



VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 43RD MEETING

Chairman: Mr. NAIK (Pakistan)

CONTENTS

DISARMAMENT ITEMS

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 34 TO 37, 41, 44, 47 AND 48 (continued)

Draft resolutions were introduced by

Mr. Martin (Canada) - A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1  
Mr. Garcia Robles (Mexico) - A/C.1/35/L.20

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month 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.1/35/PV.43  
25 November 1980

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 31, 32, 34 TO 37, 41, 44, 47 AND 48 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of New Zealand to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1.

Mr. MARTIN (New Zealand): I wish, on behalf of the delegations of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Norway, Turkey, Spain and New Zealand, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1, which proposes investigation into reports of alleged use of chemical weapons.

The use of chemical and biological weapons has always been viewed with abhorrence, and the world has justly condemned their use in war. It was that hostility to the use of chemical weapons, and the general acceptance that those weapons were an unconventional and unacceptable means of waging war, that was given formal expression in the 1925 Protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare.

Abhorrence of the use of chemical weapons brought the Protocol into existence as a signpost no authority could overlook. The Protocol is not, however, supported by any formal system of control, and makes no provision for investigation of allegations of use. In those circumstances, whenever serious allegations of the use of chemical weapons are made, or it is widely believed that the Protocol has been, or may have been, flouted, the international community has a clear duty to mobilize the moral and political authority of the United Nations to heighten respect for the rules. It has in our view no less a duty to ensure that all reasonable steps are taken to look into all reports of alleged use to determine whether or not they can be verified.

(Mr. Martin, New Zealand)

The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's study on chemical and biological warfare observes that since 1925 there have been only a few unambiguous and relatively well documented cases of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, but a much larger number of allegations where evidence about the truth of the alleged events was either non-existent or was inconclusive. In a few cases, investigations took place, sometimes under auspices of debatable impartiality. What those investigations highlighted, no less than the allegations, is that there was and continues to be a real need for machinery to investigate allegations of use.

Perhaps what is really called for is permanent machinery for this purpose. This would demonstrate the determination of the international community to uphold the authority of the Protocol. It would also, we are confident, act as a deterrent to the use of prohibited chemical weapons. At the same time, it would constrain those who might otherwise be tempted to make false complaints of use and it would provide a means by which States that may be falsely or recklessly accused could have that fact established by an international body. We think it would be appropriate for further consideration to be given to the question of such machinery during the next session of the General Assembly.

We have noted the suggestion that the question of machinery could perhaps be taken up in the Committee on Disarmament. Our own view is that, as the Committee on Disarmament has a limited membership and because all States Parties to the 1925 Protocol should have an opportunity to participate fully in the consideration of this matter - and would doubtless expect as much - it would be more appropriate for the subject to be taken up by the General Assembly.

But in the meantime, in the absence of permanent machinery we can at least look to the results of earlier consideration of the requirements for fact-finding machinery. In the course of those earlier discussions three criteria were proposed - that investigation should be speedy, that it should be impartial and that it should be carried out by a respected body. That is the approach reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1. There having been reports of the alleged use of chemical weapons, we believe that the international community has an obligation to try to ascertain the facts. We may not now be able to fulfil the criterion of speed. But we can at least satisfy the other requirements. Accordingly, the draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to carry out an impartial investigation with the help of qualified medical and technical experts.

(Mr. Martin, New Zealand)

For the purposes of this enquiry we consider that a balanced panel of up to five experts should be appointed, to be drawn preferably from neutral or non-aligned countries. Their task, as the draft resolution states, would be (a) to seek relevant information from all concerned Governments, international organizations and other sources necessary and (b) to collect and examine evidence, including on-site, to the extent relevant to the purposes of the investigation. It is thus left to the discretion of the experts to decide, after examining the information provided by Governments, international organizations and other sources, whether there would be any point in taking their investigations further.

I wish to refer to a suggestion that has been made to the sponsors. This was that, as a demonstration of impartiality and as confirmation that we are not pursuing the subject of this draft resolution for political reasons or solely in order to embarrass any of the States which are alleged to have used chemical weapons, one change should be made the fifth preambular paragraph, that is, that the word "recent" as a description of the reports of alleged use should be omitted. We considered this suggestion carefully. However, it seemed to us that there had to be some restriction on the scope of the investigation, which otherwise might seem to apply to all reports of alleged use since 1925. That, of course, was not what the delegations which suggested the change were looking for. They felt that it might be best if the wording would permit investigation of the use of chemical weapons in Viet Nam. We had no strong views on that subject and did not in any case consider that the wording necessarily excluded such investigation. It is, however, our view that there would be little advantage in such an enquiry. The reason for that is, of course, that the use of chemicals in that country is extensively documented. There would be little point in asking the Secretary-General to carry out an investigation in order to re-establish facts which are well known, which are not denied and which have been the subject of Government reports, all of which are readily available.

