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Mr. ECKERBERG (Sweden): At the turn of the century the use of the lead bullet was prohibited, because the wounds it caused when it flattened against the human body and tore its way through the flesh shocked the world as too inhuman and too excessive for the purpose of placing a man out of action. In 1925, the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons was prohibited, in reaction to the use of gas during the First World War. Both those specific bans have been largely effective.

Since then no specific weapons have been banned from use. It may further be seriously questioned whether the generic prohibition in the laws of war on weapons which are likely to cause "unnecessary suffering" or on methods of warfare which are indiscriminate or perfidious has exercised any real restraint on weapon manufacturers.

When these generic rules were to be reaffirmed and developed in work initiated by the International Committee of the Red Cross on international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts, there was an evident case for examining the whole array of modern conventional weapons and for trying to single out for specific bans those which were particularly inhuman or apt to have indiscriminate effects or to be perfidious. From the outset this effort encountered a host of objections. It is believed that most of those have been taken care of. Some appear to persist, however. I should like to dwell for a moment on the reservations on the subject per se, because progress on it will certainly be less difficult if all States display a genuine political will to reach results.
Some have feared that the injection of the issue of banning the use of specific weapons into the Diplomatic Conference on Humanitarian Law might jeopardize or delay the two draft protocols submitted to it. For its part the Swedish delegation already commented last year that, in its view, there was no absolute necessity to embody rules on specific weapons directly in the two draft protocols. Conceivably, as the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany remarked at the Diplomatic Conference, such rules might be laid down in a protocol III. It is our assumption, moreover, that once agreements are attained on bans on the use of specific weapons, the question of where to embody them will not prove difficult. Since the Diplomatic Conference has established an Ad Hoc Committee for the question of bans on the use of specific conventional weapons, the issue cannot be said in any way to retard the work of the Conference. Indeed, I think all would admit that the work in the Ad Hoc Committee this year was, if anything, smoother than in the other three committees. I think most -- if not all -- would admit further that many other issues before the Conference are likely to prove as difficult, if not more difficult than the issue of bans on the use of specific weapons.

Another concern -- which appears still to persist -- is that this issue is tied to the question of the security of States and should be treated in the context of disarmament in CCD or the world disarmament conference. A related concern is that the issue is not humanitarian but should be treated in a United Nations context.

It should be noted, however, that many issues which are covered by the present effort to develop humanitarian law have aspects which relate directly to military and security problems. Questions such as explicit bans on indiscriminate methods of warfare -- area bombing, for instance -- or on attacks upon dams, dikes or nuclear power stations, or items indispensable to the survival of the civilian population have clear military and security aspects. The same is true of definitions of military targets and suggested easings of the requirements for prisoner-of-war status. The issue of bans on the use of specific conventional weapons is hardly more closely tied to military and security problems, nor is it likely to be more difficult than the other ones just mentioned. Furthermore, it is not easy to understand why anyone should
wish to define humanitarian rules so narrowly that they could protect victims of napalm but could not protect against napalm. The simple truth is -- as remarked by a great British authority on international law -- that most rules of the laws of war have humanitarian ends. Moreover, the Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law is a meeting of government plenipotentiaries. There is nothing to prevent Governments from sending whatever security or weapon experts they feel are needed to assist their delegations, nor is there anything to prevent them from paying attention to the security aspect of any proposal before the Conference. Indeed, it would seem vital that they should consider these aspects, as rules, however justified by humanitarian concerns, are likely to be subjected to dangerous strains if they conflict with the security interests of States. There was, of course, nothing at the first session of the Diplomatic Conference in Geneva to suggest that the participating States were unmindful of their own security interests.

A third concern has been that while the two draft protocols submitted to the Diplomatic Conference had been the subject of two previous conferences of government experts, the questions of bans on the use of specific weapons had not been the subject of much discussion, nor of any draft rules formulated by ICRC. Whatever the merit of this argument last year, it is losing significance. Indeed, the compilation and analysis of data relating to the weapons issue has, if anything, been more intensive than in other areas. The report by the Secretary-General on napalm and other incendiary weapons was but the first in a series of studies. In this series, I may also mention ICRC report of 1973 on weapons which may cause unnecessary suffering or have indiscriminate effects. This report was comprehensive in scope and it concluded by singling out incendiary weapons, high-velocity small-arms ammunition and certain fragmentation weapons for intergovernmental action regarding restrictions or prohibition of use. The first session of the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts, which took place in Geneva in February-March this year, devoted an initial discussion in its Ad Hoc Committee to the questions of bans on the use of certain conventional weapons. In order to
provide a basis for discussion, the delegations of Egypt, Mexico, Norway, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland and Yugoslavia submitted a working paper with concrete proposals and explanations. This paper was introduced during the Conference. Although it received much support, it was evident that many Governments preferred to hold back comments until the Conference of government experts which took place in Lucerne during September-October 1974.

I should now like to address myself to the contribution of that Conference, to the compilation of data and to the furthering of the work. Thereafter, I should like to dwell for a moment on the substance of the issue and to conclude with some comments on the best course of action.

Even a cursory reading of the report of the ICRC Conference of government experts in Lucerne reveals a stark difference between that document, on the one hand, and the reports of the Secretary-General on napalm and other incendiary weapons and the ICRC report of 1973 on weapons which may cause unnecessary suffering or have indiscriminate effects, on the other. The latter two reports were unanimously adopted by the international groups of experts which drafted them and they urged government action with a view to prohibitions or restrictions. The Lucerne report, although it reflects work which lasted for a much longer period than that required for the earlier reports, reveals extensive disagreements. Not only were assessments diverse, but even views on facts -- even medical facts -- diverged.

