



SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 38TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 43, 46 to 50, 52 to 56, 58, 59,
61 to 63, 139, 141 and 143 (continued)

IN LIBRARY
JUN 5 1984
UNISA COLLECTION

*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/38/PV.38
16 December 1983

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 43, 46 to 50, 52 to 56, 58, 59, 61 to 63, 139,
141 and 143 (continued)

ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: We shall begin our work this morning by taking decisions on the draft resolutions listed under cluster 7 - that is to say, the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/38/L.7 and A/C.1/38/L.47. After that, we shall proceed to cluster 8 and then shall revert to cluster 4.

I call on the representative of Brazil, who wishes to explain his vote before the voting on the draft resolutions in cluster 7.

Mr. de SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): Over the past few years, Brazil has supported initiatives like those contained in draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.7 and A/C.1/38/L.47, on the question of security guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon nations. The attitude of the nuclear-weapon Powers towards this issue, however, compels us to revise our position and to withdraw support from such initiatives.

The negotiations on negative security assurances in the Committee on Disarmament since 1979 have so far been fruitless, despite the efforts of Ambassador Ahmad of Pakistan, Chairman of the respective Working Group of the Committee. The experience of these negotiations, where progress has been impeded by the attitudes and policies of the nuclear-weapon Powers, has unmistakably shown that those Powers refuse, with one exception, to take into account the legitimate interests and concerns of the non-nuclear-weapons nations with regard to their own security. This situation leads to the following conclusions:

First, the question of negative security assurances continues to be approached by nuclear-weapon Powers from the narrow point of view of their security perceptions vis-à-vis each other, and not as a provisional measure aimed at providing effective guarantees pending concrete measures of nuclear disarmament.

Second, such a parochial view of reality, which has continued to be evident in the discussions in the Committee on Disarmament, presupposes a recognition of the legitimacy of the exclusive possession of nuclear weapons by the present nuclear-weapon Powers.

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

Third, it also seeks to endorse their self-conferred right to engage in the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both in their vertical and in their horizontal aspect, taken in a geographical dimension.

Fourth, it further sanctions the military option taken by the nuclear-weapon Powers to possess, and thus threaten to use and eventually actually to use, nuclear weapons in accordance with their own perceptions.

Fifth, it has led the nuclear-weapon Powers to qualify the unilateral declarations of assurance with conditions and reservations that completely reverse the purpose and character of the guarantees offered - as if it were the non-nuclear-weapon countries that should extend binding assurances to the nuclear-weapon Powers.

Sixth, the credibility and efficacy of commitments intended to ensure respect by the nuclear-weapon Powers for the non-nuclear status of other nations have been eroded by virtue of such unilateral interpretations and reservations. Those commitments, in the light of recent experience, seem to be of little significance unless they are subject to some credible form or system of verification of compliance.

Seventh, even with regard to the only nuclear-weapon-free zone in the world, the status of which should be strictly upheld, the attitude and behaviour of the nuclear-weapon Powers have generated increasing concern about their respect for the binding obligations they undertook, highlighting the need for verification procedures to ensure that such obligations are not violated.

The delegation of Brazil stands by the statement issued by the Group of 21 in the Committee on Disarmament, just before the second special session on disarmament, that no progress on the question of negative security assurances would be achieved while the nuclear-weapon Powers maintained their present attitudes and policies on the matter.

For those reasons, the delegation of Brazil will abstain in the voting on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.7 and A/C.1/38/L.47.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take a decision on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/38/L.7. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November 1983, and is sponsored by Pakistan.

(The Chairman)

We shall now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/38/L.7.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Brazil, India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.7 was adopted by 91 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/38/L.47. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Bulgaria at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee on 15 November and is sponsored by the following countries: Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Mongolia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Viet Nam.

A recorded vote has been requested.

* Subsequently the delegations of Afghanistan, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Iraq, Malawi, Morocco and Nigeria advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Bahamas had intended to abstain.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

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

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Burma, Haiti, India, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Japan, Paraguay, Philippines, Singapore, Sweden, Uruguay

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.47 was adopted by 70 votes to 16, with 15 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.7, my delegation has reservations about the references, in operative paragraphs 2, 3 and 5, to a specific modality of negative security assurances which would seem to prejudice the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

However, we note that the resolution does reflect the trend of the work of the Conference on Disarmament's Working Group on negative security assurances, in particular the references to a common formula that has figured in the discussions in the Working Group.

In the hope that efforts in the Conference on Disarmament would be continued in that direction, my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.7.

* Subsequently the delegations of Iraq, Malawi and Morocco advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Bahamas had intended to abstain.

(Mr. Imai, Japan)

Now, with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.47, I should like to point out that my Government has different views on some of its preambular paragraphs. My delegation also has reservations about the references in operative paragraphs 2 and 5 to a particular procedure of negative security assurances, since it will prejudice the work of the Committee on Disarmament on this matter.

For these reasons, my delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.47.

Mr. RAMAKER (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation voted against draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.47 because we cannot condone the unspecified and unwarranted accusations against some countries as having once again prevented the Committee on Disarmament from making substantive progress towards the achievement of an agreement. The case is not that certain States prevent other States from reaching an agreement, but that positions differ concerning the merit of several formulations for security assurances. Moreover, we, and also members of the group of neutral and non-aligned countries, have had reservations in the past about the form - that is, a convention - that is suggested in the present draft resolution.

The Netherlands attaches the utmost importance to assurances that no country will be the first to take up arms. Or, in the words of the Bonn Declaration of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Ministers of 10 June 1982:

"Our purpose is to prevent war and, while safeguarding democracy, to build the foundations of lasting peace. None of our weapons will ever be used except in response to attack."

For us, the non-first-use of weapons is the fundamental pledge, not the non-first-use of nuclear weapons. This concept of non-first-use of nuclear weapons and its prominent role in the draft resolution is one of the main reasons for our negative vote.

This is not to say that we do not see some positive changes that have been made in this draft resolution, compared to its predecessors. We welcome the fact that at least no mention is made in the operative part of the draft resolution of the formula "non-nuclear-weapon States that have no nuclear weapons on their territory". We never endorsed this concept because whether a country actually has nuclear weapons on its territory or not is a situation that can change very rapidly in times of tension.

