWITZ (United States of America): I have asked to speak to explain the position of my Government on several of the draft resolutions before the Committee this morning which address the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones, specifically draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.6 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.14 on the Treaty of Tlatelolco, resolution A/C.1/39/L.44 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa and draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51 on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

In general the United States supports the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones as a non-proliferation measure when consistent with the following criteria. The initiative for the creation of the nuclear-weapon-free zone should come from the
States in the region concerned. All States whose participation is deemed important should participate in the zone. The zone arrangements should provide for adequate verification of compliance with the zone's provisions. The establishment of the zone should not disturb existing security arrangements to the detriment of regional and international security. The zone arrangement should effectively prohibit the parties to it from developing any nuclear explosive device for whatever purpose. The zone arrangement should not seek to impose restrictions on the exercise of rights recognized under international law, particularly the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas, in international air space and in straits used for international navigation, and the right of innocent passage through territorial seas. The establishment of a zone should not affect the existing rights of its parties under international law to grant or deny transit privileges, including port calls and overflight, to other States.

Those are the criteria by which the United States judges the effectiveness of any nuclear-weapon-free zone. We believe that effective nuclear-weapon-free zones negotiated and supported by States of the region can enhance the security of those States, as well as reinforce non-proliferation goals on a regional basis. We believe moreover that nuclear-free zone arrangements must effectively preclude the conduct of any nuclear explosions.
In this context, the United States will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.6 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. Our vote is not directed against any particular State in the region and reflects the continued United States support of the concept of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in South Asia and in other appropriate regions of the world. We take particular note of operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution, which urges all States in the region to refrain from any action contrary to the objectives of this draft resolution. Our support for this draft resolution is based on our continued expectation that the sponsors, and those voting in favour of it, will demonstrate that they take this provision seriously.

My Government will also support once again draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.14 on the Treaty of Tlatelolco. This Treaty on the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone continues to be a major contribution to the cause of non-proliferation and presents an example to other regions of the world. The United States became a party to additional protocol I of the Treaty in 1981. There are, however, countries within the region itself which have not ratified or adhered to the Treaty, although they are not mentioned by name in this draft resolution. The fact that one country is singled out consistently by the sponsors for not having become a full party to the Treaty and its additional instruments continues to be a cause for regret by my Government. Full adherence to the Treaty by all those States in the region would substantially enhance the Treaty's effectiveness in ensuring that Latin America remains a zone free of nuclear weapons.

I should now like to turn to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44 on the denuclearization of Africa and draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51 on the nuclear capability of South Africa. The United States continues to support efforts for a denuclearized Africa, if supported by all countries in the region, in the firm belief that an Africa free of nuclear weapons is a worthy goal.

At the same time, however, some of the language in these two draft resolutions compels the United States to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44 and to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51, as we have on similar draft resolutions in the past. We cannot, in particular, accept as a fact the nuclear capability of South Africa, as stated in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44. In draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51, my Government cannot agree to the call to end all forms of nuclear collaboration with South Africa. I would
remind the Committee in this regard that the United States does not engage in any military collaboration with South Africa.

I would hope that in the future our African colleagues might consider eliminating some of the tendentious language from these resolutions and work for consensus texts.

Mr. GERDTS (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation is pleased to announce that it will again vote affirmatively on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44, which concerns the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. Our positive vote is designed to express our high degree of identification with the objectives of the draft resolution, both as regards the designation of Africa as a whole as a nuclear-weapon-free zone and the particular admonitions to the Republic of South Africa to refrain from any nuclear-weapons-related activities. We have noted with gratification that the text of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44 is now of a nature which still enables us to mark our support for these objectives with unambiguous clarity.

Nevertheless, a certain number of doubts pertaining to the specific language of the draft resolution remain. In the second preambular paragraph, and in operative paragraph 1, the confines of the future nuclear-weapon-free zone are taken to comprise both the continent of Africa and its surrounding areas. This term continues to give us difficulties, since it is ambiguous. It is unclear whether the "surrounding areas" would comprise additional territories, or only sea areas, and what the extent of these areas would be. My delegation will, in any event, continue to give the strictest possible interpretation to this clause. As regards operative paragraphs 4 and 5, my delegation agrees with the general thrust of the language to keep Africa free of nuclear weapons. The Federal Republic of Germany will certainly do its utmost, within the limits of its legal possibilities, to contribute towards that end, but it should be noted that the language is still very broad and will need careful interpretation. The reservations which my Government has expressed hitherto with regard to possible broader interpretations will remain valid.

