



FIRST COMMITTEE
58th meeting
held on
8 December 1982
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 58TH MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GBEHO (Ghana)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 54: CHEMICAL AND BACTERIOLOGICAL (BIOLOGICAL) WEAPONS (continued):

- (a) REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT
- (b) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

AGENDA ITEM 58: DEVELOPMENT AND STRENGTHENING OF GOOD-NEIGHBOURLINESS BETWEEN STATES: REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 137: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLECTIVE SECURITY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY (continued)

* 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 A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), 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.1/37/PV.58
18 January 1983
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 54, 56 AND 137 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will continue its consideration of agenda item 54, "Chemical and Bacteriological (Biological) Weapons".

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): All admirers of the late unlamented Herr Goebbels have just cause for alarm. The reputation of Hitlerite propagandist is in real danger of being eclipsed by the growing renown of the United States Administration's accursed lying apparatus.

The Nazi technique of continuing to repeat a lie in the hope of its acquiring a semblance of truth, of continuing to sling mud with the expectation of some of it sticking, is being practised and sought to be perfected by the imperialist inheritors of the mantle of the Third Reich in this regard. The technique has been upgraded with the warlords of Washington seeking to convict others, including the victims of their own outrageous crimes against humanity.

The latest illustration is the repetition of the charges by the State Department of the United States that the Soviet Union has used chemical weapons in South-East Asia and in Afghanistan. The brazenness of the charge is truly breath-taking.

For the charge comes from those who stand convicted before the tribunal of humanity of the same crimes against the peoples of several countries. The charge is as breath-taking-as the devastation visited by United States imperialism upon peoples who have dared to defy its diktat and asserted their national identity and independence.

The peoples of the three countries of Indo-China - the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea - are still struggling to recover from the aftermath of the most cruel war in history forced by the imperialists upon them. The long years of saturation bombing of these countries, in which a record amount of chemical weapons were employed, and the biological warfare, which included a diabolical defoliation campaign, have left a long trail of human misery that will remain a living reminder of imperialist bestiality for quite some time to come.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The memory of the Viet Nam War is still fresh in the mind of the world public, and now a similar adventure is being pursued in El Salvador. The great people of that small country are facing savage imperialist fury, which has found expression in the use against them of the most lethal chemical weapons, among other things.

And the butchers of Washington and the Pentagon, who not very long ago launched a bacteriological war against socialist Cuba, have continued to develop this branch of the inhuman imperialist enterprise. It was only recently that an American malaria research institute in Pakistan was exposed as an undercover centre for the manufacture of biological and bacteriological arms. The charge comes from those who have actually put chemical weapons at the disposal of the Afghan counter-revolutionaries, as has been proven by specimens seized from some of them in the Herat province of Afghanistan. These dangerous toys are being presented to bandits who have shown no compunction about committing starkly brutal, sacrilegious crimes against the Afghan people.

The actual use of chemical munitions by the gangs of Afghan counter-revolutionaries is a matter of record. In the statements of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, some of which have been distributed as official documents of the General Assembly, and in the statements of the Afghan delegation before this Committee, we have brought to the attention of the international community the hard evidence and the material proof of chemical munitions recovered from captured bandits. These materials are permanently displayed in the museum of captured arms in Kabul, and a large number of foreign journalists and representatives of dozens of international organizations have inspected them.

One cannot but ask why the United States and some others, who shed crocodile tears over the fate of alleged victims of chemical warfare, chose to disregard and ignore completely the invitation of the Afghan Government to inspect the chemical grenades captured from the terrorist gangs.

The charge is being repeated ad nauseum, in spite of all evidence to the contrary. A fact-finding mission of United Nations experts, after spending several weeks in Peshawar, returned empty-handed, without a shred of evidence to back up the absurd allegations. And it was reiterated only the other day that the team found no evidence to support the American charge - unlike the case of Viet Nam.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The representative of the United States, in the statement he made earlier in this Committee, preferred not to refer to the report of the Experts, contained in document A/37/259 of 1 December 1982. One reason for this may be that the United States files on chemical weapons contain no documents other than their own fabricated allegations and slanderous lies. The other reason is that there is nothing in the report of the Experts which could be exploited for the purposes of substantiating the United States allegations. On the contrary, some parts of that report unveil the baselessness and fallaciousness of those charges.

It is well known that the delegation of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, together with a large number of other delegations, voted against the resolution which established the Group of Experts. Our position remains the same. But, since this Committee is to study and comment upon the report of the Experts, I shall nevertheless quote some parts of the report, produced after the on-site investigations conducted by the Group in Peshawar.

In chapter VII of the report, on the Group's conclusions, the Group states that:

"it could not overlook the fact that such accounts might be incomplete or distorted for various reasons. The Group therefore found it difficult to make a definitive assessment regarding the veracity of the accounts given by the alleged victims or eyewitnesses mentioned in the submissions"

(A/37/259, para. 186),

and that:

"it was unable to decide from the analytical results whether such exposure was due to a chemical attack or could be attributed to natural causes".

(Ibid., para. 187)

Later on, we read the following:

"However, with respect to the origin of the samples, the Group felt... it was not in a position to ascertain beyond a reasonable doubt whether or not these samples were obtained from areas that had /allegedly/ been exposed to chemical attacks". (Ibid., para. 188)

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

It is further stated that

"the Group was not able to detect signs and symptoms pathognomonic of exposure to chemical attack. However, the Group had the opportunity to interview two Hmong refugees who claimed to have been exposed to the yellow powder only two weeks earlier. Medical examination, in consultation with two dermatologists, proved that their skin condition was due to fungus infection of at least three months' duration. Analyses of their blood did not show any trace of trichothecenes... and there was no leucopenia". (Ibid., para. 189)

In that same part of the report, we read that:

"The results of chemical analyses of samples received or collected by the Group are inconclusive. In most cases, no presence of chemical warfare agents

demonstrated", (Ibid., para. 191)

and that:

"In its evaluation of the allegations mentioned in the course of the interviews, the Group noted that some allegations were only supported by scanty circumstantial evidence and that alternative explanations other than the one of chemical warfare agents were possible and, in most of those cases, even likely. One example is the allegations concerning poisoning of water supplies, which could be explained by natural occurrences of pollutants in the water. In some cases, because of lack of adequate information or evidence of any kind presented, it was not possible to arrive at any conclusion". (Ibid., para. 193)

I now move on in the report and wish to note the results of research and analysis of the "hard evidence" presented to the experts during their stay in Pakistan. There were five pieces of so-called hard evidence, and I shall deal with them one by one.