(Mr. Ramaker, Netherlands)

The fact remains, however, that in this draft resolution several concepts of security assurances play a role, and that they can have totally different and sometimes even contradictory implications in situations of tension. On the one hand, the non-stationing formula, the central concept in the official security assurance of the Soviet Union, is still an element in the draft, although less prominent than before. On the other hand, there is the non-first-use concept. The relationship between the many different concepts and proposals made in the past by the Soviet Union is still not clear to us.

Our negative vote does not mean that we will cease our efforts towards reaching a common formula, for example, through a Security Council resolution, in order to bring together the different security assurances which have been given in the past by nuclear-weapon States. On the contrary, we still consider this to be a goal worth striving for, although the debate in this Assembly has shown - short as it may have been - that there is still a considerable way to go in this respect.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): Sweden considers that negative security assurances should be made in a legally binding form. As to the legal framework for such assurances, the two draft resolutions, A/C.1/38/L.7 and A/C.1/38/L.47, seem to favour an international convention whereby nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States would enter into some kind of mutual obligations. Sweden has strong reservations about certain aspects of such arrangements. The vast majority of non-nuclear-weapon States have already made a full undertaking by adhering to the non-proliferation Treaty and there is no reason for further obligations.

Sweden's reservations regarding the idea of an international convention in this field also have a direct bearing on fundamental elements of the Swedish policy of neutrality. Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.47 specifically underlines the importance of a convention and the Swedish delegation therefore abstained on that draft resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): Ireland abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.47. 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.

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

It is our view that States which 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 had regretfully to abstain in the vote.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like very briefly to explain the vote of my delegation on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.7 and A/C.1/38/L.47, which we have just considered. Both have to do with the conclusion of effective international arrangements to give non-nuclear-weapon States certain guarantees against the threat or use of such weapons. Both drafts are practically identical to resolutions which were adopted in the General Assembly in past years and for which we voted in favour.

It is precisely that similarity which gives rise to our problem: My delegation is increasingly convinced that the lack of progress in this all-important issue, as reflected in the two drafts, indicates that we have reached an impasse.

Hence we need a new approach to this question: We need to find new ways to make progress and new ways to increase our chances of finding a truly satisfactory solution. All of this explains why the delegation of Argentina abstained on both draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.7 and A/C.1/38/L.47, which are merely another route leading to the same dead end.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus completed its consideration of cluster 7.

The Committee will now take up the draft resolutions grouped in cluster 8: draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.6, L.20, L.32, L.51 and L.60. Members will note that draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.67 and L.68 also form a part of this cluster, but draft resolution L.67 has financial implications the report on which is not yet ready. Draft resolution L.68 deals with a related subject, and I propose therefore to defer action on both of those draft resolutions until Friday.

I now call on representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. de SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.6, L.20 and - although we will not be taking action upon it until Friday - L.67.

The delegation of Brazil will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6. As we have indicated in previous years with reference to similar draft resolutions, this text does not reflect adequately the concerns expressed by

(Mr. de Souza e Silva, Brazil)

my country and 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. Those requirements are consensus among the States directly involved, and a commitment on the part of the nuclear-weapon Powers to respect the status of the zone and to refrain from interfering in the respective negotiating processes.

The general approach of Brazil to the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones also takes into account other important elements. The recent trend towards the geographical proliferation of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon Powers compels the non-nuclear-weapon nations to consider very carefully the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Effective and binding provisions on verification of compliance by the nuclear-weapon Powers with their commitments under the instrument establishing a zone are an essential requirement for the success of negotiations aimed at creating such zones.

This applies to the proposed establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as it does to any other similar regional agreement.

Nevertheless, my delegation will not object to a consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20 and will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.67, which deal with other regions in the world, because of the very specific characteristics of the situations prevailing respectively in the Middle East and in South Africa. Our continuing abstention regarding draft resolutions like A/C.1/38/L.6 on South Asia should therefore be interpreted as a reaffirmation of the Brazilian stand with respect to the general question of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. JAYAKODDY (Sri Lanka): Let me explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6. In keeping with the practice that Sri Lanka has followed in previous years on the item covered by draft resolution L.6, my delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution. We do this in continuation of our consistent support for the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the world, which, in our view, can contribute to the strengthening of regional - and thereby international - peace, security and stability. We believe that nuclear-weapon-free zones have much to commend them in the international quest for nuclear disarmament and the reversal of the nuclear arms race.

(Mr. Jayakoddy, Sri Lanka)

A nuclear-weapon-free zone, however, can be attained and be viable only to the extent that such a zone is created with the full consent, support and co-operation of all countries in that zone. Prerequisites for this will be close consultations among all States in the zone at all stages, and full recognition of the characteristics of the zone. These are essential if we are to ensure that agreement can be reached on the conditions under which the zone is to be established.

My delegation wishes also to express its full understanding of the concerns of those who feel that a nuclear-weapon-free zone cannot exist in a vacuum, and that it calls for an effective commitment from the nuclear-weapon States and States in areas contiguous to the zone not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the States in the zone. The problems that confront us are complex and formidable. Nevertheless, they have to be faced, taking into account the concerns of all States in the zone.

We feel that draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6 can assist in facing those problems.

Mr. DUBEY (India): I should like briefly to explain our vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.6 and L.60.

As regards draft resolution L.6, it has regrettably become an annual and pointless ritual for this Committee to have a draft resolution on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. Draft resolution L.6 is no different from its forerunners of past years, during the consideration of 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; I shall not repeat those reasons.

As we reject this proposal once again, we regret having to point out that this repetitive exercise of submitting a draft resolution like draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6 serves only to introduce an unnecessarily discordant note into the process of beneficial regional co-operation, which the countries of South Asia are working hard to foster and promote.

India will accordingly vote against that draft resolution.

(Mr. Dubey, India)

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.60, our position on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones has been placed on record in clear and unambiguous terms by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of India on 11 June 1982 at the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament. That position remains unchanged.