In conclusion, I should like to commend this draft resolution to the Committee. Its objective is to uphold the continued authority of the 1925 Protocol. We believe that this Organization has a duty and an obligation to see that this is done.

Mr. VO ANH TUAN (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French): In connexion with item 34 of the agenda entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons", our Committee has before it three draft resolutions contained in the following documents: A/C.1/35/L.35, A/C.1/35/L.38 and A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1.

The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, which has for decades been the victim of all kinds of sophisticated weapons used by aggressors, attaches great importance to the question of the prohibition of the use, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons. That is why it acceded to the 1925 Geneva Protocol and to the 1972 Convention on bacteriological (biological) weapons. It intends to respect them scrupulously and requests that other States Parties to the Protocol and to the Convention do likewise. We hope that bilateral and multilateral negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons will as early as possible lead to the conclusion of an international convention on the matter.

The two draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/35/L.35 and A/C.1/35/L.38 which have been submitted to the Committee for its consideration by delegations of the non-aligned, socialist, Western and other countries, reflect the concern of the international community and are such as to contribute to the implementation of the relevant paragraphs of the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, devoted to disarmament. My delegation is happy to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.38 and is ready to support draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.35.

With respect to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1, after listening very carefully to its introduction by the representative of New Zealand, my delegation cannot but state outright that the draft resolution in question is negative in character, and wonders what are the intentions of its authors, especially those working behind the scenes. The United States of America does not appear among the sponsors. However, it is an open secret that the United States itself is the initiator of the draft resolution in question.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

They drew up an initial draft resolution, changed it several times so as better to conceal their true designs and lastly submitted it officially in its present formulation under cover of a group of States members of NATO and other Western countries. Although reformulated several times, the essential purpose of the draft resolution remains unchanged: to use the idea of respect for the 1925 Geneva Protocol and request the United Nations to carry out an inquiry into rumours relating to the alleged use of chemical weapons in certain regions of the world in order to slander the socialist countries and seek to divert the attention of public opinion from the consequences of the American chemical war in Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea.

How ironical it is to see those who trampled underfoot the 1925 Geneva Protocol concerning the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and of bacteriological methods of warfare, who waged the greatest chemical war in the history of mankind against the people of Viet Nam as well as those of Laos and Kampuchea, now transformed in one stroke into the zealous champions of the Protocol, requiring the United Nations to carry out an impartial inquiry into rumours concerning an alleged violation of that Protocol.

Where do those allegations come from? They come above all from "reports of the secret army of the CIA", as The Washington Post wrote in its issue of 18 October last; they are fables invented by the radio broadcasting service of the so-called Democratic Kampuchea established somewhere in southern China; they are, finally, dispatches from some neighbouring countries of Afghanistan on the orders of certain Western press agencies.

The Governments of the countries concerned have repeatedly made official statements categorically rejecting those slanderous allegations, which are without foundation. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has expressed its desire to participate in the work of the Committee on Disarmament on chemical

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

weapons in order to shed the necessary light on the rumours relating to the alleged use of those weapons and to make its modest contribution to the Committee on the basis of its experience. It is to be deplored that Sino-American collusion has not permitted the Committee on Disarmament to hear the views of Viet Nam on this subject during its 1980 session.

For its part, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) issued a communiqué which was distributed in the United Nations in document A/35/226, the text of which reads as follows:

"Alleged use of poison gas in Kampuchea: test results

In mid-March 1980, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) received from its delegation in Bangkok some specimens taken, at the Khmer-Thai frontier, from patients suspected of having been the victims of poison gas.

This material was sent by the International Committee of the Red Cross to a laboratory for analysis. The results of the tests made on the specimens which had been forwarded to the International Committee of the Red Cross show that poison gas was not involved."

There we have the conclusion reached by an international humanitarian organization whose credibility is widely acknowledged.

We therefore have the right to wonder why the American Government is especially interested at present in the question of chemical weapons.

It will be remembered that the United States has raised that problem at the 1980 session of the Committee on Disarmament, at the 67th Inter-Parliamentary Conference, held in Berlin last September, and now at the current session of the General Assembly, to say nothing of the publication by the United States State Department of a voluminous report on "The Use of Chemical Weapons in Afghanistan, Laos and Kampuchea". That American initiative has always been supported by the great nation hegemonists and certain Western countries. Despite all the camouflage, the sinister designs of the United States and its friends have become obvious.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

The first is to sabotage the future work of the Committee on Disarmament, and in particular the negotiations that are under way concerning the preparation of a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, manufacture and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction, in order to find some pretext on which to justify the development and production of a new generation of chemical weapons called binary weapons "as recognized by Secretary of Defence Harold Brown before the United States Congress", according to the Christian Science Monitor of 25 April 1980. An Agence France Presse (AFP) dispatch of 20 November confirmed that the American Congress recently took a decision:

"to grant a credit of \$3.5 million to begin construction of installations to produce new chemical weapons using a binary component (that is, two chemical agents harmless in themselves but which, mixed together, become dangerous)".