Operative paragraph 9 "requests the Secretary-General to render all necessary assistance" to the Organization of African Unity in the context of the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa. My delegation would have appreciated a more specific wording of this clause, in particular as to
the possible financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44. My
delegation wishes to make it clear that its support for draft resolution
A/C.1/39/L.44 will in no way curtail its freedom of action when the extent of
United Nations financial involvement is considered in the competent financial
bodies.

I should like to recall a working paper on the question of the nuclear
capability of South Africa which my delegation submitted to the United Nations
Disarmament Commission in 1983 and its contributions to the 1984 session of the
Commission in this field. In our various presentations we have suggested wording
of our own on many of the issues considered in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44.
Happily, our wording was generally not too far removed from what we now find in
this draft resolution. It is with regret that my delegation notes in this context
that the United Nations Disarmament Commission at its substantive session earlier
this year was not able to make further progress in its work on concrete
recommendations on this topic. It is to be hoped that the United Nations
Disarmament Commission will fare better in this respect next year and will, indeed,
be able to dispose of the item in terms of providing a decisive input into the work
of the fortieth session of the General Assembly.

Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): My delegation would like to explain its vote on the
draft resolutions dealing with the question of the establishment of
nuclear-weapon-free zones. My delegation will abstain in the voting on draft
resolution A/C.1/39/L.6, since this draft resolution continues, in our view, to
avoid the main concerns voiced by my Government and also those embodied in the
Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to
disarmament, regarding the requirements for the establishment of
nuclear-weapon-free zones, such as the commitment by nuclear-weapon Powers to
respect the status of the zone and to refrain from interfering in the respective
processes of negotiation, as well as the consensus of the States directly
involved. Brazil believes that other elements must also be taken into account,
particularly in the light of the attitudes of the nuclear-weapon Powers towards the
question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. I should like to stress in this regard the
Brazilian view that respect for the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones
presupposes the cessation of the continuing proliferation of nuclear weapons in
which the nuclear-weapon Powers, particularly the two super-Powers, are currently
engaged.
Effective compliance by the nuclear weapon Powers with the commitments undertaken with regard to the zones must be strictly verifiable, in order to prevent any circumventing of their obligations. The experience of the only existing nuclear-weapon-free zone in an inhabited region of the world, in Latin America, has unfortunately shown that the nuclear-weapon Powers do not seem prepared to accept the commitment to respect their obligations under the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which instituted the zone.

Those considerations would apply, in our view, to the proposed establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as they do to any other similar regional agreement.

My delegation will not, nevertheless, object to the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44, as it did not on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.54 earlier on. They deal respectively with the denuclearization of Africa and with the Middle East. We recognize that the particular situations of those two regions warrant special regard for their specific characteristics. Our continuing abstention on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.6 on South Asia should therefore be interpreted as a reaffirmation of the Brazilian stand regarding the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in general.

Mrs. Segarra (Ecuador) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Ecuador wishes to make a brief explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51, introduced by the delegation of Cameroon. Ecuador will vote in favour of this draft resolution because of the principles it sets out, which are in keeping with our international policy and our permanent rejection of any form of racial discrimination. However, we do not agree with the selective language used in specific paragraphs, in particular operative paragraphs 1 and 6.

Mr. Neira (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation wishes to refer to the item on the signing and ratification of additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, not for an explanation of vote since Peru is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.14, and consequently fully agrees with its contents, but in order to make the following statement on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and its Protocols.

My delegation understands that the silence of Additional Protocol I on the subject allows for submission of reservations, unlike Protocol II, which expressly...
prohibits them regardless of their language, in accordance with article 2 (d) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Nevertheless, we should not lose sight of the fact that a reservation can in no way contravene the objective or the purpose of the treaty, as also provided for in the Vienna Convention, in article 19 (c).