Our delegation will accordingly abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.60, since it is merely of a procedural character seeking to transmit all the relevant documents, as well as the records of the debate, to the Group of Experts currently engaged in preparing the second United Nations study on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Mr. TARI (Israel): I wish to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51.

In his report to the General Assembly, contained in document A/38/199 of 1 September 1983, the Secretary-General of the United Nations in paragraph 3 of that document concerning the subject under consideration stated the following:

"The Secretary-General has received no new information in this regard and consequently has nothing to add to his earlier report to the General Assembly on the subject (A/37/434)."

Nevertheless, once again we are called upon to vote on it. In keeping with the practice of previous years Iraq apparently intends, for its own political and partisan reasons, to make the subject of agenda item 54 a permanent feature of discussion of this forum. The negative effects of Iraq's continuous misuse of international organizations for its own narrow objectives have already been vividly demonstrated. This transparent exercise needlessly burdens our discussions, arousing from its inception much world-wide dissatisfaction.

It is therefore sad that we should once again be required to discuss this issue and reach the usual foregone distorted conclusions. Nothing tangible can emerge from additional resolutions on this issue. The draft resolution proposes no solution to the basic problems but, on the contrary, hampers any attempt to understand and grapple with the essential issues involved. Hostile and biased initiatives, such as the Iraqi draft resolution before us, do not serve the cause of peace in the Middle East and, indeed, are not intended to do so.

The present Iraqi draft resolution introduces an imbalance into the international debate on this question and thereby hinders all efforts to bring regional problems under control. The Iraqi persistence in pursuing this course

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

can be understood only if viewed against the background of Iraq's unrelenting hostility towards Israel.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51, like the previous draft resolutions introduced by Iraq on this issue, is discriminatory, as was the resolution that singled out Israel for investigation. It is based on a study produced by a United Nations Group of Experts whose terms of reference prejudged the outcome of that study. It is certainly interesting that a study which rests solely upon technological and scientific aspects of Israel's "nuclear capability" was written by five experts, only one of whom is a nuclear physicist and happens to be a national of an Arab country. It is also worth noting that, of this group, the one who submitted this study on behalf of the entire group is a well-known proponent of the development of the so-called Islamic bomb and has several times called for further proliferation of nuclear weapons. But even the limited and biased conclusions of this report are distorted in the draft resolution before us in order better to serve the Iraqi campaign of slander and hatred against Israel.

Israel will not be dragged into repetitive discussions. My delegation simply wants to stress two points: First, as already mentioned, draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51 is blatantly discriminatory. Many countries which in the past voted for similar resolutions, among them Arab States, are not party at all to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). While parties to the NPT, some Arab countries have not fulfilled their obligations in accordance with that Treaty. Also, in signing the NPT and various other disarmament treaties, a number of Arab States have had reservations regarding Israel. Secondly, concerning the alleged nuclear and military co-operation between Israel and South Africa, let me quote briefly from the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations in the General Assembly on 17 November 1983:

"Regarding the false and unsubstantiated allegations that Israel supposedly maintains special ties with South Africa in the military and nuclear fields, those who make them apparently believe that, by repeating these lies often enough, they will be accepted as fact... Indeed, reports of experts on this matter have been virtually ignored, including the Secretary-General's report contained in document A/36/431 of 18 September 1981, page 8, paragraph 13, which, in referring to certain anti-Israel rumours, dismissed them as unsubstantiated speculation.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

"For the sake of accuracy, I wish to reaffirm my Government's undertakings of 7 December 1977 in document S/12475, 3 April 1978 in document S/12475/Add.1 and 23 June 1980 in a letter to the Security Council Committee established under resolution 421 (1977). Israel's position was stated in paragraph 2 of document S/AC.20/17 of 14 September 1979...". (A/38/PV.61, pp. 83 and 84-85)

Predictably, the sponsors of that draft resolution in document A/C.1/38/L.51 have seen fit to ignore this position.

However, as I have said, Israel will not be dragged into these redundant discussions. Instead, we urge that this Committee devote its energies to preventing Iraq's misuse of the United Nations for the purpose of introducing this issue in a repetitious manner. We also call upon the members of the Committee to support positive international initiatives, such as the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Israel believes that a serious effort should be made to support direct negotiations among the countries of the Middle East for the establishment of such a zone patterned after the Tlatelolco Treaty for Latin America. Such a framework can be created only through the incessant search for understanding between the States of the region rather than through propagandistic exercises. Israel has repeatedly expressed its readiness to begin at any time, and without preconditions, negotiations between the States of the Middle East.

I wish to make one last point. The adoption of operative paragraph 3 would constitute blunt interference by the General Assembly in the affairs of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which is a separate body. This paragraph tries to re-introduce by the back door an item submitted by Iraq during the last General Conference of the IAEA which has been met with considerable opposition. It calls for the denial of Israel's rights of membership in the IAEA. It tries specifically to accelerate and intensify the process of politicization of the Agency, thereby undermining its universality as well as its specific responsibility.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51, as compared to last year's resolution on the same subject, adds another fundamental element of bias against Israel.

For all those reasons, and for the sake of this Organization's future and of peace in the Middle East, Israel calls upon all States to join in opposing this Iraqi effort.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): The United States delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6 on the "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". Our vote reflects our support of the concept of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in South Asia and in other appropriate regions of the world.

We believe that effective nuclear-weapon-free zones negotiated and supported by the States of the region, cannot only enhance the security of those States but also reinforce non-proliferation goals on a regional basis. My delegation has elaborated, at previous sessions of this Committee, the criteria by which the United States judges the effectiveness of any nuclear-weapon-free zone, so they are all well known. At the same time we wish to point out that our vote is not directed against any particular State in the region.

We believe, moreover, that nuclear-weapon-free-zone arrangements must effectively preclude the conducting of any nuclear explosions. Moves by any State towards the development of nuclear weapons concerns us all equally. In this connection I should like to take particular note of paragraph 2 of this draft resolution, which urges all States in the region to refrain from any action contrary to the objective of the draft resolution. My Government's support for the draft resolution is based on our expectation that the sponsors and those voting in favour of it will demonstrate that they take this provision with the utmost seriousness.