What are we to make of this? It is hard to avoid the impression that many experts from technologically advanced States had come with an ambition to concentrate on the disproving of certain points advanced in the earlier reports. Moreover, the amount of support given at Lucerne to those earlier reports does not clearly emerge in the present report. I am referring to the report with the pink cover which was distributed in this Committee about two weeks ago. I quote from paragraph 10 of that report: "These statements ... which amounted to a confirmation or an endorsement of earlier documents, are rendered in the report in a somewhat more summarized form". (International Committee of the Red Cross, Report on the Work of the Conference of Government Experts on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons, p. 4, para. 10)
Furthermore, this Conference, which was to be interdisciplinary among lawyers, doctors and military experts, was dominated by the military aspects. Perhaps it is natural that military experts should look primarily to military utility. But the question of bans on use requires for its consideration a balancing of military-utility considerations with humanitarian and legal considerations. Let me illustrate how another one-sided argument can read. It is in paragraph 80 of the report which reflects the views of some military experts and which reads, in part, as follows:
... the military were not accustomed to maintaining useless or superfluous items of equipment. It followed, in their view, that arsenals contained only weapons for which a definite military necessity was perceived. Likewise, only those weapons were retained for which adequate substitutes did not already exist in the arsenals". (Ibid., para. 80)

With such an attitude, any weapon that is included and retained in an arsenal is by definition indispensable. It may be doubted -- to put it mildly -- that bans on use would ever have been adopted on the dum-dum bullet or on gas, had Governments allowed themselves to be guided by this simplistic approach. The evident conclusion is that Governments must consider the question of bans on the use of specific weapons at a political level where there can be an appropriate balancing of military-utility arguments with humanitarian arguments. It should not be forgotten that whatever bans are adopted by general agreement will be of benefit to all sides and will in all likelihood constitute the same military handicap, if any, to all parties. Bans with one-sided effects are not sought.

Another example may be given. In the discussion of "indiscriminate weapons" some experts in Lucerne felt that:

"... Except for the case of a weapon intentionally designed to follow a random course and at the end of its trajectory hit whatever object happened to be there, all conventional weapons could be used in circumstances where the risk of hitting civilians was virtually non-existent."
(Ibid., para. 30)

What about weapons whose miserable accuracy was a simple fact but not the result of deliberate construction? Further, even unanchored automatic contact mines might, of course, be used without risk to civilians, if they were dispersed in a lake where the only vessels were those of an enemy navy. Yet, such mines were prohibited for use under the VIIIth Hague Convention, unless they contained a self-destruction device which rendered them harmless within one hour after dissemination.

While general rules prohibiting indiscriminate methods and means of warfare may lay down adequate limits for the use of many weapons, specific rules may be needed restricting or conditioning the use of specific weapons, for example, rules requiring the marking of minefields or, indeed, requiring that minefields laid in
areas where civilians may be affected, contain effective self-destruction devices. As regards yet other weapons, their normal or typical use might entail such a pronounced risk of indiscriminate effects that there might be justification for banning the use of the weapon altogether, despite the fact that there could be circumstances in which this risk did not exist or was negligible. We should discuss whether some of the most modern and most extremely area-covering fragmentation weapons are not of this kind.

Several other arguments advanced at the Lucerne Conference were somewhat startling. In paragraph 32 of the report, an argument advanced by some experts from technologically developed States is reflected in the effect that bans on the use of incendiary weapons, like napalm, might be especially inconvenient to developing countries, because those countries might not be able to afford expensive substitutes. These preoccupations, however, were not shared by experts of developing countries at the conference.

Perhaps some of those latter experts had witnessed enough use of incendiary weapons to urge a ban on them without discussing the question of substitutes. It is, indeed, debatable whether it is at all meaningful to discuss the question of substitutes for weapons which seem to deserve being banned from use. Such questions were hardly asked when gas and bacteria were banned as weapons.

Despite many negative impressions of the Lucerne Conference, positive ones prevail. This was the first time since the 1930s that such a large gathering had considered the question of conventional weapons with a view to possible prohibitions or restrictions. No doors were closed, but some new data were disclosed. If there was some reticence in revealing data, it is perhaps understandable. Before Governments begin to define their policy stands, their experts will avoid statements which might later be invoked against such stands.

Furthermore, all criticism of earlier reports must not be seen as negative. Although a disproportionate amount of time and argument seemed to be spent on criticism of a few points, any criticism which helps to establish what the true facts are must be welcome. The major parts of the earlier reports were not subjected to criticism and it may be assumed that most of these parts were accepted as common ground. This is welcome also.
It is possible that another working method in Lucerne would have resulted in more tangible agreement. As it was, no efforts were made to extract from the lengthy debates points that were held in common. In such circumstances one cannot expect anything but juxtaposed statements. On one point agreement was recorded, thanks to an informal working group. This had regard to the definition of incendiary weapons. The definition reached by consensus -- which is found in annex 5 of the ICRC report of the Conference -- is very welcome as evidently any bans on the use of a weapon or category of weapon will require a precise definition of such weapon or category. On other points, too, one could easily discern consensus or near consensus, although they were not formalized. Thus, it appeared to be a widely held view that hinterland bombing with incendiaries was not an indispensable method and might be prohibited. A limited rule to that effect would not, in our view, be satisfactory, and would contain grave weaknesses. Nevertheless, support even for such a rule marks some progress. On the suffering caused by incendiary weapons there seemed, moreover, to be only one view. The ICRC report states:

"All experts agreed that ... generally speaking, severe burn wounds are probably the most painful type of wound and frequently remain so for long periods of time. There was general agreement that they may require long-term treatment and rehabilitation, that a high grade of medical care is required for adequate treatment, and that they may result in permanent disability, including physical, functional, cosmetic, social and psychological disability." (Ibid., para. 85)

This medical conclusion is not at variance with the medical chapter of the Secretary-General's report and it is evidently an indictment of all incendiary weapons, whether used in the battle zone or in the hinterland, whether affecting combatants or civilians.

My delegation does not claim that all incendiary weapons are obsolete or of limited military utility. Nor does it claim that they are invariably indiscriminate, although evidently fire, unlike explosives, is self-propagating. But it holds that a comprehensive ban on the use of incendiary weapons should be contemplated rather than a restriction of their use. Restrictions may be more liable to erosion. What is "the battle zone" or "the hinterland"? What is "anti-materiel"? We submit that as long as there is deployment of weapons there is a considerable risk of use -- in spite of restrictions. Only by complete bans on use will there be a likelihood of no deployment.
The better reliability of such rules is the great advantage that may be gained by any military disadvantage that may be perceived in a complete ban. Other Governments, like those of Iran, Mexico, Norway, Syria and New Zealand, have likewise expressed preference -- either in their comments on the Secretary-General's napalm report, or in this Committee -- for a complete ban. Let me only quote last year's statement in this Committee by the representative of New Zealand. He said:

"... there are likely to be substantial difficulties in the implementation of prohibitions on the use of incendiaries in particular circumstances or against particular targets. In the view of the New Zealand Government there is a strong case for a total prohibition of such weapons." (1949th meeting, p. 63)