The first was allegedly toxic wheat grains. The result of laboratory examination was that the Group found no chemical warfare agents in the original samples or the control samples.

The second piece of evidence was part of a parachute. There again, the Group states that no chemical warfare agents were found in the original samples or in the unspiked control samples.

The third piece of evidence was a gas mask with a filter canister. With regard to that piece of evidence, the Group's final verdict was that in the original samples and unspiked control samples, no chemical warfare agents were found.

(Mr. Zarif, Afghanistan)

The other piece of evidence was a material described as a fuse from an alleged chemical hand bomb. Once again, the Group concluded that no chemical warfare agents, either in the untreated control samples or in the original samples, were found.

The fifth and final piece of evidence given to the Group was various bullets and a flechette. Here again, the Group states that no chemical warfare agents were detected. These are portions of the report submitted by the Group of Experts to the Committee for its examination. I do not understand what kind of proof is being looked for to substantiate the charges made by the United States delegation.

Their charge is being trumpeted again and again, even while the Reagan clique prepares to step up its spending on chemical and other mass-murder weapons to the phenomenal figure of \$6,000 million and to add to the United States arms stockpile, in which chemical arms alone account for 150,000 tons.

The degree of credibility of the charge is shown by the reaction of the United States press itself. The Christian Science Monitor newspaper, for example, says that suspicion cannot but arise that the Reagan Administration levels such violent accusations against the Soviet Union only to justify its own development of chemical armaments.

If that is what is thought by the American people, many of whom have suffered as guinea pigs in the imperialist laboratory for the perfection of methods of mass extermination, then the reaction of the rest of the world should be quite obvious. Such abominable lies can hardly make a difference to the ever-growing world stature of the Soviet Union as the foremost champion of peace. The Soviet initiatives for an international advance towards nuclear and general disarmament have been too many - and too transparently sincere - for that.

As for the reaction of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, our reaction to such Goebbelsian propaganda can only be one of contempt, combined with a redoubled determination to pursue the path of peace and our own chosen course of progress regardless of imperialist obstructions and provocations.

Mr. TRAUTWEIN (Federal Republic of Germany): My delegation wishes to thank the Group of Experts appointed under General Assembly resolution 35/144 C for the work it has done and for having submitted its report.

The Federal Republic of Germany has acted as a sponsor of resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 that was submitted by the representative of New Zealand this morning in order to emphasize its interest in this subject. The task of the Group of Experts was in many respects a difficult one, but it has undertaken its mission in a manner that deserves our full appreciation.

Unfortunately, the members of the Group of Experts did not always receive the help and co-operation they might have expected. It has been suggested that they were pursuing political objectives that had nothing to do with the task at hand, whereas in fact they were merely fulfilling the mission which they had been assigned under a United Nations resolution. Several countries Members of this Organization refused the experts access to certain areas and did not allow them to meet people who could have helped them with their investigations.

It was also asserted that the sponsors of the initial General Assembly resolution 35/144 C, as well as General Assembly resolution 36/96 C, and their supporters, had asked for the establishment of this Group of Experts with other aims in mind. These assertions have, unfortunately, been repeated in today's debate by the same delegations that have denied any support to the Group's work from the beginning. In this context, we consider the allegations of the representative of the Soviet Union this morning concerning the authorship of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 as extremely unfortunate. We associate ourselves fully with the rebuttal already made by the representative of the Netherlands. I would just add that the Soviet presentation was, of course, founded on a totally wrong picture of decision-making among Western countries. We evaluated the facts on their merits and came to parallel conclusions.

(Mr. Trautwein, Federal Republic
of Germany)

Now that the report is before us, we believe that similar assertions can no longer be made, for the report shows that they have no foundation. Indeed, we still agree with the comment made by the representative of Singapore in 1980 during the debate on this item when he said:

"He who is innocent need have no fear of an impartial investigation"
(A/C.1/35/PV.44, p. 8-10).

This impartially conducted fact-finding mission does give reason for concern. The unprejudiced reader will be impressed by the large number of incidents that have been reported and by the statements of witnesses, all of which show that there have been victims whose injuries or loss of life cannot be ascribed to some natural disaster. It is also made clear by the last sentence of the Group of Experts' conclusion.

It is indeed very worrying that these incidents occur and that those who have caused such injuries cannot be identified beyond doubt. This creates the disturbing impression that it is true that the report can indeed be considered to be inconclusive in this respect. This may be regrettable, but we cannot expect the experts to base their findings on conjecture.

Thus, the experts are rightly using the same high standards that any independent court of law would adopt. But we are puzzled when some delegations draw from this the conclusion that all allegations are groundless, slanderous or fabricated. In this context, we agree with the thrust of the statement by the representative of Singapore this morning, when he expressed his amazement and stated that he could now understand in the light of the evidence presented in the report:

"why the occupying authorities in Afghanistan and Kampuchea...have not permitted the United Nations Group of Experts to investigate and to conduct on-site verification" (A/C.1/37/PV.57, p. 68-70).

I might add that this was despite the specific requests of the Group of Experts.