Let me turn to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/38/L.32 and say that the United States delegation is pleased to announce its intention to support that draft resolution by voting in favour of it and on the implementation of General Assembly resolution 37/71, concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, known as the Treaty of Tlatelolco. The United States became a party to that Additional Protocol in 1981. The United States believes that the Treaty on the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone, the landmark Treaty on this important subject, constitutes a major contribution to the cause of nuclear non-proliferation and presents an example for other regions of the world. We cannot but express our

(Mr. Fields, United States)

regret, however, that the sponsors of the draft resolution continue to single out but one country for not having become a full party to the Treaty and its additional instruments, when there are countries within the region itself which have not ratified or adhered to the Treaty. Full adherence to the Treaty by all those States would substantially enhance the Treaty's effectiveness in ensuring that Latin America remains a zone free of nuclear weapons, thereby advancing the influence of this significant arms control Treaty to encourage appropriate efforts in other regions.

Mr. IMAI (Japan): My delegation considers that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, whether in South Asia or in any other region of the world, will contribute to the overall objective of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as well as to peace and security in the region in question. We therefore favour draft resolutions on this subject. However, my delegation would like to reiterate its view that the establishment of such a zone, if it is to strengthen the security of the region, will require the fulfilment of a number of conditions, among them, for example, that it should be agreed upon by all the countries concerned, including the nuclear-weapon State, as the case may be, and that it should be based on the initiatives of the countries in the region.

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

Mr. KUNDA (Zambia): My delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/38/L.6 and L.20.

Draft resolution L.6 relates to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. My delegation reserves its position in relation to paragraph 2 of this draft resolution because of its reference to non-proliferation. Similarly, my delegation wishes to reserve its position in regard to draft resolution L.20 because of its reference to non-proliferation in paragraph 1. My delegation will none the less vote in favour of the two draft resolutions because of its commitment to the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

The CHAIRMAN: If no other delegation wishes to explain its vote before the vote, we shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6. It was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 28th meeting of the First Committee, on 9 November, and is sponsored by Pakistan.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Democratic Kampuchea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, 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, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6 was adopted by 81 votes to 2, with 42 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action upon draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 32nd meeting of the First Committee, on 15 November, and is sponsored by Egypt. The sponsor of the draft resolution has expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20 was adopted.

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

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.32. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, 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, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: Argentina, Cuba, France, Guyana, Malawi, Mali, Venezuela

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.32 was adopted by 118 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51. This draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Iraq at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November, and is sponsored by the following countries: Bahrain, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan,

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

(The Chairman)

Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Qatar, Sudan, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

The delegation of Belgium has requested a separate recorded vote on paragraph 3 of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Bahamas, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Spain, Suriname, Uruguay, Venezuela

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51 was adopted by 79 votes to 26, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Swaziland, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51 as a whole was adopted by 90 votes to 2, with 35 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.60, which was introduced by the representative of Brazil at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 17 November and is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Indonesia, Mexico, Uruguay, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen,

* Subsequently the delegation of Costa Rica advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, 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, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: None

Abstaining: India, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.60 was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. de SOUZA e SILVA (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.32, which urges another nuclear-weapon State having jurisdiction over territories in the zone covered by the Treaty of Tlatelolco to become a party to Additional Protocol I of that Treaty.

In voting in favour of the draft resolution, Brazil wishes to place on the record once more that after the Malvinas Islands conflict it has become necessary to establish in the Treaty of Tlatelolco a system of verification of compliance by the nuclear-weapon Powers with all the provisions of that Treaty. For that reason, the affirmative vote of the Brazilian delegation was cast without prejudice to our position concerning the need for a system of verification.

Mr. TARI (Israel): Israel has studied draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20 of 11 November 1983, concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, with great care and attention as the subject matter is of the utmost importance to my country. Ever since the problem of non-proliferation was raised

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

at the United Nations, Israel has consistently supported resolutions aimed at preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In keeping with that line, Israel today joined the consensus in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20. In spite of my delegation's reservations regarding the modalities included in the text adopted, we joined the consensus on this question, as we have done in the past, in order to stress our wholehearted support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

In the frantic circumstances prevailing in the Middle East, restraints of a technical or institutional nature alone, or declarations made by correspondence, can hardly protect the area from nuclear proliferation. In no case can they be presented as a credible alternative to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

We are convinced that the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons to the Middle East would best be assured by a regional approach freely arrived at and negotiated in good faith by the States of the area. Israel believes that the most effective way to achieve this goal would be the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East modelled on the lines of the Tlatelolco Treaty. Within this context, Israel believes that the initiative for the establishment of such a zone should originate with the States in the region. The preliminary consultations necessary to achieve this aim should be carried out directly among them. The negotiations between the States in the region should address themselves to the modalities for the establishment of the zone, the obligations and rights of the contracting parties, the machinery and procedures for ensuring effective compliance by the States with the obligations undertaken by each of them. That is Israel's vision for the establishment of a system of mutually binding obligations which would provide each State in the region with a contractual assurance of the others' compliance with their commitment to abstain from introducing nuclear weapons into the region.

These principles are consistent with the studies and statements of various groups of experts composed of distinguished members from countries representing different political backgrounds, including the Palme Commission and the non-aligned nations. In this connection, I should like to refer to documents A/10027/Add.1, A/CN.10/38 and A/38/42.

(Mr. Tari, Israel)

Israel has repeatedly given expression to these ideas and has advocated them annually at the United Nations General Assembly. Also, on 30 October 1980 Israel submitted draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.8, which inspired wide-ranging support at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20, though designed to attain the same aim of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, omits mention of the negotiating process without which, as I have stated, such an arrangement is unlikely to come about. Regrettably, the Egyptian draft resolution does not deal with this aspect, essential for the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. Therefore, our serious reservations of past years remain in force as to the ways and means proposed by Egypt for arriving at the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and as envisaged by the draft resolution just adopted. It goes without saying that Israel's vote today does not indicate a change in attitude towards one of the resolutions which is recalled in the first preambular paragraph - a resolution that we opposed at the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh): The delegation of Bangladesh voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6, regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia - as indeed we have voted in favour of other, similar draft resolutions - because we believe in the principle and concept of the establishment of such nuclear-weapon-free zones.