Let me turn for a moment to another category of weapons on the use of which my Government, and others, have proposed a ban. I have in mind high-velocity small-arms projectiles. While the M 16 rifle with its 5.56 mm calibre bullet is the most discussed example in this class, there are many others. In fact, most countries with technologically advanced armed forces are probably now contemplating changing over from the traditional 7.62 mm calibre rifle to a new standard rifle. The smaller calibre offers the indisputable advantage of a lighter weapon and lighter ammunition. The burden of the soldier will not be eased, however. He will have to carry more of the lighter ammunition. He will also -- this is our conclusion based on presently available data -- subject himself to a much greater risk of sustaining explosive-type injuries with the new ammunition as compared to most traditional ammunition -- with the exception of the dum-dum bullet. Although our conclusion was disputed by several experts in Lucerne, we think all Governments should pause to examine the data which may be available to them. In our view, a world-wide switch to a more devastating standard ammunition would be tragic and could not be to the advantage of anyone. Evidently, this is a policy question for Governments, not a matter to be settled at a technical expert level. Changes in standard rifles and ammunition occur only at very long intervals. The moment to consider humanitarian aspects of the changes under discussion and on the drawing board is now. The Conference on International
Humanitarian Law and the anticipated conference of Government experts offer the first opportunities for exchanges of views and for concerted action on this matter, as on others relating to the prohibition of use of specific conventional weapons. This is why their engagement in the subject is welcomed in the seventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691 before us.

I do not want to prolong this, I am afraid, already lengthy statement by discussing other specific weapons now. But I should like to add that in our view a successful tackling, in the context of humanitarian law, of the question of bans on use should make the even more difficult disarmament questions of non-production, non-stockpiling and non-proliferation of the weapons in question somewhat less intractable. Those disarmament questions in our view should be taken up in the proper disarmament forum. As in the case of biological weapons, prior bans on the use of those weapons might, perhaps, help to bring about the complete subsequent elimination of them. This is the thought expressed in the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.691 before us.

I should like to conclude by making a few comments on the further procedure to be followed in this question, and in this connexion to introduce the draft resolution sponsored by the delegations of Austria, Cyprus, Egypt, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia and Yugoslavia. I again refer to document A/C.1/L.691, upon which I have already commented somewhat.

My Government was already of the view last year that the body of data compiled on the subject before us was substantial. This year's discussions in the Ad Hoc Committee of the Diplomatic Conference and, even more, at the Lucerne Conference of Government Experts have added even more to our knowledge and understanding -- as noted in the eighth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. Although we are inclined to believe -- as expressed in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution -- that the single most important element needed now is a political will to attain results, we recognize the fact that several Governments feel a strong need for further time for inquiries, both internally and in conjunction with other States. Since it is highly desirable that all bans on use should have general support so as to be reciprocally respected in any conflict, we feel we must heed requests for further examination
of data and joint discussion, provided this is not used as a way of temporizing. This is reflected in the ninth and tenth preambular paragraphs and in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

In our view, the Ad Hoc Committee of the Diplomatic Conference could usefully contribute to the advancement of the item by discussing the results of the Lucerne Conference and considering specific proposals that are before it or that may be laid before it. We understand that there was a common agreement to that effect among the experts in Lucerne. For our part, however, we doubt that the Ad Hoc Committee would ready to adopt any treaty rules on the subject during its 1975 session. Many Governments, regrettably, will need more time and further inquiries before any decisive action is taken. In this situation, my Government, like several others, has concluded that the best course of action would be to accept the offer of the International Committee of the Red Cross to host another conference of Government experts, provided, however, that the mandate be more forward-looking than this year's Conference. It should notably require the Conference to focus its discussion on those conventional weapons which have been, or may become, the subject of proposed bans or restrictions. Moreover, the conference should study the possibility, contents and form of bans or restrictions on use of such weapons. Although it would be for the Ad Hoc Committee of the Diplomatic Conference and ICRC to discuss the detailed work programme of the expert conference, the outline which I have described is noted in the eleventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution.

One final comment about the Ad Hoc Committee: With the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee last year, it should now be evident that the consideration of the weapons issue is not encroaching upon the time allotted to the work of the draft protocols.

It is the view of my Government that discussions in the Ad Hoc Committee in 1975 and at a second conference of Government experts should suffice to clarify the questions and bring enough agreement to permit subsequent decisive Government action on the issue of bans or restrictions on the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons, as well as on other specific conventional weapons. If, as already seems likely, the difficult work on the two draft protocols before the Diplomatic Conference should make a third session of that conference inevitable, action on the weapons issue might be taken at the same session.
That issue would then, like the two Protocols, have been preceded by two conferences of government experts. Some might view such a schedule as optimistic. Given the political will -- and I stress this point -- my delegation finds it completely realistic. All the facts and all the data that might be desirable would not be forthcoming, but all the most important facts and data should be available. Also, there should be enough time for necessary consultation, internally and internationally. If Governments were to await all the data that might conceivably be asked for on any given point, they would be paralysed. My Government hopes that the world will not allow itself to be paralysed on this issue and let slip by the opportunity to take speedy action which would prevent some terrible suffering.

Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia): Mr. Chairman, I should like to present a few comments on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690.

Yugoslavia has always supported the prohibition of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both vertical and horizontal, and has opposed the continuation of the nuclear arms race and of nuclear-weapon tests in all environments. We were among the first to sign and ratify the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We did so in order that the monopoly of nuclear Powers should not be legalized and perpetuated and we acted, together with other signatories, in the profound belief that we were thereby making an effective and important contribution towards the discontinuance of the nuclear arms race and the prohibition of the use, development, manufacture, and stockpiling of nuclear weapons.

We have always strongly supported an increased use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, especially for the accelerated development of developing countries, including the benefits derived from nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. We have also repeatedly pointed out in the General Assembly and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament -- and in this we were not alone -- that the continuation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear-weapon tests undermines the very bases of this Treaty, considerably reduces its importance and lessens the likelihood of its universal acceptance. We continue to believe that the discontinuance of the nuclear arms race, the
cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests and the giving of necessary security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States are matters of the highest priority. The solution of these questions would not only greatly enhance confidence in the non-proliferation Treaty but also amount to a substantive contribution to the creation of necessary conditions for nuclear disarmament.

