

31/73 and 32/83, it requested the Secretary-General to convene a meeting for the purpose of the consultations mentioned therein and to render such assistance as might be required to promote the efforts for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Bearing in mind the provisions of paragraphs 60 to 63 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, including in the region of South Asia.

Taking note of the report of the Secretary-General on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia,

1. Reaffirms its endorsement, in principle, of the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia;

2. Urges once again the States of South Asia and such other neighbouring non-nuclear-weapon States as may be interested to continue to make all possible efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and to refrain, in the mean time, from any action contrary to this objective;

3. Calls upon those nuclear-weapon States which have not done so to respond positively to this proposal and to extend the necessary co-operation in the efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia;

4. Requests the Secretary-General to render such assistance as may be required to promote the efforts for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and to report on the subject to the General Assembly at its second special session devoted to disarmament as well as at its thirty-seventh session;

5. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its thirty-seventh session the item entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

Recorded vote in Assembly as follows:

In favour: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Federal Republic of Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, German Democratic Republic, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Indonesia, Israel, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Mongolia, Mozambique, Norway, Poland, Samoa,^a Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sweden, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

^a Later advised the Secretariat it had intended to vote in favour.

Non-stationing of nuclear weapons

Expressing regret that little progress had been made in the Committee on Disarmament, the General Assembly, by a resolution adopted on 9 December 1981,⁽²⁾ again requested the Committee to proceed without delay to talks with a view to elaborating an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons on the territories of States where there were no such weapons. The Assembly called on all nuclear-weapon States to refrain from further action involving the stationing of nuclear weapons on the territo-

ries of other States. This resolution, sponsored by 19 States, was adopted by a recorded vote of 84 to 18, with 42 abstentions, following its approval by the First Committee on 25 November by a recorded vote of 67 to 17, with 38 abstentions.

Introducing the resolution, Hungary stated that the conclusion of an international agreement on the non-stationing of nuclear weapons would strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation régime and could contribute to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and to reducing the danger of nuclear war. Recent decisions to deploy nuclear weapons in States where there were none and to deploy additional nuclear weapons in States where they already existed had increased the importance and timeliness of the question. As the Committee on Disarmament had been unable to deal appropriately with the question, efforts must continue towards the elaboration and conclusion of an international agreement.

Belgium explained its negative vote on the ground that the text would prevent States from exercising the right of collective self-defence as provided for in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. Japan also cast a negative vote, asserting that the measures proposed might destabilize the international military balance and thereby prove detrimental to the maintenance of peace and security.

Of the States which abstained, Brazil observed that the proposal failed to include the specific requirement of withdrawal and elimination of nuclear weapons from the territories of States where such weapons already existed. Brazil, Peru and Yugoslavia considered that an international agreement such as the one contemplated in the resolution could, therefore, confer legality on the existence of nuclear weapons on the territories of countries that already possessed them. Peru thought the right approach was the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Greece felt that the subject of the resolution should be dealt with in a broader, global context, founded on the sovereign right of every country freely to decide on questions concerning its own collective or individual defence. Ireland wished to avoid taking sides on strategic issues between the two alliances. Sweden considered that the question of non-stationing could not be dealt with in isolation and security arrangements; also, a serious problem of credibility and consistency arose when the USSR co-sponsored a resolution against the stationing of nuclear weapons on new territories after a Soviet submarine, in all probability carrying a nuclear warhead, had recently violated Swedish territorial waters and penetrated into a militarily restricted area.