(Mr. Trautwein, Federal Republic
of Germany)

The occurrences underlying draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79, which have been the subject of reports from various quarters over the years, induced my delegation to support General Assembly resolution 35/144 C in 1980. We did not do so in order to accuse or to blame anyone, but simply because we wanted to help impress upon the international community the need to observe a fundamental instrument of law, the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons. Any use of such weapons constitutes a violation of the Geneva Protocol and of the Convention of 1972 as well. Unfortunately, neither of these instruments provides for suitable verification. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany sees itself confirmed in the opinion that it is urgently necessary to agree on a convention which provides for a comprehensive and world-wide ban on chemical weapons and for reliable and binding verification procedures. In this connection, we would refer to our initiatives for a solution to these problems which we submitted to the Geneva Disarmament Committee in 1982 and to the United Nations General Assembly during the second special session devoted to disarmament. We appeal to all countries to agree to international co-operative measures to ensure the observance of arms-control commitments.

(Mr. Trautwein, Federal
Republic of Germany)

We particularly support operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79, which calls upon all countries strictly to observe the Geneva Protocol. All Members of the United Nations should respond to this call.

The draft resolution deserves the broadest possible support. The Federal Republic of Germany will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no further speakers in the debate on this issue. The Committee will therefore now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 as orally amended this morning.

I now call upon the Secretary to read out the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

The SECRETARY: The sponsors are Australia, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, New Zealand, Turkey and Spain.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. KABA (Guinea) (interpretation from French): The delegation of Guinea abstained in the votes on draft resolutions A/C.1/37/L.61 and A/C.1/37/L.54, and it is compelled to refrain from supporting draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79. In fact the delegation of Guinea considers that the principle of an international inquiry should be extended and applied to all areas of conflict and not be applied on the basis of ideological or political reasons. A standing mission of inquiry should be established by virtue of an international convention to protect peoples from governmental observations.

Since the end of the Second World War the so-called colonial or semi-colonial peoples have speeded up the process of their political, economic and social liberation, if necessary by using weapons against the colonial or administering Powers. During the struggles for national

(Mr. Kaba, Guinea)

liberation of the oppressed peoples the international community everywhere noted the use of chemical, biological and other weapons use of which against peoples seeking to free themselves from the foreign yoke are forbidden by previous agreements. For a long time chemical and other forbidden weapons were thrown into waters to massacre the peaceful peoples of Africa, Indo-China, and the Near East, and they are still being used today in Namibia and Angola by the South Africa hordes -- not to forget Lebanon and Palestine, where the most deadly of weapons have been used.

The People's Revolutionary Republic of Guinea has always unequivocally condemned colonialism and military occupation of foreign territory. Nothing can justify the presence of an army outside its internationally recognized frontiers against the express will of the people of the country to which they have been sent.

That is why the Revolutionary People's Republic of Guinea has requested the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghanistan and Kampuchea.

My country disapproves of the selective methods used and has in the past condemned and will always condemn acts directed against peoples and their national independence. It insists purely and simply as the extension of commissions of inquiry to all areas of conflict.

We cannot keep silent about crimes of genocide committed in one place while we attack such crimes elsewhere. The principle of non-alignment compels us to tell the truth when irrefutable proof exists. The commission of inquiry that was established has not arrived at conclusive results as to the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons in the countries that were the object of the inquiry, and therefore my delegation will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79.

Mr. ALEXANDROV (Bulgaria): My delegation wishes briefly to explain its vote before the vote on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.79.

As many preceding speakers have already pointed out, the deliberations conducted on the issue of the alleged use of chemical weapons have highlighted the utter absence of any evidence whatsoever of the use of chemical substances in the cases in question. They have left little doubt as to

(Mr. Alexandrov, Bulgaria)

the purely political nature of the whole enterprise, the main thrust of which is in line with the course of confrontation and exacerbation of tensions.

The study before us designed some two years ago to provide credibility for the slanderous campaign, fails to produce either substantive data or definitive conclusions to confirm the false accusations levelled against the Soviet Union and certain sovereign Asiatic States so intensely disliked by the imperialist forces that once dominated the region.

The efforts exerted by those circles until the last moment to influence the elaboration of the report were really formidable. New official concoctions were subsequently launched, and the most massive propaganda offensive was unleashed to brainwash public opinion. Yet the document in question, romantic as it is, adds nothing new to the already existing situation. Even its concluding part, which attempts a sort of diplomatic compromise between fact and hypothesis, does not in any way endorse the improbable, the impossible and the untrue.

The futile and counter-productive exercise in which the United Nations was regrettably involved has entirely exhausted itself. The time has come when it must be called off. Of course it would be naïve to expect the initiators of the idea to stand up and gallantly confess their fiasco.

The draft resolution before us reflects their intention to launch a sort of rearguard face-saving operation. The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.79 is obviously meant politically to finalize the venture, to impress upon this body that something useful has been successfully brought to an end. As we all know, that is not the case. What we are witnessing now is not a dignified conclusion but an ignominious failure.

That is why my country will not be a party to such a move. We shall vote against the draft resolution.

(Mr. Alexandrov, Bulgaria)

But my delegation would like to pose a question. Is it not high time that we, Members of the world Organization, should say 'no' to artificial and openly provocative arrangements which can only invite further tampering with a very important issue by adding poisonous ingredients?

As far as Bulgaria is concerned, it remains fully committed to the continuation of negotiations on chemical disarmament and will contribute in good faith to the resumption of the negotiations and their successful outcome.

Mr. S.O. BOLD (Mongolia) (interpretation from Russian): The Mongolian delegation has familiarized itself in a very cursory manner with the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/37/259, dated 1 December 1982. I say in a cursory manner because this report was submitted to the Committee for its consideration and distributed to delegations literally only a few days ago. Consequently we and, clearly, many other delegations, have not had time to study its contents in detail.