The consideration of the problem of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes is, to our mind, inseparable from the consideration and solution of the questions just mentioned. They are closely connected and must be solved in parallel, so that we may reach the goal towards which we are aiming, namely, prohibition of the proliferation and sophistication of nuclear weapons and the unimpeded use for peaceful purposes of potential benefits derived from nuclear energy. We agree with the views expressed by the Secretary-General in his introduction to the report on the work of the Organization when he suggested that the question of peaceful nuclear explosions in all its aspects should now be a subject for international consideration. Thorough international consideration should therefore be given to the question of peaceful nuclear explosions.

We have carefully examined the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690, which is before the Committee. Its basic intention concerns the necessity for undertaking a study of the various aspects of the problem of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, in order to prevent nuclear proliferation. However, various paragraphs of the draft, especially in the preamble, are not to the satisfaction of my delegation and could be construed as prejudging different aspects of the issue, while other paragraphs might be understood as limiting the benefits which might materialize from nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes or from a wider dissemination of nuclear technology and nuclear materials. We think that the General Assembly should have been given a more active role at the outset of the consideration of the complex matter of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, and that reference should have been made in respect to the fulfilment of pending obligations under article V of the non-proliferation Treaty in relation to reaching special international agreement on peaceful nuclear explosions. We also believe that the Secretary-General
should have the possibility, when presenting further comments on this matter, of requesting Member States to submit their views on it. That would ensure that all States concerned which are not members of one of the bodies mentioned in operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 could state their views on the problems that every one of these bodies will examine separately, depending on its competence.

In view of these considerations, my delegation will have to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution.

**Mr. KEVIN** (Australia): I should like with your permission, Mr. Chairman, to make a statement in regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.692 concerning chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons which was adopted by consensus in this Committee two days ago. The Australian delegation was instructed to co-sponsor that draft resolution. Unfortunately, those instructions were not received until after the voting process in this Committee had been completed. Accordingly, my delegation wishes to state, for the record, that had we had the opportunity to do so we would have co-sponsored the draft resolution in the First Committee and also that we would like the name of Australia to be added to the list of co-sponsors before the draft resolution is adopted in the plenary Assembly.

**The CHAIRMAN** (interpretation from Spanish): The comments of the representative of Australia will be duly reflected in the records of the Committee as well as comments made by any other representatives who would like to clarify their position with regard to votes already taken.

**Mr. DINKA** (Ethiopia): When the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.685, concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, was voted upon the Ethiopian delegation was unable to vote because, due to unforeseen circumstances, we could not get to the meeting in time. I ask your indulgence this morning,
Mr. Chairman, to allow me to state for the record that my delegation fully supports that draft resolution and would like to see its vote in favour of it recorded.

Mr. TANKOUA (United Republic of Cameroon) (interpretation from French): For reasons outside our control, we were not able to participate in the vote on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.685 and L.686. My delegation regrets that it was absent and requests that the record may show that had it been present it would have voted in favour of the two draft resolutions.

Mr. LAWSON (Togo) (interpretation from French): My purpose in asking to speak is the same as that of the two previous speakers. I want to apologise for having been absent during the voting on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.685 and L.686, for reasons beyond my control. The Government of Togo approves of those two draft resolutions and we would have voted in favour had we been present during the vote. I make this statement for the record.
Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): My delegation was absent yesterday morning when the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.685 and A/C.1/L.686 were put to the vote. I should like to inform the Committee that if my delegation had been present we would have voted in favour of both those draft resolutions.

Mr. MONDJO (Congo) (interpretation from French): For reasons beyond its control, my delegation was absent yesterday during the vote on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.685 and A/C.1/L.686. I should like to have the fact recorded that, had the Congolese delegation been present, it would have voted in favour of the two aforementioned draft resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to announce that the representative of Ireland has joined the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690.

I should like also to take this opportunity, before we turn to the draft resolutions to be voted on, to indicate that according to information available to me draft resolutions are being prepared on agenda items 24, 27, 31, 34, 35 and 101. I should like to draw the attention of delegations involved in preparing draft resolutions to the fact that the deadline for completing the vote on draft resolutions is Friday afternoon; and, as indicated in the rules of procedure, normally we allow 24 hours before a draft resolution is voted on. Naturally, that rule can be suspended if the Committee so decides, but I must stress the fact that, generally, as stipulated in the rules of procedure, draft resolutions should be distributed in all working languages at least 24 hours beforehand. Therefore, if Friday is the deadline, the draft resolutions should be submitted and introduced in the Committee at the very latest on Thursday, that is to say, tomorrow.

Since I know that several delegations are involved in that task, I thought that I should make this comment to encourage them to work harder to submit their draft proposals to the Committee before the deadline. The deadline for submission of draft resolutions is indeed Thursday.
As previously decided, we shall now proceed to consider and vote on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682 relating to agenda item 107, entitled "Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia", sponsored by India and Pakistan, respectively.

I shall now call on those delegations which have asked to be allowed to explain their votes before the vote.
Mr. HYVÄRNEN (Finland): It is my intention to explain in a few words my delegation's position with regard to the two draft resolutions now under consideration, namely, those in documents A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682.

We are aware of the fact that those two draft resolutions take a somewhat different approach, in practical terms, to the question to which they are addressed, that is, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. At the same time, we note that neither of the two authors of those draft resolutions -- indeed, they have so stated in this Committee -- is adversely disposed to conducting consultations for the furtherance of this idea. That being the case, and since a positive vote on such suggestions by States outside the said region can only indicate their support of the question in principle, Finland will cast a positive vote on both draft resolutions.

Mr. KEVIN (Australia): The Australian delegation wishes to make an explanation of its vote on the two draft resolutions under agenda item 107. Australia believes that nuclear-free zones should contribute to the objective of non-proliferation and that they should effectively inhibit the development of any nuclear-weapon capability. Australia would support the objective of establishing a nuclear-free zone in the South Asian region should it meet those requirements.

In general, my Government also considers that nuclear-free-zone proposals should, in principle, have the support of all States in the area proposed for a zone. However, my Government has taken full account of the difficult situation which arose this year under this agenda item. We regret that it did not prove possible for the sponsors of the two draft resolutions on which we will be voting today to reach agreement on a single text. However, we note the efforts -- unsuccessful though they were -- made by both parties to reach agreement. It goes without saying that Australia is a good friend of both countries which have sponsored draft resolutions under this item.