**Mr. SHARMA** (India): It has regrettably become an annual and pointless ritual in this Committee to have a draft resolution on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.6 is no different from its forerunners of past years, during which it has been absolutely clear that the countries of South Asia do not have a consensus on setting up a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that area.

India has consistently and categorically rejected this proposal and our reasons for doing so have been set forth in the past, in clear terms, before this Committee. While rejecting this proposal once again, we regret to point out that this repetitive exercise of submitting a draft resolution like A/C.1/39/L.6 only serves to introduce an unnecessarily discordant note to the process of regional co-operation, which the countries of South Asia are working hard to promote. India will, accordingly, vote against this draft resolution.

**Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA** (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain its vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51. Since the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) adopted the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa in 1964, the implementation of that Declaration has come up against the obstacle of the growing nuclear capability of South Africa. Also, for many years this Committee has stumbled upon arguments in defence of nuclear collaboration with South Africa, alleging that it is for peaceful purposes. Such arguments do not stand up even to minimum analysis.

Why do States which defend nuclear co-operation for peaceful purposes, for example, try to criticize nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes by saying that they lead to knowledge applicable in the military sphere. Obviously, the main obstacle to the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa is to be found in the nuclear collaboration with South Africa by certain Western States and Israel. It is that collaboration precisely which enables the apartheid régime to maintain its hostile and aggressive policy against the African countries.
The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I have been requested by the delegation of Cameroon to read out an earlier oral amendment that it had proposed to the Committee at an earlier meeting to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51. What it requested me to read out now, which it had earlier already read into the records, would appear in the sixth preambular paragraph, which in the English text is on page 2. The amended version, as proposed by the delegation, would read as follows:

"Taking note of the report of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, 'South Africa's nuclear capability', undertaken in co-operation with the Department for Disarmament Affairs and in consultation with the Organization of African Unity".

To repeat, we delete from the first line, after the words "taking note", the words "with appreciation". And in the last but one line we delete the words beginning with "as well as" to the end of that paragraph.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): I simply wish to note a discrepancy in the title of draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51. The last phrase of the text in French says: "Capacité nucléaire de l'Afrique du Sud". That same sentence in the Spanish text says: "Capacidad nuclear de Africa". Therefore, since we are introducing amendments, I would like to draw attention to this. The Spanish text says "Africa" instead of "South Africa".
The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster B.

We shall first take up draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.6, which was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 35th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Bhutan, India

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Sao Tome and Principe, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.6 was adopted by 90 votes to 2, with 43 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.14, which was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 34th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November, and is sponsored by the Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay.

A recorded vote has been requested.
A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, 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, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Cape Verde, Cuba, France, Guyana, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mali, Rwanda

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.14 was adopted by 129 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44, which was introduced by the representative of Cameroon at the 40th meeting of the Committee, on 15 November, on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations members of the African Group.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus,
Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, 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 Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44 was adopted by 132 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51, as orally amended, which was introduced by the representative of Cameroon at the 40th meeting of the Committee, on 15 November, on behalf of States Members of the United Nations members of the African Group.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.
(Mr. Imai, Japan)

My delegation also considers it highly desirable for the realization of nuclear-weapon-free zones that all the countries in the region concerned adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44 as a whole, my delegation also wishes to put it on record that our vote in favour should not be construed as meaning that we are in full agreement with the assertions contained in some of the paragraphs in the draft resolution, which in our view are not necessarily based on conclusive evidence.

Mr. MacFHIIONNBHAIRR (Ireland): Ireland voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.44 and A/C.1/39/L.51 as amended, on, respectively, the denuclearization of Africa and South Africa's nuclear capability, because we wished to give expression to our traditional, long-term support for the fundamental principle of the denuclearization of Africa.

At the same time, while it cast an affirmative vote on both draft resolutions, Ireland has reservations about a number of elements in them. Ireland is thinking in particular of the singling out of certain Western States and the failure to distinguish between co-operation for peaceful purposes and co-operation for weapons purposes.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): I wish to explain the vote of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and my own country, Sweden, on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa, and draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51, on the nuclear capability of South Africa.

Our countries' condemnation of apartheid in all its forms and manifestations has been voiced in the General Assembly on many occasions. We have also voiced our rejection of the increased oppression of and restrictions on South Africa's black majority. This rejection is based on the traditional Nordic concepts of justice, freedom and democracy and on our belief in the equality and dignity of every human being.