It is our sincere hope that necessary contacts and consultations will take place among the countries of the South Asian region to ensure unanimity on the issue, to define the limits of the zone and to deal with other matters. In this context, we should like to stress the need for the carrying out of intensive consultations among all the States of the region in order to establish a consensus on this issue, without which the purpose of the draft resolution would not be achieved.

Miss DA SILVA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Venezuela had to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/31/38/L.32, concerning Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco). We withdrew our co-sponsorship of, and abstained in the voting on, a similar draft resolution in 1982, and our reasons have not changed.

(Miss Da Silva, Venezuela)

Venezuela reaffirms its support for the letter and spirit of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Indeed, that was the basic reason for our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.32.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51, although as a whole it is in keeping with Venezuela's international policies, we had to abstain on operative paragraph 1 because it singles out for condemnation one Member State for its negative position on nuclear weapons. Consistent with our total condemnation of the possession and proliferation - horizontal and vertical - of nuclear weapons, Venezuela would have abstained had operative paragraph 1 been put to a separate vote.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): It is with regret, yet also calmly, that my delegation has taken note of the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.32.

In this connection, we can merely repeat what we said last year in similar circumstances. The French delegation was obliged to abstain in the vote which has just taken place on the draft resolution. We find it unacceptable to be singled out like this as long as certain countries within the sphere of application of the Treaty have not signed it, ratified it or invoked the clause permitting its entry into force with regard to them - indeed, as long as all countries of the region have become parties to the Treaty.

The French delegation will, in due course, take an appropriate decision on the ratification of Additional Protocol I, taking into account the state of ratification of the Treaty itself.

Mr. ELBE (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.60.

My delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.60 in order to express once again its support for a comprehensive study on the question of nuclear-weapon-free zones in all aspects, for which it has provided a qualified expert. I should like to point out, however, that studies undertaken in the United Nations already have a tradition of including up-to-date material and all relevant documents submitted to sessions of the General Assembly, as well as the records of debates. Requesting once again to do so in operative paragraph 1 in document A/C.1/38/L.60 amounts to stating a truism.

(Mr. Elbe, Federal Republic of Germany)

Of a more serious order is the consideration that resolutions should not normally interfere with procedure and with the orderly transaction of United Nations studies according to their mandate.

In the last resort, my delegation, therefore, considers this draft resolution unnecessary. It might thus have been avoided without damage to the study.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): The United States delegation would like to comment on its decision to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51 on Israeli nuclear armament.

The resolution, unfortunately, is discriminatory on its face in that it singles out one Member State and ignores the number of States which have neither become parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty nor placed their nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards.

The United States would welcome a balanced provision calling for all non-nuclear-weapon States which have not done so to request the IAEA, pursuant to article III A.5 of its Statute, to apply safeguards continuously to all their nuclear facilities. The application of safeguards to all peaceful nuclear activities in a State contributes significantly to increased confidence among neighbouring and other States regarding the peaceful nature of such activities.

In fact, however, operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51 ignores this principle of balance and, moreover, would represent an inappropriate attempt by the General Assembly to instruct the IAEA on a matter which relates directly to the interpretation of the IAEA statutory provisions.

We believe this is a function properly reserved to the IAEA Board of Governors and the General Conference, which alone are competent to determine whether or not a Member State may have its rights and privileges of membership suspended in accordance with article XIX B. of the IAEA Statute.

Mr. EKEUS (Sweden): Sweden has on several occasions expressed its positive attitude with regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. In the opinion of Sweden, one of the most fundamental prerequisites is that general agreement should exist among all the States concerned.

Other important elements are the non-possession of nuclear weapons of zonal States as well as the absence and non-deployment of nuclear weapons in such States. Another essential element is the commitment by the nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against targets within the zone.

(Mr. Ekeus, Sweden)

In line with these principles, Sweden could not support draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6, regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as it was evident that all 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 contained in the draft resolution. Efforts to that end by the countries concerned would have a confidence-building effect, as well as having a positive influence on the political climate in the area.

Miss BOYD (Australia): I should like to explain Australia's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51, the resolution we have just adopted on Israeli nuclear armament. Australia voted against operative paragraph 3 of this draft resolution and abstained in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole. We did so not because we in any way condone the action of Israel taken in 1981 against Iraq's nuclear reactor, but because of the unconditional call on the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to suspend any scientific co-operation with Israel which could contribute to Israel's nuclear capabilities.

We noted that the IAEA itself, at its General Conference this year, adopted its resolution 703, which deferred consideration of such action against Israel until its own next conference in 1984, and made that decision contingent on other developments.

In the light of this, we think it unwise for this General Assembly to adopt a draft resolution which prejudices the outcome of the IAEA's own due processes. This draft resolution before us does not make action by the Agency contingent on Israel's failure to clarify its public threat, as the Agency's own resolution does.

Paragraph 3 of this draft resolution is unacceptable to Australia, therefore, in that it exceeds the already unacceptable provisions of the decision by the IAEA's General Conference. It also seeks to circumvent due process under the Agency's Statute which must be observed in regard to the right of a Member State.

Australia has difficulties with other aspects of the draft resolution, but our vote none the less reflects our overriding concern about nuclear proliferation. It is Australia's firm policy to encourage all Member States to adhere to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place their nuclear installations under full-scope safeguards as administered by the IAEA.

Mr. DEPASSE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The Belgian delegation called for a separate vote on paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51 because it wished to place on record its negative vote on a clause whereby the General Assembly would have assumed the right to interfere in the affairs of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

On the same paragraph 3, the Belgian delegation is of the opinion that the scientific co-operation between the Vienna Agency and all its member States applies to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy - not to armaments, the subject of that paragraph.

The Belgian delegation shares with most of the members of this Committee the desire to see the largest possible number of States ratify the Non-Proliferation Treaty; yet it has never sought to condemn individual States which feel they cannot do so just now. We would have great difficulty, therefore, in agreeing to single out the case of Israel.

Our abstention in no way diminishes our support for the universalization of arms control and disarmament agreements, or our desire for all civilian nuclear facilities to be subject to Agency safeguards, be it in the case of Israel or any other State.