The Australian Government has carefully considered all those factors and, as a result, has instructed its delegation to vote in favour of both draft resolutions under this agenda item. At the same time, we would like to express the hope that in the course of the ensuing year both India and Pakistan will reach agreement on a common approach to this question, so that the First Committee will not be faced again with a repetition of this rather unfortunate situation.
Mr. TSHERING (Bhutan): I have asked to be allowed to speak to make my delegation's position clear on the draft resolutions now under consideration in this Committee.

My delegation has been following the debate on disarmament with great interest because it is a subject that affects the security and well-being of all nations. We have also carefully examined the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682, which are now before the Committee.
My delegation believes that it is important to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones whenever it is found desirable, but we also believe that it is more important to have adequate consultations first among the members of the concerned region, so that we do not take unduly hasty decisions on such an important issue.

In view of this, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681 and will vote against the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682. This, however, should not be construed as an indication that Bhutan is against the concept of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all parts of the world. I can assure you that my delegation has not taken this position with a view to "betting on the winning horse", but that our position is guided purely by our desire to promote peace and stability in South Asia.

Mr. MARTIN (United States of America): The United States has often affirmed its support of the establishment of nuclear-free zones, subject to the criteria which we have discussed in this Committee and at the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. Indeed, we firmly believe that they can make a substantial contribution to non-proliferation and to regional stability and security.

The establishment of such a zone, however, requires basic agreement on the goals and conditions for such a zone. This implies a substantial community of interests among the potential participants in the zone and a certain degree of consultation and preparation before specific proposals are made.

The draft resolutions put forward by two Member States, both of whom would be essential members of a proposed South Asian nuclear-free zone, are quite different in scope and perspective. We understand that efforts have been made by the sponsors of those two draft resolutions, with the assistance of others, to bridge the gap that exists between the two drafts. However, those efforts to arrive at a compromise solution have unfortunately not succeeded.
In these circumstances, we do not believe that the Assembly's adoption of those two draft resolutions which, in our view, embody quite differing approaches, would advance the objective of a nuclear-free zone in the South Asian area. Therefore the United States will abstain on both resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Nigeria on a point of order.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): I apologize, Mr. Chairman, I could not catch your eye earlier, but I did indicate yesterday that I would like to make a statement on this subject. It must have escaped your notice -- probably a matter of urgent necessity called -- since I did give notice about this, but I also thought that I should not speak on a point of order, since I would not be able to challenge your ruling on the matter. I might have been tempted to raise a point of order under rule 91, to see whether a procedural motion could not be made either with a view to asking that the two drafts be adopted by consensus or stating that the Assembly takes note of the two draft resolutions, and leaving the matter at that. I wonder if you would like me to proceed, Sir, on the basis of what I have said. If not, I will hold my peace and vote when the times comes.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I am sorry that the representative of Nigeria was not able to speak before the others -- on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681, if I am not mistaken -- and I should like to say that if he now wishes to raise a point of order, he can do so. The voting procedure has not yet begun, after which rule 128 would apply, so if the representative of Nigeria would like to do so, he has the right to raise a point of order with regard to the draft resolution which is being studied.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I must confess that I am very pleased and moved by the ruling which you have just given. I may also say that it may not be important but I have had to cancel a dental appointment in order to be present at this meeting. I can survive my
dental problems at the moment, but my conscience would not be at ease for quite some time if I did not say what I want to say now about the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681 which, with your permission, Sir, I should like to read, along with the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682.

I am motivated by my friendship for the Ambassadors of India and Pakistan, a friendship which I enjoy by virtue of the fact that their two countries and mine enjoy the closest and most cordial relations.

Yesterday, as I was coming to the meeting, the thought occurred to me that the greatest contribution Nigeria could make to this debate was not to exacerbate the situation, not to hinder the desire of India and Pakistan to move towards an agreement in their bilateral relations which would include the subject under discussion, if we cannot help them to formulate a common draft from their two separate drafts which I have just referred to. Since then I have read and reread their statements in document A/C.1/PV.2020. I must confess that I have been more impressed by the temperate and conciliatory manner in which their views were presented than by the views themselves. Of course, we of Nigeria naturally respect those views highly, and we give them all the attention they deserve. I have also been impressed, Sir, by the measure of agreement that has been achieved so far under your able leadership, in working out the procedure of submitting and voting on the two draft resolutions.

My delegation, as I said, has already studied the two draft resolutions. To us they do not seem to be mutually exclusive, even though we would be the first to admit that their approach and scope are different. I know that one of the parties has already said so, even though the other does not agree. When the very sad situation arises of having to choose between friends rather than between issues as we see them, the issue is not difficult for us. The statements of the two delegations with respect to this item and other items show that they are both committed to a certain position with regard to nuclear disarmament and nuclear proliferation. They show their common belief in the right of all States to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. I think that what we are not really discussing is how do we translate these feelings they share on this matter into some sort of resolution relating to the creation of a nuclear-free zone in their subcontinent.
I think, purely out of conscience, I would personally feel that it would not do damage to either position if we were to appeal to the two delegations, either by means of a simple resolution, stating that the General Assembly, having received the two resolutions, takes note of them, and stop there, or formally move now that the two draft resolutions which I have referred to, in documents A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682, be considered together and be adopted by consensus.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Before I call upon other speakers, I should like to make a few brief comments that will outline the situation with regard to the two draft resolutions.

As I told the Committee yesterday, and as all representatives know, attempts have been made to obtain a consolidated text of these two drafts. I wish to state publicly that there was indeed goodwill demonstrated by the two delegations directly involved in this item, that is to say the delegations of India and of Pakistan. The efforts of delegations in mediating for this purpose and the action taken by the Chairman himself made it possible to appreciate the constructive spirit demonstrated in this regard by the delegations of India and Pakistan. I therefore believe that, whatever may result from the suggestion made by the representative of Nigeria, we should make some acknowledgement of the great desire to contribute to the achievement of an equitable solution that has been shown by the two delegations mentioned.

The representative of Nigeria has proposed that the Committee adopt by consensus the two draft resolutions appearing in documents A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682. As this is a decision that must be reached by the Committee, with the permission of those delegations on my list for an explanation of vote before the vote, I shall call upon those delegations that have asked to speak in order, I am sure, to comment on the proposal of the representative of Nigeria.

Mr. MISHRA (India): I have listened very carefully to the representative of Nigeria. As we listened to him, we were conscious of his pain, both physical and spiritual. I assure him that we share both the physical and the spiritual pain he feels.