From the very beginning of the introduction of the so-called question of the study of allegations and possible incidents of the use of chemical weapons and then the subsequent formation of the Group of Experts, the Mongolian delegation has opposed and continues categorically to oppose this item. This was true at the time of the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 35/144 C at its thirty-fifth session and we held the same position at the time of the adoption of resolution 36/96 C at the thirty-sixth session; and we hold the same position at this session as well.

Like many other delegations, we have repeatedly pointed out that the deliberately false and inaccurate reports fabricated by certain circles, in this instance the United States and its allies, for the ignoble purpose of denigrating and slandering other countries do not need any study at all. We have repeatedly drawn the attention of the Committee to the very serious fact that no study, no matter on what pretext it was conducted, could take place on the basis of unfounded allegations or reports wholly lacking in authenticity. Moreover, this establishes a very dangerous precedent.

(Mr. S. O. Bold, Mongolia)

What is more, the study under United Nations auspices of dubious allegations of alleged incidents of the use of chemical weapons and the submission of its hollow results for discussion in the General Assembly is, in our firm belief, a futile waste of time and a costly waste of the resources of the United Nations. Not the least consideration in this regard is that this represents a net loss for the prestige and authority of the United Nations.

The report presented by the Group of Experts has turned out to be exactly what my delegation and many others expected it to be. After all the work done by that Group over the last two years, after the consideration of reports that it received, after the study of numerous documents, materials and facts and after the assessment of the individual cases mentioned in it, the Group proved unable to arrive at a definitive conclusion as to whether or not chemical weapons had been used.

Now we have before us the conclusion of the experts after their latest study. It is interesting to refer to some of these conclusions.

The report says, for example, that the Group questioned so-called victims and witnesses of the alleged chemical weapons attacks. However, in chapter VII it says:

"...the Group noted that, while alleged victims and/or eyewitnesses would be in a position to provide firsthand accounts, it could not overlook the fact that such accounts might be incomplete or distorted for various reasons." (A/37/259 para. 186)

Further on in the report it is clear that in their visits to various places the Group of Experts received certain samples. In connection with the samples received by the Group, paragraph 186 has the following to say:

"(The Group) was not in a position to ascertain beyond a reasonable doubt whether or not these samples were obtained from areas that had been exposed to chemical attacks." (ibid.)

Lastly, another conclusion from paragraph 193 of the report says:

"In its evaluation of the allegations mentioned in the course of the interviews, the Group noted that some allegations were only supported by scanty circumstantial evidence and that alternative explanations other than the one of chemical warfare agents were possible and, in most of those cases, even likely." (ibid.)

(Mr. S. O. Bold, Mongolia)

From the above-mentioned conclusions of the experts, only one conclusion can be drawn. This is that not a single allegation of the supposed incidents of the use of chemical warfare agents has been confirmed. There is no other conclusion. Therefore, any accusations about the imaginary use of chemical weapons are lies and slanders from beginning to end.

On the basis of these considerations, the Mongolian delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.79.

Mr. KONADU-YIADOMI (Ghana): Before the Committee proceeds to a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 on chemical and bacteriological weapons, my delegation would like to explain its vote.

About two years ago, the General Assembly was seized of the question of the serious allegations then levelled against one of the super-Powers to the effect that it had used chemical weapons or toxic agents in Afghanistan and certain parts of South-East Asia. The gravity of the allegations and the dramatic manner in which the Assembly was confronted with the problem impelled the Assembly to appoint a Group of Experts to investigate and report on the allegation. After two years of difficult and unenviable work, the report of the Group of Experts is before the Assembly. The draft resolution in document A/C.1/37/L.79 is therefore the decision that the Committee is being invited to take on the report.

My delegation would also like, first of all, to record its thanks to and appreciation of the Group of Experts for the work they have done. We have noted the circumstances in which they have undertaken their task and are convinced that they could not have done more, given the difficulties inherent in a delicate task of this nature.

My delegation is therefore appreciative of the fact that the draft resolution is direct and to the point. We are, however, unhappy with the second preambular paragraph, which attempts to summarize the contents of the report in one sentence. We have reservations about it because it has the net effect of an insinuation to which my delegation cannot be a party.

(Mr. Konadu-Yiadom, Ghana)

We note that the Group of Experts stated that it found some of the circumstantial evidence hard to dismiss, but at the same time it was careful enough not to assert that it was a sufficient basis for making accusations against anyone.

From the legal point of view, we doubt that any person or State could be convicted on the evidence recorded in the report, hard as some of it is to ignore. To introduce this into the draft resolution, therefore, is to indulge in insinuation, which can be of no practical consequence to the Assembly.

In reaching a decision on the draft resolution, the Committee must bear in mind that the draft resolution deals with a particular question: that of the serious allegations made against a Member State. It is not - I repeat "not" - a general debate on the question of chemical and bacteriological weapons, which the Committee has already held. Therefore, if the report of the Group of Experts did not endorse the allegations made, this Committee, as a fair-minded body, has only one task to perform: that is, it should record its appreciation and leave the matter at that. To proceed to insinuations would, in our opinion, be counterproductive. The extent of insinuations cannot be delimited.

My delegation would be happy to vote in favour of the draft resolution without the second preambular paragraph, for the reasons I have stated and also because it makes a general appeal to all Member States to adhere to the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

We would be happy to vote in favour of it because we believe that the reality with regard to this type of weapon is that it exists and is in the arsenals of the super-Powers and their allies. What is more, such weapons are likely to be used not in any of the countries that have manufactured and stockpiled them but in third-world countries for which they are cynically destined. Therefore my delegation would like to reiterate its support for and commitment to the banning of all types of chemical and bacteriological weapons and their destruction under verifiable conditions.