I wish to point out, moreover, that our vote in no way alters our position with regard to the 1981 attack on the Tammuz reactor, which was dealt with in Security Council resolution 487 (1981).

Mr. NUÑEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20, on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. The fact that we did not oppose the consensus behind this draft resolution does not signify a change in my Government's position on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which is referred to in paragraph 1.

The delegation of Cuba also wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.32, on the implementation of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, known as the Tlatelolco Treaty. My delegation's abstention is in keeping with the well-known position of my country. As everyone knows, Cuba commends Mexico for its initiative, joined in by other Latin American countries which finally managed to adopt the Tlatelolco Treaty. Although we fully support the basic idea of nuclear-free zones and, in

(Mr. Nuñez Mosquera, Cuba)

this case, endorse the purposes and principles of this kind of nuclear-free zone in Latin America, Cuba is not a party to the Treaty, since the nuclear Power in our area has been pursuing a hostile and aggressive policy towards us - a policy characterized by constant threats - and maintains a military base on our territory against the will of our people and Government. Throughout the nearly 25 years of the base's existence various Administrations have committed acts of aggression and harassment against the Cuban revolution.

We are a peace-loving country, but we reiterate in this forum our categorical position of principle that as long as the hostile policy of the United States continues, and until the territory unlawfully occupied by the United States base is returned to us, we consider it our right to acquire and possess whatever weapons are most appropriate to defend the security, sovereignty and territorial integrity of our homeland. Like all the other countries of Latin America, we hope to see an end to the acts of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of our countries waged by certain Powers since the past century. We hope that ours will be a nuclear-free zone in the fullest sense: a zone closed to the transit of nuclear weapons; a zone in which nuclear energy will be used for exclusively peaceful purposes; a denuclearized zone in which the nuclear Powers will not carry out threatening manoeuvres against our countries. We want practical guarantees that there will be no threat or use of nuclear weapons against our countries and that the existing military bases will be removed. The recent criminal invasion by the most highly equipped nuclear Power, the United States, against one of the smallest countries in the world - which is also a party to the Tlatelolco Treaty and a full-fledged member of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (OPANAL), the Republic of Grenada - shows that the United States does not respect its commitment to denuclearization or to peace and security in Latin America.

That is the explanation of vote that my delegation wished to offer in these brief terms. We trust we have been clear. We want an end to the hostile aggressive policies of the United States. We want an end to its threats and to its efforts to destroy our socialist revolution. We want it to give back the territory it has usurped against our will and to allow us to return to our noble task of economic and social development. Those are the conditions for our joining other Latin American countries in the plan to denuclearize our continent, a goal we fully endorse.

Mr. CARSALES (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): There is no need for me to repeat my country's position on the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the compulsory implementation of full International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. Both elements are contained in a number of draft resolutions which have just been voted on or are coming up for vote on Friday, in connection with the denuclearized status of certain regions.

My delegation endorses the purposes of these draft resolutions and have already voted for some of them, notwithstanding our stated reservations and without implying any change in our position on the subject.

In past years, despite certain reservations, we have gone along with similar versions of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51. This year, however, the matter is more serious and, by virtue of our position of principle, it was not possible for us to overcome these difficulties this year and we were obliged to abstain.

Our position regarding the attack on the Tammuz reactor and regarding the general possibility of attacks on nuclear facilities has been made very clear, and it remains unchanged.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.32, we abstained for the same reasons that caused us to take a similar position last year; those reasons may be found in the records of the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth sessions of the General Assembly.

Mr. SHARMA (India): Although India did not stand in the way of a consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.20, we should like to make it clear that its adoption is without any prejudice at all to India's well-known stand concerning the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and on the question of the application of so-called full-scope safeguards.

As regards A/C.1/38/L.51, while India voted in favour of that draft resolution and of the operative paragraph on which a separate vote was taken, our delegation would like to state again that that vote is without prejudice to my country's stand on the question of so-called full-scope safeguards and on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mr. DE LA FUENTE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.51, in keeping with its well-known position in support of the efforts of the international community to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Peru is a Party to the Treaty on the

(Mr. De La Fuente, Peru)

Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and we feel it is essential that safeguards be applied universally, as one of the ways of ensuring free non-discriminatory access to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Therefore, my delegation considers that, in order that the call to submit to International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards be credible, this too must be directed to all States which have not yet submitted to them, and not made in the discriminatory form found in paragraph 1 of A/C.1/38/L.51.

We wish, finally, to express our reservations about those paragraphs which contain provisions irreconcilable with the division of responsibilities between the General Assembly and the Security Council, as set forth in the Charter. We also have reservations about paragraph 3, which requests implementation of a practice of which my delegation is not in favour.

Mr. CISSE (Mali) (interpretation from French): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on A/C.1/38/L.32. As it did on a similar text last year, my delegation abstained in the vote on this draft resolution. However, my delegation continues to believe in the relevance of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and, in particular connection with this draft resolution, of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

The delegation of Mali remains committed to the establishment of denuclearized zones throughout the world, because this cannot fail to improve the security of the peoples of the world and international security in general. My delegation is convinced that a denuclearized zone - and more generally the prohibition of nuclear weapons - in Latin America would be a step in that direction.

But, as I have said, my delegation had to abstain, owing to the wording of paragraphs 1 and 2 of A/C.1/38/L.32, which has just been adopted by the First Committee. In the opinion of my delegation, those paragraphs are not likely to be very helpful, because they interfere with the internal procedures followed by States in relation to their security - procedures which must not be prejudiced. We would have hoped that negotiations among the parties concerned might have achieved a better result.

Mr. NOUANETHASING (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from Russian): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6. We support the idea of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, but we feel that it is impossible to establish such a zone in South Asia because around that zone are the military bases of imperialist States, on which nuclear weapons are stationed. My delegation was therefore obliged to abstain in the vote on L.6.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): Yesterday afternoon, Sir, my delegation spoke in explanation of vote, but we failed to say how pleased we are to see you presiding over the work of the First Committee. We should have done so for it was the first time we made a statement of any length. I wish now to express our gratitude to you and to say that we appreciate your many merits.