Mr. Chairman, as you yourself said, and as was said by the representative of Nigeria, there has been no lack of goodwill. However, there are situations where differences are so deep that it becomes difficult to arrive at a compromise, despite all the goodwill that is possible. We are sorry that it was not possible to arrive at a compromise, and I am quite sure the delegation of Nigeria is equally unhappy about that situation. Efforts were
indeed made by many representatives. You yourself, Mr. Chairman, took this matter in hand yesterday and you know the difficulties we are facing. However, in a spirit of goodwill, we are still prepared to follow the course suggested by our friend from Nigeria and to accept a statement of consensus by the Chairman of the Committee that the Assembly takes note of the two draft resolutions.

In regard to the other part of the suggestion made by our friend from Nigeria, I must confess that, given the very deep differences of substance and of principle, it would be difficult for my delegation to adopt the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.682 by consensus. Though I regret it deeply, this is a matter that we have to press to a vote if the two drafts are going to go to a vote. That, however, is the position.

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (interpretation from French): I should like to support the proposal of the Ambassador of Nigeria. As a matter of fact, numerous precedents exist in the case of the General Assembly, both in plenary session and in the Committees. There have been many instances in which, when faced with difficulties of this kind and in order to avoid the necessity of a vote, we have adopted proposals either by consensus or without a vote, with delegations having the chance, of course, to explain their differences of opinion later on. You will remember, Mr. Chairman, that the differences of opinion which existed at the sixth special session of the General Assembly at times ran very deep. Nevertheless, those whose points of view were sometimes farthest apart agreed to procedure by consensus or by adoption of proposals without a vote, later coming to the rostrum to explain their reservations, sometimes at great length.

I think the procedure suggested by the representative of Nigeria would not result in any concealment of the profound differences of opinion to which the representative of India referred just now. The representative of Nigeria's proposal seems to me to have been made in a farsighted spirit. We have two draft resolutions, and as the representative of Nigeria indicated, they are not necessarily in conflict with each other. Expressing the views of my own delegation,
we should like to see this absence of any contradiction between them become in the future a matter of complementarity, so that the idea of a denuclearized zone may become a reality. And it was in this spirit, I believe, that the representative of Nigeria made his proposal.

I support that proposal, but as you yourself stated, Mr. Chairman, many efforts have been made during the last few days by the parties involved and by delegations friendly to the two parties, and by you yourself, Mr. Chairman, but those efforts have met with no success.

If the two draft resolutions are put to the vote, I shall vote according to my instructions, reserving my right to explain my vote after the voting.
Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): My delegation is most grateful to the representatives who have spoken at this meeting, and in particular I should like to express our appreciation to the representative of Nigeria for proposing that the two draft resolutions be adopted by consensus and to the representative of Iran, who has supported this proposal. To this procedure my delegation is entirely agreeable. It should commend itself to the members of the Committee, because if the matter is pressed to the vote there is no doubt that the two draft resolutions will be adopted by an overwhelming majority. So the result is bound to be the same. This is not a situation in which one draft resolution would fail of adoption if it were pressed to a vote. Most delegations have committed themselves to both the draft resolutions, and the outcome is not in doubt. Therefore the suggestion made by the representative of Nigeria has much to commend it and will not prejudice the positions of the delegations of either India or Pakistan, particularly when it is open to us to make our own statements of interpretation in regard to the vote.

We think that the statements by the representatives of Finland and Australia have also been most helpful. I should like to assure the representative of Australia that the search for agreement with India will continue. This is only one of the forums in which Pakistan and India are engaged in an honest dialogue to reconcile differences. Of course, if full agreement has not been possible on this occasion at the delegation level, the matter could be discussed at the Foreign Secretary level in Pakistan and in India or at the ministerial level or at the summit level. Therefore the fact that Pakistan and India have not been able to reach complete agreement at this time in no way clouds the prospect of future agreement. In this regard, I feel constrained to tell the representative of the United States that his visualization of the situation is much more pessimistic than seems to us to be warranted.

I should like also to express my gratitude to the representative of Iran for what he has said. Most delegations are aware of the great efforts made by Foreign Secretary Kevval Singh of India and myself to reach agreement. We do suffer from certain limitations here, because we are both away from our
capitals. The movements, in positions, have been quite rapid, and it has been impossible to keep our Governments fully informed of the trends of opinion. Therefore we have to contend with such an adverse situation. But I should like to make one thing clear: the delegation of Pakistan does not feel that its draft resolution is in any way antagonistic to the draft resolution of India. I am sorry that we have failed to put this across to the representative of India but I believe that the two draft resolutions are entirely compatible. We certainly have no intention of interpreting our own draft in a rigid manner in any of its provisions, and we believe that the existing draft that we have put forward has gone to the maximum extent to accommodate India's legitimate preoccupations and concerns. We were prepared to go even further, but because of the circumstances that I have mentioned -- that we are far away from our capitals and it is impossible before the deadline set for the conclusion of this debate to obtain the considered reactions of our Governments -- we have to cope with this situation.

It is not necessary for me again to explain the provisions of the Pakistan draft resolution. As I have said, we really think that we have accommodated the Indian point of view. We are not calling for the declaration and establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone here and now in South Asia. What we have endorsed is the principle. The extent of the zone is a matter which will be a subject for consultations. The characteristics of the zone will also be a matter which will be a subject for consultations. So no position is prejudiced.

Therefore it is in this earnest belief that we would request the Committee to adopt the two draft resolutions by consensus. Merely to take note of the two draft resolutions would, we think, be construed in my country and by a greater part of the world as indicating an attitude of indifference on the part of the world community to the effort that has been mounted and to the developments of a grave nature which have taken place. I should not like to go back with that impression and I should not like my Government to feel that the world community is indifferent to the danger of nuclear proliferation in South Asia and elsewhere. So we believe we have merely seized upon those assurances that the countries of South Asia will be nuclear-weapon-free countries. This follows clearly from
their statements of policy and the assurances they have extended. So that is the essential component of our draft resolution, and we should like the international community to take note of these assurances, which have been taken note of in communiqués between the Government of India and other Governments.

As I have stated repeatedly, we do not consider our draft resolution to be incompatible with that of India. After the adoption of these draft resolutions, we have every intention of entering into consultations on the widest possible basis, and no position of any Government is prejudiced if we proceed to accept both draft resolutions.