(Mr. Konadu-Yiadom, Ghana)

Therefore we request a separate vote on the second preambular paragraph. If the paragraph is not upheld, we shall proceed to vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. However, if it is retained, my delegation will abstain on the draft resolution as a whole, because we believe that in the absence of ironclad evidence we should endeavour not to worsen the atmosphere in which international security could be negotiated. We fear that the Assembly might go in the opposite direction by indulging in any insinuations at this point.

Finally, my delegation hopes that, whether or not the draft resolution is adopted, we can now address ourselves to the task of negotiating the banning of the use of these weapons everywhere.

Mr. KAHN (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79, and we wish to remind the Committee of the statements we made on this subject at the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth sessions of the United Nations General Assembly. My delegation had stated, first, that the motives of the authors resolutions 35/144 C and 36/96 C were rooted not in the desire to implement the Geneva Protocol of 1925 but in the intention to defame other States; secondly, that the aforementioned resolutions could be used to impede the efforts for the banning of chemical weapons; thirdly, that the entire manoeuvre from start to finish had harmed the reputation of this Committee.

The report of the Group of Experts has confirmed that there is no proof of the use of chemical weapons in the areas mentioned. That statement is also contained in the first part of the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79. In contradiction of that statement, the vague formulation of the second part of the same paragraph is a political concession to the authors of this unworthy procedure. That formulation was deliberately given an ambiguous meaning. The provocative manoeuvre to defame other States was linked to an expensive propaganda campaign which caused the United Nations to expend considerable financial resources, although it was clear from the very beginning that they would be wasted.

(Mr. Kahn, German Democratic Republic)

All the efforts made by the initiators of this campaign failed to succeed and they were doomed to failure because the entire manoeuvre was based on malevolent defamations. Apart from the fact that the witnesses' credibility is doubtful, there is no proof that certain phenomena were caused by the use of chemical weapons.

The so-called circumstantial evidence has obviously been manipulated and it can in no way justify the aforementioned allegations. The facts show that in the event that chemical or toxic warfare were really waged it could not be kept secret. Traces of toxic agents used by the United States Army during the Viet Nam War can be found to this day, although 10 years have elapsed since then. No traveller in South Viet Nam can fail to notice the vast areas in which the tropical forests were completely destroyed. In villages malformed children can be seen whose parents were exposed to chemicals used by the United States forces.

In contrast to that, so-called circumstantial evidence was furnished in the form of leaf or stem samples the origin and date of which cannot be ascertained. The toxicity of these samples either has natural causes or was produced with malice aforethought.

The so-called victims of alleged chemical attacks show symptoms which admit of no medically accurate diagnoses. There is in no case material evidence giving proof of the use of chemical weapons, such as, for instance, shells, spray devices, containers or other means for the use, transportation or storage of chemical weapons.

That totally unworthy procedure and its results, together with the fact that at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly the representative of the United States referred to the provocative resolution then adopted, resolution 35/144 C, as the most important result of the whole session, cast a searching light on the standards of value applied by the United States with regard to the activities undertaken by this Organization. Unfortunately, this manoeuvre has not been completed but it is to be continued in another form with draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.54. This undertaking is also doomed to failure.

In view of this state of affairs, we appeal to members to approach with all seriousness and responsibility the preparation of a convention demanding the total banning of all chemical weapons and their destruction. This is the task that must now be carried out.

Mr. MAKONNEN (Ethiopia): Ethiopia is one of the original signatories of the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and bacteriological methods of warfare. The conscience and the practice of Ethiopia has been and continues to be invariably bound by the provisions of that Protocol.

It was also recalled this morning that Ethiopia was, in the 1930s, the first victim of the violation of the Protocol prohibiting the use of these inhumane weapons. That scores of thousands of Ethiopians were indiscriminately and brutally killed by chemical warfare agents on the eve of the Second World War, was and is a fact established and unchallenged by anyone. While the agony and death of thousands of Ethiopians shocked the peoples of the world and gave rise to a world-wide uproar and revulsion, Governments of the Powers that then were, not only looked the other way but in fact imposed sanctions by way of embargoes on the victim itself. Such was the depth of the historic, moral and political bankruptcy of those very Powers which now pose supposedly as the new-found defenders of the 1925 Geneva Protocol.

From our own national experience we have seen that the issue is not one of ascertaining whether or not chemical weapons have been used but rather what the international community can and ought to do in the event of their use and how such use can be effectively prohibited in the future.

Ethiopia's keen interest and concern for the promotion of full compliance with the 1925 Protocol cannot be questioned. But unfortunately the undisguised political motivation, the polemics and absurd unfounded allegations, all under the pretext of and relating to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79, in our view do not lend themselves to that purpose. On the contrary, they might result in the erosion of the moral and legal edifice of the 1925 Protocol. My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 as it voted against draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.54 adopted by this Committee a few days ago.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79, entitled, "Chemical and Bacteriological (Biological) Weapons", as orally amended. A separate vote has been requested on the second preambular paragraph of the resolution. I, therefore, put the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 to the vote.

The second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 was adopted by 55 votes to 21, with 33 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now put draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 as a whole, as orally amended, to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Qatar, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Democratic Kampuchea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mauritius, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Afghanistan, Angola, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Viet Nam

Abstaining: Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cyprus, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Kuwait, Mali, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Sri Lanka, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 as a whole, as orally amended, was adopted by 63 votes to 20, with 31 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those representatives who wish to expalin their vote after the vote.

Mr. ABDELWAHAB (Sudan): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79, consistent with its unwavering position based on the inadmissibility of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons in any part of the world. We did so in the belief that impartial investigations should be carried out in any part of the world where there are reports concerning the use of chemical, asphyxiating, or poisonous weapons by any State whatsoever engaged in such prohibited activities.