We also share the concern that South Africa might acquire nuclear weapons. Such a development would be a major setback for international non-proliferation efforts and could contribute to a further aggravation of the situation in southern Africa.

Our commitment to this cause is demonstrated by the measures taken by the Nordic countries in accordance with the joint Nordic Programme of Action against South Africa.
For those reasons, our delegations voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.44 and A/C.1/39/L.51. In doing so, however, our delegations have to voice reservations caused by some formulations used in the draft resolutions, reservations which concern questions of principle.

First, because of the strict adherence of the Nordic countries to the provisions of the Charter, we must generally reserve our position with regard to formulations that fail to take into account the proper division of competence between the United Nations main organs, and not least between the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Secondly, the Nordic countries deplore the inappropriate and arbitrary singling out of individual countries and groups of countries. This makes it more difficult to maintain the international consensus in dealing with the question of South Africa.

Thirdly, since the Assembly is composed of delegations representing the Member States, it should address itself to Governments rather than to private citizens and enterprises.

Those are the considerations on which most of our reservations are based.

As regards specific paragraphs, I should like to add that we have reservations about operative paragraph 7 in draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44.

I should like to take this opportunity also to explain, on behalf of my own delegation, Sweden, our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.6.

Sweden has on several occasions expressed its positive attitude with regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. In Sweden’s opinion, one of the most fundamental prerequisites is that general agreement should exist among all the States concerned. In line with this principle, Sweden could not support draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.6, regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as it was evident that all the States concerned were not prepared to support that draft resolution. Notwithstanding the Swedish abstention, my delegation would like to encourage the States concerned to continue to explore ways to enhance the attainment of the objectives set forth in the draft resolution. Efforts to that end by the countries concerned would have a confidence-building effect as well as a positive influence on the political climate in the area.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like briefly to explain why the United Kingdom delegation was unable to support draft resolutions A/C.1/39/L.44 and A/C.1/39/L.51, which have just been adopted by the Committee.
The United Kingdom fully supports the Governments of the independent States of southern Africa in their efforts to guarantee and safeguard their territorial integrity and national sovereignty. We note that South Africa has announced its intention to abide by the spirit of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We believe, however, that South Africa should accede to the Treaty at the earliest opportunity so as to reassure its neighbours and the world about its nuclear programme.

The United Kingdom does not collaborate in any way with South Africa in the development of its civil nuclear power programme and, still less, in the development of a nuclear-weapons capability. None the less, all States have the right to apply and develop programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. This right is internationally recognized and set out in a number of international instruments. It continues to be our view that it would be wrong to seek to limit this right in individual cases for political reasons.

Mr. LIPATOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Our delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.44 and A/C.1/39/L.51, which, generally speaking, contribute to efforts to curb the nuclear threat. My country's fundamental position on these matters has been set forth frequently and is well known to all.

In connection particularly with draft resolution A/C.1/39/L.51, we would stress that a very dangerous situation has arisen in southern Africa as a result of South Africa's attempts to establish for itself an arsenal of nuclear weapons. In view of the general policies pursued by the racist South African Government and its escalation of aggressive actions against neighbouring African countries, and in the light of the constant strengthening of its military arsenals, the attempts by the racists - with the help of their Western patrons - to get their hands on nuclear weapons have immeasurably increased the threat to international peace and security. We therefore believe that it is important, indeed urgent, to condemn - as the draft resolution does - all forms of co-operation with South Africa, and particularly in the military and nuclear fields. As is known, such co-operation is in fact engaged in by certain countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and by Israel. This co-operation not only increases South Africa's threat to African countries but also constitutes an artery feeding this régime and enabling it to escalate its bloody crimes against the oppressed peoples of South Africa and against neighbouring African countries.
In this connection the draft resolution quite properly calls upon the partners of the racists to put an end to any kind of collaboration with the racist régime, including military and nuclear collaboration.

We should particularly like to emphasize that we feel that this draft resolution and the fulfilment of its provisions, rather than general considerations about the evils of apartheid, constitute the litmus test that will reveal those who are furthering the elimination of apartheid and racism in the southern part of Africa and those who are not.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.