As I have also indicated, the representative of Sri Lanka has made a great contribution to this debate. We feel that we should go forward, and we should like the international community to express itself by the adoption of these two draft resolutions by consensus, which would mean that it is giving a green light to the countries of South Asia and the neighbouring countries to enter into consultations with a view to promoting the objectives of non-proliferation.

**Mr. RAMPHUL** (Mauritius): Mauritius enjoys the most friendly diplomatic relations with both India and Pakistan, and I personally hold the highest respect for the delegations of both countries. That is why I find the prospect of voting on two proposals submitted by each of the two countries rather painful, especially since India and Pakistan are neighbouring countries which are in the process of normalizing their bilateral relations. Indeed only a quarter of a century ago they were one and the same country.

I did attempt to avoid some embarrassment to most delegations by suggesting privately to both India and Pakistan that any decision on the item under consideration be postponed until the thirtieth session so as to allow time for bilateral and regional consultations. One delegation accepted this formula, and the other was against it.
As I pointed out during the general debate on this item in this Committee earlier, my delegation strongly holds the view that proper consultations are essential before the Assembly can arrive at a decision on such a very important item, although the principle of this item has wide support.

In the light of this, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.681 and will abstain on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.682 on the grounds that it is premature.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As I see the situation at this time, a motion has been made by the representative of Nigeria that the Committee should adopt by consensus the two draft resolutions under agenda item 107, A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682.

The representative of India, a sponsor of one of the draft resolutions, has said that while it could accept that, by declaration of the Chairman, note be taken of the two resolutions, it would not be able to accept having both adopted by consensus, as it has reservations with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.682.

The representative of Iran supported the motion that both draft resolutions be adopted by consensus. The representative of Pakistan has also accepted the motion made by the representative of Nigeria, but did say that he would be unable to accept having the Committee merely take note of the two draft resolutions.

In view of the fact that one of the delegations directly involved does not believe that it is able to accept a consensus, I think that it would be useless to consult the Committee with regard to that proposal made by the representative of Nigeria. It is obvious that there will be no consensus, taking into account the fact that, while one can of course be flexible in interpreting what a consensus would be -- it does not necessarily mean unanimity -- one of the parties directly involved does not accept this.

I would also like to indicate that the Chair appreciates, pays tribute to and fully understands the reasons why the delegations involved have acted as they have, both the representative of Nigeria, who wished to contribute constructively to our discussion, and those delegations -- although there were several of them, I shall refer to two, Mexico and Iran -- which carried out very intensive negotiations so that there might be a reconciliation of views, and also the two delegations which are directly involved, Pakistan and India.
We have just heard the representative of Pakistan say that he does not feel that the two draft resolutions are diametrically opposed. A statement of this nature was made by the representative of India in an earlier meeting, when he said that the resolutions were not mutually exclusive.

As, in my view, we have no option but to take a vote, I would hope that this climate of understanding prevailing between the two delegations directly concerned will be maintained, so that whatever the outcome of the vote may be on the two draft resolutions, these two Governments, which are neighbours and friends and which play such an important role in the United Nations, will be able to reach a solution, that next year may be approved unanimously and not merely by consensus.

Mr. ROSCHIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union, in principle, adopts a favourable attitude towards the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, viewing this as a step towards the territorial limitation of the sphere of the dissemination of nuclear weapons and thus towards an easing of the threat of nuclear war. The creation of nuclear-free zones can be carried out, given that measures are taken with the aim of really transforming the territory of the States in question into a zone totally free from nuclear weapons. There should be no loopholes in this, of course, whose existence would militate in favour of violation of the nuclear-free status of the zone.

The agenda of this session of the General Assembly contains items relating to the creation of nuclear-free zones. Consideration by the General Assembly of these questions is an index of the concern of States about the possibility of the spread of nuclear weapons and, hence, a growth in the threat of nuclear war. This is an aspiration to create a barrier against the spread of nuclear weapons, against their penetration into various parts of the world with the consequent danger of the use of such weapons in these areas.

Today, our Committee, the First Committee, will be taking a vote on two draft resolutions on the question of the declaration and creation of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia, draft resolution A/C.1/L.681 and draft resolution A/C.1/L.682. The fact that two draft resolutions separate in terms of their content have been presented on one item convinces us that the creation of a nuclear-free zone in any given region of the world is a complex issue which requires a very scrupulous and comprehensive consideration.
We must reckon with the fact that conditions in one part of the world quite often are totally different from conditions reigning in another part of the world. Therefore it is necessary to take into account the existing circumstances in any particular case. It seems to us desirable that the adoption of a substantive decision by the General Assembly on this question should be preceded by a common understanding on the part the States which may participate in the establishment of such a zone with regard to its geographical limits and the content of any future agreement.

It seems to us that draft resolution A/C.1/L.681 does actually adopt this approach. Therefore, the Soviet delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution. As to draft resolution A/C.1/L.682, the ideas in it omit some important elements which would ensure fully the nuclear-free status of a given nuclear-free zone in this case.
Also, there is some ambiguity regarding the frontiers of the zone to which
the idea mentioned in this draft resolution would be applied. Therefore,
the Soviet delegation will be unable to support the draft resolution in
document A/C.1/L.682, and will abstain from voting on it.

Mr. SOUMARE (Mauritania) (interpretation from French): The draft
resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682 on the declaration and
establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia relate to a problem on
which my delegation has already expressed its views in the general debate
on disarmament. Any initiative towards creating a nuclear-free zone in
any part of the world will obtain the support of my delegation, which
continues to be aware of the nuclear danger and is convinced that such
actions are important steps towards the reduction of the arms race, and thus
towards general and complete disarmament. The purpose of my statement
is to state our position on the two draft resolutions before the Committee
in documents A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682.

My delegation would have hoped to see an agreement in principle on the creation
of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia more explicitly spelled out in the
draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681. The sponsor of that text was
primarily concerned with laying stress on the fact that the initiative for the
creation of a nuclear-free zone should come primarily from the States of
the regions concerned. My delegation agrees with that view.

The shortcomings of the Indian draft resolution have happily been supplemented
by the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682, which gives rise to no
doubt about the final objective at which we are aiming, that is, the creation
of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia. Furthermore, this draft resolution,
in a desire for efficiency and in a desire to implement its aims, appeals
for the assistance of the Secretary-General, whose help can only be of use
in this matter. In the view of my delegation, therefore, we are faced with
two draft resolutions which are not contradictory, but complementary. This
being the case, and in the light of the statements made by the sponsors in
presenting the two draft resolutions, both favourable to the principle of
the creation of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia, my delegation will vote in
favour of both draft resolutions.
Mr. KEDADI (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): In the course of previous statements the Tunisian delegation has always supported the principle of creating nuclear-weapon-free zones in the world. We are happy to note that many delegations have supported this very principle here in this Committee.