This year, the Group of Experts established under resolution 35/144 C came up with a report in which it concluded that it could not state that the allegations of the use of chemical weapons had been proven. Nevertheless, it could not disregard the circumstantial evidence suggestive of the possible use of some sort of toxic chemical substance in some instances. My delegation is, of course, aware of the circumstances and constraints under which the Group of Experts worked while carrying out its mandate, which rendered the findings of the Group incomplete and inconclusive.

(Mr. Abdelvahab, Sudan)

Our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 should in no way be construed as a judgement on or an endorsement of the findings of the Group of Experts, or as a comment on the allegations in question. It is rather a consistent support for the call for strict observance by all States of the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and for the need for impartial investigations wherever there are reports pertaining to any use of chemical weapons in any part of the world whatever the Government or State engaged in that prohibited activity.

Mr. SAID (Tunisia)(interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79. In so doing, we acted in conformity with our constant policy of support for any measure capable of sparing the world and every region of the world the use of weapons of any kind. When the horrible effects of the deadly weapons recently employed in the world, particularly in the Middle East and in Lebanon, are realized, we can only endorse the idea underlying this draft resolution.

It is of course important to extend the ideas of the draft resolution to all regions of the world without any restriction. My delegation wishes to emphasize, however, that the language employed in the draft resolution we have just adopted does not seem entirely satisfactory to us. For example, my delegation cannot see any link between the second preambular paragraph and the second clause of operative paragraph 2. The inclusion of that preambular paragraph in the draft seems lacking in conviction. The oral amendment to operative paragraph 2 submitted by New Zealand made the text slightly less vague, and without convincing us completely, it allowed us to overcome our earlier doubts.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): As representatives know, the United States supported the draft resolution we have just adopted. It is a careful and sober commentary on the matter of chemical weapons use, and accordingly we deeply appreciate the efforts of the sponsors.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

At the same time, we would like to note certain points that should be borne in mind with regard to the United Nations report and the issue of chemical-weapons use in general. First, it would seem to us only logical to take note of the fact that reports of the use of chemical weapons are, of course, continuing. Secondly, we believe that the 1972 Convention on biological and toxic weapons is of direct relevance to the issue. That Convention prohibits the production, stockpiling and transfer of the kind of weapons which are being used, and we think it important to record once again the need for strict observance of its provisions. Finally, we believe it is highly significant to the work of the United Nations experts to note that they were not permitted to enter those areas where chemical-weapon attacks are taking place.

All three of these points were made in my statement this morning, as representatives will remember, but all three need to be borne in mind continuously.

Miss MEREGA (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Argentina abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79, just as we did on General Assembly resolutions 35/144 C and 36/99 C on the same subject. We did so because it sets up a sort of verification machinery under the General Assembly and therefore alien to the framework of a convention duly negotiated between Member States, a solution which, as I stated when speaking on this subject earlier in this current session, my delegation advocates.

Mr. AYENWAH (Nigeria): My delegation was able to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.79 that the Committee has just adopted. It did so on the basis of its principled belief in the continuing validity of the need for all States to observe the principles and objectives of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 on chemical and bacteriological methods of warfare. It believes that when allegations of violations of the provisions of the Protocol are made

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

and when those allegations are of a serious nature, it is right that, without any political bickerings, polemics or propaganda whatsoever, and on the grounds of their humanitarian import, the facts of the matter be established once and for all in order that the matter can be put to rest.

My delegation, however, reserves its position on the second preambular paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN: Certain delegations have, however, asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I would remind members that, in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly decision 34/401, statements in exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes.

I now call upon those delegations that have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

Mr. OCAK (Turkey): In relation to the observation made today by the representative of the Soviet Union on the method of preparation of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.79, which this Committee has just adopted, I would like to state very clearly that the text of the draft resolution was prepared exclusively by its sponsors, and that my delegation, as one of them, participated in that preparatory work with no concerns other than its own will and judgement.

Mr. YANG Hushan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): This morning the representative of Viet Nam attacked China in his statement by insinuating that his country's "northern neighbour" had used chemical weapons, including toxic agents, against Viet Nam.

(Mr. Yang Hushan, China)

The Chinese delegation wishes solemnly to point out that these attacks are sheer rumour-mongering and slander. The representative of Viet Nam has an ulterior motive in doing this; he is trying to divert people's attention. As is well known to all, Viet Nam has carried out armed aggression against and occupation of Kampuchea. It has employed all kinds of weapons, including chemical weapons, murdering and trampling the Kampuchean people underfoot. These criminal facts cannot be covered up through any manoeuvre.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): My delegation wishes categorically to reject the absurd allegation made by one speaker that an anti-malaria research centre in Pakistan was used as an undercover laboratory for the manufacture of biological weapons which were passed on to so-called bandits for use in Afghanistan. This is a wholly fabricated and slanderous allegation.

All anti-malaria research centres throughout Pakistan are part of an international network established in our area years ago to eradicate this disease. In this regard may I say that many of the countries of the area are co-operating with each other.

The farcical nature of the second allegation, to the effect that so-called bandits are operating from Pakistan, cannot conceal the reality of the situation in Afghanistan, which is that of national resistance against foreign intervention in that country.

An objective view of the situation can be seen in the verdict of the international community, which is embodied in the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

The Group of Experts to investigate reports on the alleged use of chemical and biological weapons was established by United Nations General Assembly resolution 35/144 C. In pursuance of that resolution the Government of Pakistan was approached by the United Nations to facilitate the visit of the Group to our country for the said investigation. The Government of Pakistan agreed to receive the Group and to facilitate the visit of the Group to wherever they wished to go. Their programme was formulated by the concerned agency in our country, strictly in accordance with the requirements indicated by the Group itself. Our co-operation with

(Mr. Khan, Pakistan)

the Group was, therefore, an obligatory response to a request from the United Nations and also arose from our deep concern and revulsion at any use of chemical or biological weapons, the latter of which have been prohibited under international law, specifically the Geneva Protocol of 1925.