Had my delegation been present earlier this morning when a number of votes were taken, we would have abstained in the vote on A/C.1/38/L.51, on Israeli nuclear armament, for reasons very similar to those expressed by the representative of Venezuela. We must not condemn one single State for not renouncing the possession of nuclear weapons; we believe that all States, not just one, should renounce the possession of nuclear weapons.

We would have abstained in the vote on A/C.1/38/L.51, on Israeli nuclear armament, for reasons very similar to those expressed by the representative of Venezuela. We must not condemn one single State for not renouncing the possession of nuclear weapons; we believe that all States, not just one, should renounce the possession of nuclear weapons.

Mr. DARMOSUTANTO (Indonesia): My delegation has long considered that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world, including the proposed establishment of such a zone in draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6, which has just been adopted by the Committee, constitutes the most effective means of preventing proliferation.

We have come to this conclusion because the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) has certain inherent shortcomings and does not enjoy universal support. In this context we believe that many of the deficiencies of the NPT can be overcome through the regional approach, namely, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

(Mr. Darnosutanto, Indonesia)

However, a proposal for a nuclear-weapon-free zone should be initiated by the States in the region and based on voluntary participation and agreements freely arrived at between them, something which, evidently, remains to be realized in South Asia.

For that reason, and despite our support for the zonal concept, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.6.

The CHAIRMAN: That concludes our work on the draft resolutions in cluster 8, except for A/C.1/38/L.67 and A/C.1/38/L.68, which we shall take up on Friday.

We shall now revert to cluster 4, containing the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/38/L.1/Rev.1, L.10, L.12, L.13, L.19, L.30 with financial implications in document L.72, L.38, L.50 in connection with which there is a financial statement, and L.55.

I shall first call on those delegations wishing to speak on the draft resolutions I have just enumerated, after which I shall call on those wishing to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. ERDENECHULUUN (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): The First Committee is now proceeding to take decisions on the last substantial problems of our age: prevention of nuclear war, curbing of the arms race and limitation of all nuclear weapons in all their aspects.

In the large number of draft resolutions submitted by various delegations, we find the expression of mounting concern on the part of the peoples of the world with the rising threat of nuclear war and the trend towards a further escalation of the nuclear arms race. Among these draft resolutions, we should particularly like to single out the importance of the new proposal made by the Soviet Union at this session of the General Assembly relating to the condemnation of nuclear war.

There can be no doubt as to the great political importance of the General Assembly's expressing the will of the peoples and decisively and unconditionally for all time condemning nuclear war as being contrary to human conscience and reason, as the most heinous crime against the peoples and as a violation of the most basic human right - the right to life.

In the present international situation, the question of the adoption by the nuclear Powers of specific obligations not to be the first to use nuclear weapons is acquiring ever greater relevance and immediacy. This is the purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.10, which

(Mr. Erdenechuluun, Mongolia)

"Expresses the hope that those nuclear-weapon States which have not yet done so would consider making similar declarations with respect to not being the first to use nuclear weapons." (A/C.1/38/L.10, p. 2)

Cluster 4 contains draft resolutions relating to other important aspects of nuclear disarmament, such as the prohibition of the nuclear neutron weapon and a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The Mongolian delegation will give them its full support.

Mr. MEISZTER (Hungary): I should like to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.10, entitled "Non-use of nuclear weapons and prevention of nuclear war", submitted by the delegation of the German Democratic Republic.

Hungary attaches paramount importance to avoiding nuclear war. We are aware of the fact that total elimination of the danger of nuclear war is a very complex task which can be accomplished only by eliminating all nuclear weapons - and that is certainly not a short process.

In the meantime, however, mankind has to be given guarantees against the outbreak of nuclear war. It is our firm conviction that the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons is the most practical and shortest way in this direction. Such declarations on non-first use by all nuclear-weapon States would be a most important step in the elimination of the danger of nuclear catastrophe.

That is why the Hungarian People's Republic highly appreciates the solemn commitment of two nuclear-weapon States not to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances. The danger of the outbreak of nuclear war, however, can be eliminated only if all States possessing nuclear weapons undertake similar commitments.

We therefore believe that those nuclear-weapon States which have not yet assumed such an obligation should take reciprocal steps. Those commitments would lift the shadow of nuclear war from everyone and, consequently, would be received with great relief by international public opinion.

Some delegations try to call into question the rationale of such a step by advancing the argument that this is a limited move, that it does not embrace all kinds of weapons. We see no sense in this reasoning because the most important and urgent task is to prevent nuclear war and, for this reason, we must not wait for a solution which would rule out all other wars.

(Mr. Meiszter, Hungary)

Secondly, because the two lines of effort are not at all mutually exclusive and the search for means of preventing the outbreak of a nuclear war in no way impedes efforts to prevent any kind of war, but on the contrary would create better conditions for reaching that goal, in our judgement the argument is false and has no *raison d'être*. It is in that spirit that my delegation wholeheartedly supports the appeal in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.10 which requests those nuclear-weapon States which have not yet done so to make similar declarations to those mentioned in paragraph 1. I hope that the draft resolution will receive the widest possible support in our Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to hear explanations of vote before the vote.

Mr. CROMARTIE (United Kingdom): I should like to make a statement in explanation of vote on three draft resolutions in this cluster, resolutions A/C.1/38/L.1, L.19 and L.38.

Draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.1 seems to my delegation to be a simplistic and propagandistic draft resolution, designed to divert attention from the important and positive proposals which the United States, with the support of its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, has made over the past months in the negotiations in Geneva for reductions in intermediate and long-range nuclear weapons. We should have much preferred to see a Soviet draft resolution welcoming those proposals as a basis for agreement. Instead we are asked to endorse a deliberate attempt by it to divert the attention of the United Nations from practical measures of arms control in favour of a meaningless and misleading document.

We have heard this morning with profound regret that the Soviet Union has discontinued the Geneva talks on intermediate-range nuclear force reductions, with no date for resumption. We have made clear our wish that these talks should continue and the voting yesterday on draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.3 shows that this is also the wish of the majority of Member States.