We have before us two draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.681 and A/C.1/L.682. In the view of my delegation, a detailed study of these two draft resolutions reveals that they are not at all contradictory, but rather complementary. This has already been said by many delegations in the Committee and by the two delegations sponsoring the drafts themselves. Both of them are in favour of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, but one subjects this to agreement among the countries of the region and the second, while supporting in principle the idea of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, does not exclude the need for consultations among the States of the region. In this point operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682 is very explicit.

As has been said in the Committee, we would have hoped to see a single draft resolution presented on this subject. You, Mr. Chairman, mentioned all the efforts that have been made by the two delegations concerned and by certain other delegations to achieve that objective. Unfortunately, that was not possible, but in the United Nations we should always strive to achieve such agreement. It is for this reason that my delegation was able to support the proposal presented by the representative of Nigeria when he suggested that the two draft resolutions, which are complementary, be adopted by consensus, so as to make it possible precisely for the delegations concerned to continue their negotiations and perhaps at the next session of the General Assembly to come up with a single draft resolution. Unfortunately, the proposal of the delegation of Nigeria was not accepted. However, my delegation is in a position to vote in favour of the two draft resolutions.
Mr. LIN (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese Government and people deeply sympathize with the numerous small and medium-sized countries in their positive efforts to safeguard the peace and security of their regions, oppose nuclear blackmail and threat and to establish nuclear weapon-free zones and peace zones. In our view, the Pakistan proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia is just and reasonable. Based on the Chinese Government's consistent position on the questions of nuclear disarmament and nuclear-free zones, the Chinese delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.682. The Chinese Government is ready to undertake due obligations.

At present, the super-Powers which possess a large amount of nuclear weapons have continued to accelerate their nuclear arms race and contention for spheres of influence, seriously menacing the peace and security of non-nuclear countries and regions. The South Asian sub-continent has also seen the intensifying contention between the two super-Powers, one of which has supported the expansionist policies of a certain country in the region in addition to carrying out intervention and subversion by all means against some countries there. This has caused prolonged turbulence and unrest in the South Asian situation. Therefore, in order to realize the desire for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia, it is imperative to guard against and oppose the super-Power aggression and intervention and the expansionist acts of any country.

Finally, we wish also to point out that in its preambular part, the draft refers to the questions of general and complete disarmament and the halting of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Chinese delegation holds its own views on these questions, and therefore has reservations about these references.

With regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681, the Chinese delegation will abstain.
Mr. MONDJO (Congo) (interpretation from French): My delegation has the two draft resolutions before it. I cannot improve on the arguments put forward by some of the representatives here. We have relations with both India and Pakistan, so I could not be upset at all by having one friendship outweigh the other, but I share the same concern of all of us -- disarmament.

With regard to the establishment of nuclear-free zones, my delegation, which has followed attentively the statements made by other representatives, still recalls that made by the representative of India who said that the nuclear tests carried out by his country are for peaceful purposes. Since what is involved is the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia, and since the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682, proposed by the representative of Pakistan, responds to all the concerns expressed in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.631 submitted by the delegation of India, and since the draft resolution presented by the delegation of Pakistan goes further, is more detailed and takes into account all situations. I refer in particular to the seventh preambular paragraph. Indeed, if we read its subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c), and if we consider operative paragraph 5 we can see that it is more detailed. So we support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682 and will abstain with regard to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation will abstain from the vote on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.631 and A/C.1/L.682, although they have been submitted by two countries with which France has friendly relations.

My delegation believes, and has already so indicated on various occasions, that the first condition that must be satisfied by a draft project to establish a nuclear-free zone is that of full agreement among States to be included in that zone. In the case of the denuclearization of South Asia, the very fact that there are two draft resolutions submitted by two States within the zone, despite efforts made to consolidate and unify them, is the obvious proof of divergencies which exist between these States in this connexion. The condition to which we referred therefore has not been satisfied, and this fact will dictate our attitude.
Mr. MISHRA (India): Mr. Chairman, with your permission I should like to make the position of my delegation clear on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682 before it is put to a vote, but I should prefer to do that after the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681 has been voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I tell the representative of India that I should like to put the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.681 to the vote and then immediately after put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682.

There were no speakers inscribed to explain their vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682, so that all speakers were referring to both drafts at the same time. Therefore, the proposal that the Chair wished to make is that we take a vote on the two draft resolutions and proceed to the explanation of votes by representatives wishing to explain their votes on both draft resolutions afterwards.

Mr. MISHRA (India): Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence I should like to say that my statement would be merely to explain my delegation's vote before the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.682 -- if you could find your way clear to accept this request.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In this case I request the representative of India to explain his vote now.

Mr. MISHRA (India): Mr. Chairman, I shall explain the vote after the vote.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of India for his co-operation. Would any delegation like to explain its vote before the vote with regard to either of the draft resolutions?

As there are no delegations wishing to do so, we shall first put the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.681 to the vote and immediately follow that up with a vote on the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.682.

I should like to announce that the voting procedure has begun and that therefore we shall apply article 128 of the rules of procedure.
A recorded vote has been requested. We shall vote first on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.631, referring to item 107 of the agenda, entitled "Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in south Asia", a draft submitted by India.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Barbados, Burma, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Congo, Dahomey, Denmark, El Salvador, Fiji, France, Gabon, Germany (Federal Republic of), Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 90 votes to none, with 32 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We will now vote on the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia" in document A/C.1/L.632, which also refers to agenda item 107 of the agenda "Declaration and establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia", and is submitted by Pakistan.

I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the administrative and financial consequences of this draft which appear in document A/C.1/L.697.
A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen.

Against: Bhutan, India.

Abstaining: Bangladesh, Barbados, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Libyan Arab Republic, Malawi, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

The draft resolution was adopted by 84 votes to 2, with 36 abstentions.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Some delegations have expressed the wish to explain their vote after the vote. I suggest that we start that procedure this afternoon. We shall meet at 3 o'clock and proceed to explanations of vote on the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.681 and L.682. We shall then vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.690 and the amendments to it.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.