For the same reasons we consider the work of the Group to be important, and we view its report with seriousness.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): I should simply like to put the record straight and to read once again a part of the statement I made earlier in this Committee:

"It was only recently that an American institute of malaria research in Pakistan was exposed as an undercover centre for the manufacture of biological and bacteriological arms."

That was all I stated. It was not an allegation levelled by the Afghan Government, it was reported by the press, and it was reported by the people who used to work in that institute. The Government of Pakistan admitted certain abuses of that institute. I do not see how the representative of Pakistan can want to disregard the previous statements of his own Government.

Secondly, I have been looking through the statement in which I supposedly mentioned the facts regarding the operation of bandits from the territory of Pakistan, but I have not found in my statement any reference to such facts. That is a matter we have put before the international community in other forums on other occasions. In this particular statement, though, there was no reference to such facts.

Mr. PHAM NGAC (Viet Nam): What my delegation said this morning about the use of chemical weapons in the wars of aggression in Viet Nam was the truth. However, the Chinese representative attempted to react to the statement of my delegation.

The truth is that during the war of aggression against Viet Nam in February 1979 the Chinese mobilized 600,000 troops and used every kind of weapon against us including the poisoning of water and the use of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Pham Ngac, Viet Nam)

To be brief I should like to quote a Chinese saying: "The criminal spits blood at his victims". I think that that most appropriately applies to the representative of China.

Mr. KHAN (Pakistan): In the context of my earlier right of reply it has been said that the Pakistan Government had admitted that there was some misuse or abuse of the anti-malaria research centre in Lahore. I wish to take this opportunity to set the record straight.

At one time, after the contract of one foreign expert had expired and he was replaced by a Pakistani expert of the same seniority, this fact was misrepresented in the press. But the Pakistan Government made it very clear that there was no abuse of the research centre and that it was for certain administrative reasons, namely that the contract had expired and that we had our own people of sufficient seniority and expertise, that we replaced the foreign expert who was working in that particular centre.

I wanted to bring these facts to the Committee in order to set the record straight so that there would be no misrepresentations.

Mr. YANG Hushan (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I should like to say a few more words. For the second time today we have heard the representative of Viet Nam slandering China. I do not wish to waste the Committee's time, but I would like to advise that representative to make his point in deeds rather than words and to correct his crimes of aggression. That is, he should implement the resolutions adopted by a number of General Assembly sessions calling for the immediate withdrawal from Kampuchea of his occupation troops and forces of aggression.

Mr. ZARIF (Afghanistan): I regret that I have had to ask to speak again in explanation of one point. As I stated before, these charges about the abuse of the malaria research institute in Pakistan are not of our making. They were brought to the attention of world public opinion through publications which quoted certain Pakistani experts who used to work in that institute and which said that the then chief of that institute, an American, had been charged with developing certain substances whose production did not lay within the scope of the work of that institute. My Government has nothing to hide in this matter in the light of what has already been stated by the responsible authorities of Pakistan.

Mr. PHAM NGAC (Viet Nam): I am sorry to have had to ask to speak again. I wish also to advise the Chinese representative that the best way to conduct talks with Viet Nam is to resume the talks which were broken off some years ago. That is the best forum for talks between the two countries. I advise him to do this rather than waste the time of the Committee and the Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 54. It will now consider the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.73/Rev.2.

Mr. KAHN (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic would like to make a statement on the draft resolutions submitted in connection with agenda items 58 and 137, particularly with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.77 entitled 'Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States', and A/C.1/37/L.73/Rev.2 entitled 'Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security'.

Our delegation is in favour of these draft resolutions, above all for the following reasons. First, the content of the draft resolutions is directed at the strengthening of international security, and the continuation of the process of détente and peaceful coexistence between States of different social systems. They are therefore suitable to counter the policy of confrontation and super-armament as pursued by the most extreme imperialist forces. Secondly, the draft resolutions serve the purpose of promoting effective measures concerning arms limitation and disarmament as well as such measures for the improvement of the political and legal relations between States as a uniform process. Thirdly, the drafts I have mentioned underline the role of the United Nations under its Charter in the strengthening of peace. This is fully in accordance with the views held by the German Democratic Republic.

The draft resolutions constitute a contribution to the strengthening of the foundations for the peaceful settlement of conflicts between States where their continuation would not only cause great suffering to the peoples involved, but also involve a direct danger to world peace. The draft resolutions therefore also contribute to the observance of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the United Nations Charter. It is a matter of particular urgency to seek a solution to the Middle East conflict on the basis of the United Nations Charter, the six-point plan of the USSR and the Pez plan. Israel's aggressive policy is opposed to that.

(Mr. Kahn, German Democratic Republic)

It is a long-standing practice of the representative of Israel to the United Nations to divert attention from its policy and the fact that Israel stands condemned by the whole world, including the United Nations, and to attack Member States. That also happened on 7 December 1982 with regard to the German Democratic Republic. We completely reject this slander and would like to state merely that the socialist German State, the German Democratic Republic, is anti-Fascist in its nature and has been since its foundation. Lessons have consistently been drawn from German history, and imperialism, chauvinism and racism have been totally eradicated. In the German Democratic Republic, friendship among peoples and peace have been enshrined in the Constitution and are State policy. If such lessons had been drawn everywhere from history, there would be no war, no hatred between peoples, and no genocide. The German Democratic Republic firmly stands at the side of all those who condemn fascism and aggression and who work for the safeguarding of the rights of all peoples.

Mr. KOROMÁ (Sierra Leone): With the permission of the Committee I should like to restructure the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/37/L.73/Rev.2. First of all, with the Committee's indulgence, we would place the eleventh preambular paragraph, which begins: "Recognizing that fundamental approaches ..." immediately after the sixth preambular paragraph, which starts with the words "Further concerned ...".