The attitude of my Government towards nuclear weapons and nuclear warfare was set out fully by the Prime Minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, in her statement to the twelfth special session of the General Assembly on 23 June 1982. She said that there would be no victors in a nuclear exchange, but rather that to start a nuclear war among nuclear Powers was not a rational option. She left no doubt that she was

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

fully alive to the horrors of nuclear war but, as she also pointed out, my Government believes that nuclear weapons can function as deterrents and, as such, they have kept the peace between East and West for nearly 40 years.

As Mrs. Thatcher also said, we believe the fundamental risk to peace is not the existence of weapons of particular types: it is the disposition on the part of some States to impose change on others by resorting to force.

We do not believe that a declaration drafted in terms of the one put before us by the Soviet Union serves a useful purpose, concentrating as it does on a single aspect of weaponry and ignoring the causes of conflict in international relations. I would remind the Committee that the British Minister of State, Mr. Luce, said in his statement in the general debate that we should look beyond the title of a resolution and study its principles, its precise language and, above all, its potential contribution to progress in the negotiations. On that test the draft resolution before us fails.

Paragraph 1 is cast in hysterical language which seems intended to divert attention from other, real - not potential - dangers to human life that arise every day from conventional war and paragraph 2, with its unwarranted implications that those who do not agree with the Soviet Union are seeking to justify the unleashing of a nuclear war is equally objectionable. I wish to remind the Committee of the declaration made by the NATO countries in Bonn in 1982, that no NATO weapons, nuclear or conventional, would ever be used except in response to attack. That declaration remains valid today. My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution L.1.

Turning to draft resolution L.19, the British Government's views on the question of the prevention of nuclear war have been made very clear in the Committee on Disarmament, notably in a statement by the then Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Mr. Douglas Hurd, on 10 March 1983. We continue to set the prevention of nuclear war firmly in the context of the prevention of war in general, because the causes of war, whether conventional or nuclear, are the same. It follows that we believe that discussions on the prevention of war which concentrate solely on the nuclear aspects will not be fruitful. It was the unwillingness of certain delegations to accept this that led to the long delay in agreement on an agenda for the Committee on Disarmament and the failure of the Committee to agree to the suggestion that the essential first stage in considering this question was a thorough discussion of the subject in order to identify areas where negotiation might be possible.

(Mr. Cromartie, United Kingdom)

As we have pointed out before, an essential prerequisite for successful negotiation is that the parties should first agree on their general objectives. This we have not yet done in relation to the prevention of nuclear war. We are ready to consider at any time specific suggestions which might be put forward in the Committee on Disarmament. However, until we have reached preliminary agreements on specific proposals to pursue we do not believe that the initiation of negotiations on the establishment of a working group for the purpose would lead to fruitful result. We shall therefore abstain on this draft resolution.

Finally, turning to draft resolution L.38, it seems to us that this draft covers no new ground except in its final operative paragraph, which requests nuclear-weapon States to submit annual reports to the General Assembly on measures and steps taken by them in the field of nuclear disarmament. The British Government has for many years provided this Committee with an annual review of its position on issues relating to disarmament by means of a statement made to this Committee, normally by a Minister of the Government - this year, by Mr. Luce, Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. My delegation intends to continue this practice and does not think any more to be necessary. It will therefore abstain on this draft resolution.

Mr. KARRAN (Guyana): The delegation of Guyana has consistently expressed its dissatisfaction with what has been achieved with regard to the establishment of conditions for a secure and lasting peace. We have consistently called for and I shall, as I did last year, reiterate the adoption of effective measures to end the arms race at an early date and bring about general and complete nuclear disarmament.

The draft resolution before the Committee in document A/C.1/38/L.12, in its second preambular paragraph, stresses that the neutron weapon represents a further step in the qualitative arms race in the field of nuclear weapons. Guyana opposes the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons in all aspects, including the neutron weapon. As we said last year, it is our conviction that the introduction of the neutron weapon represents another upward development in the spiralling arms race, one which dangerously worsens the present situation of tension and crisis in the world while complicating and frustrating United Nations efforts for the attainment of disarmament goals.

(Mr. Karran, Guyana)

My delegation expresses its appreciation to the authors of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.12 for reflecting as well as they do the profound concern that Guyana feels at the introduction of what has properly been described as the ultimate capitalist weapon.

As has been stated before, Guyana opposes the production of all types of nuclear weapons, without exception, and we are prepared to support any measure which seeks the prohibition of the production of nuclear weapons in general. We do not believe in calling for a selective prohibition; there are other types of nuclear weapons apart from the neutron weapon which make for an escalation of the nuclear arms race and on whose production we should also like to see a prohibition placed. Guyana believes, therefore, that to give its support to any selective approach to the question of nuclear weapon refinement would be inconsistent with the general concern we feel for the overall process of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear weapons.

My delegation will therefore abstain on this draft resolution, as we did last year.

Mr. KORHONEN (Finland): The delegation of Finland agrees with the main thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.10. Addressing the question of the use of nuclear weapons, the President of Finland, Mr. Mauro Koivisto, in his address to the General Assembly on 29 September this year, said:

"Nuclear war is nowhere professed to be an element of rational policy. To limit such a war would scarcely be possible. Its effects would extend beyond all national boundaries. The authorization of even the smallest nuclear reprisal in a crisis situation would quite probably lead to an all-out nuclear war. Awareness of this fact should lead to further agreements now. The use of force is prohibited by the Charter, but the peoples of the world are entitled to specific assurances against the use of nuclear weapons."

(A/38/PV.11, p. 8-10)

Accordingly, on the basis of my Government's position that nuclear weapons should never be used under any circumstances, we shall cast our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/38/L.10.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been in continuous contact with the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, Ambassador Fonseca, and I am fully aware of his ceaseless efforts, working almost day and night, to achieve a consensus. I appeal to the members of the Ad Hoc Committee to assist the Chairman in his task, so that the Committee can conclude its work. I remind the Committee's members that a decision must be taken soon, as it will have financial implications, and financial implications must be submitted before 1 December. Therefore, time is running out, and I make an urgent appeal to the members of the Ad Hoc Committee to assist its Chairman to succeed in completing the work.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.