Secondly, again with the permission of the Committee, we would delete in preambular paragraph 12 the words "comprehensive" and also "on all aspects". That preambular paragraph will now read: "Convinced that a study of collective security is timely and necessary".

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

I should like to give an assurance here that the changes do not affect the substance of the draft resolution itself. They are intended merely to improve the symmetry and to provide a better flow. Therefore I hope that the Committee will be prepared to accept those oral amendments at this late stage.

I should like also to explain that the word "report" in the last line of operative paragraph 1 has the same meaning as "inform"; that is to say, "report to the General Assembly" has the same meaning as "inform the General Assembly".

Having said that, I wish to state that this draft resolution represents a continuum in our collective drive to maintain a just and peaceful world. Today we live in a beleaguered world beset with tension, strife and conflict. Many of the reasons for this state of affairs, in the view of my delegation, may be found in the massive betrayal of faith and departure from the United Nations Charter and its principles. Today, more than ever before, the United Nations stands in desperate need of fidelity and observance of its principles.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.73/Rev.2 is, accordingly, based on the Charter of this Organization and represents a reaffirmation of its purposes and principles. Foremost among these is the maintenance of international peace and security, along with the requirement to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace. Reference is also made to the proscription of force in international relations and concern is expressed over the growing tendency of States to resort to the use of force to resolve international disputes in violation of the Charter. Central to this whole exercise is the call for the Security Council to resume and indeed ensure its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security through collective action and by the implementation of its decisions.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

Sierra Leone's commitment to the Charter of this Organization is deep-rooted and long-established, and for this reason we refuse to buy protection from others in safeguarding our independence. Instead we have invested our security in this Organization. It is our fundamental belief that genuine security will come about only if we all severally and collectively strive to rediscover the sources of the inspiration that gave birth to this Organization some 37 years ago and if we remain faithful to its principles.

It is against that background that we express the hope that this draft resolution, as just amended, which addresses the fundamental tenets of the Charter in calling on the Organization to implement the collective security provisions contained therein, a draft resolution which is intended to buttress this Organization, will win universal approbation in this Committee.

As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, I should have been elsewhere by now but I decided to stay here in order to see this draft resolution through, because of our belief that not even the seas will remain peaceful and secure for long in a world that is beleaguered and beset with an unprecedented arms race, tension, strife and conflict. Therefore, since I shall be away when this Committee completes its work, permit me to express my gratitude and appreciation to you, on behalf of my delegation, for the outstanding and skilful manner in which you have administered the affairs of this Committee and the invaluable contribution you have made to the cause of disarmament, peace and international security. Your personal qualities and efficiency have made an indelible impression on all of us here and will linger with us for a long time. I should like also, through you, Sir, to express my delegation's gratitude and appreciation to the other officers of the Committee for their assistance and to the Secretary of the Committee and all the members of the Secretariat, from whom we have derived a great deal of support and understanding. My special thanks go also to those who are heard but invisible and who on the occasions when I have had the privilege of addressing this Committee have had to operate without written texts. I thank them most sincerely for their patience and understanding.

(Mr. Koroma, Sierra Leone)

Finally, I should like to make an appeal again that this endeavour, which is universal in its objective, will win the consensus of this Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.73/Rev.2, as orally amended. This draft resolution comes under agenda item 137 entitled "Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security". I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to read out the list of the sponsors.

Mr. RATHORE (Secretary of the Committee): The sponsors are as follows: Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Benin, Cape Verde, Colombia, Congo, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Gambia, Ghana, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Qatar, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of this draft resolution have 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.1/37/L.73/Rev.2, as orally amended, without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/37/L.73/Rev.2, as orally amended, was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. de La GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation associated itself with the consensus that has just been registered on resolution A/C.1/37/L.73/Rev.2. However, my delegation wishes to make a number of comments. The first is an observation on form that affects only the French version of operative paragraph 1. The English word "Requests" is translated by "Demande". This term is out of place in the General Assembly's relations with the Security Council. The word "Prie" should be used instead.

The second remark of the French delegation relates to the word "study" which appears in the same operative paragraph. The Security Council is asked to study the question of implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter. It seems to me to be a rather unusual term where the Security Council is concerned. After all, the Security Council does not carry out studies. That is not part of its mandate. We would have preferred the word "study" to be replaced by "consider".

Still on paragraph 1, we feel that the expression, "... to report to the General Assembly ..." is not, in our view, fitting language given the respective status of the Security Council and the General Assembly. A request to the Security Council to inform the General Assembly of the conclusions of its consideration in its annual report would have been preferable.

Lastly, with respect to operative paragraph 2, we wonder whether it is necessary or useful to include a special item on the provisional agenda of the thirty-eighth session on the "Implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security." In fact, we note that the Assembly normally is called upon to consider the implementation of the provisions of the Charter when it deals with the various items on the agenda relating precisely to the maintenance of international peace and security.

Mr. FIELDS (United States of America): My delegation decided not to object to the adoption of this text since we do not interpret it as requiring any special report from the Security Council, but rather as an expression of the desire to have the membership as a whole kept informed of any conclusions the members of the Security Council might reach. We recognize, as does the Annual Report of the Secretary-General, that the system has not functioned as well as we, and many others, would have liked. We believe the suggestions contained in the Annual Report of the Secretary-General are more realistic, practical and likely to improve the situation than the ideas put forward in the context of the item before us.

If these or other related ideas are to be considered by the Assembly it should be in the context of the "Report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization". The proliferation of agenda items does not strengthen collective security; it only clogs the agenda.

We also note with regret that the preamble of this resolution ranges beyond the immediate question of collective security. We believe, for example, the mention of the new international economic order is inappropriate in this context.

For all these reasons we would not have been able to vote in favour of this text had it been put to a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has thus concluded consideration of item 137 of the agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.