The second is to orchestrate a new propaganda campaign against the socialist countries - in particular, a campaign of slander and denigration of the Soviet Union and the peoples of Viet Nam, Laos, Kampuchea and Afghanistan, whose only crime is to have put a stop to wars of aggression and the subversive activities of the imperialists and hegemonists as well as international reactionaries, to have become masters of their own destiny, mobilizing all their efforts towards the rebuilding of their respective countries, which were devastated by so many years of wars of aggression, including the chemical war waged by the United States.

The third is to create an uproar about an imaginary use of chemical weapons in an attempt to confuse public opinion, to evade their responsibility for a real large-scale chemical war carried out in a systematic fashion over a period of many years by the United States against the peoples of the countries of Indo-China, the immediate and long-term consequences of which are extremely serious for human life and the environment in those three countries and also for the American and allied military personnel who participated in the "second Indo-Chinese war". That uproar is also designed to conceal the crimes committed by 600,000 Chinese troops against the Vietnamese people, including the use of toxic gas and the poisoning of sources of drinking water in the areas through which they passed.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

Research studies carried out by Vietnamese and foreign scientists have made it possible to make a preliminary assessment of the enormous human loss and material damage caused by 15 million tonnes of bombs and over 100,000 tonnes of toxic chemical products in Viet Nam. In this connexion, my delegation wishes to draw the attention of the Committee to the memorandum of 21 January 1980 of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam concerning the criminal use by the United States of chemical weapons in Viet Nam, Laos and Kampuchea distributed in the United Nations under the symbol A/35/71.

In his report on "The State of the Environment 1980", which was made public on 5 June of this year on the occasion of World Environment Day, the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme wrote as follows on the effects of American toxic chemical products in Viet Nam:

"Chemical herbicide use in southern Viet Nam completely destroyed 1500 km<sup>2</sup> of mangroves and damaged another 150,000 km<sup>2</sup>, and it has been noted with concern that the natural regeneration of those areas has been very slow. Over 100 kilos of dioxin, a substance to which cases of congenital malformation have since been attributed, as well as premature births and cancer of the liver, were spread by mistake in the form of impurities contained in a defoliant. Millions of people were driven from their homes and their land in South-East Asia, and their displacement has also caused a deterioration of the environment .. It is probable that it will take dozens of years for those regions to recover from the repercussions."

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

For its part, the Swiss newspaper La Tribune De Dimanche published in its 4 May 1980 issue an article on the long-term effects of a toxic chemical product known as "agent orange" on the second generation of Vietnamese living in the affected zones which runs as follows:

"At the beginning of this year an Australian television team went to Ho Chi Minh City where 300 orphans, victims of agent orange, live under medical control. It turns out that Vietnamese mothers whose husbands were fighting in the rice-fields in the south or in the mangrove forests have brought into the world abnormal children. Some lack arms. Others cannot speak or hear".

The spread of United States toxic chemical products in Viet Nam not only has brought about sorrow, suffering and devastation among the Vietnamese people, but has also caused harmful effects to American military forces and their allies. Public opinion in many countries, especially in the United States of America and Australia, is becoming more and more concerned with this question and is speaking out to demand an inquiry into these effects.

Lieutenant Michael Uhl, a veteran of the Viet Nam war, who was fighting in the 11th infantry brigade, and Tod Ensign, a lawyer specializing in military law, have just published a book entitled: "G.I. Guinea Pigs - How the Pentagon Exposed Our Troops to Dangers More Deadly Than War: Agent Orange and Atomic Radiation". It is stated in that book as follows:  
(spoke in English)

"U.S. servicemen who survived the terrors of war have come home only to die of radiation and chemically induced diseases. Their children have inherited crushing deformities. Our veterans now fight on the battlefield of red tape, urgently seeking benefits for their families and financial aid to pay for astronomical medical bills. Theirs is a shocking and shameful story, revealed here for the first time in all its horrifying dimensions."

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

(continued in French)

I believe that these few quotations are more than sufficient to give us a sickening idea of the consequences of the American chemical warfare in Viet Nam.

This is an action that is repugnant to the human conscience and runs counter to the established principles of international law to which the international community must pay particular attention lest those responsible for the crime infer that they could continue with impunity to carry out such misdeeds.

It is deeply to be deplored that draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1, when referring to respect for the 1925 Geneva Protocol, says nothing about this unique case of deliberate and systematic violation of that Protocol and about the use of toxic chemical products as a means of waging a war of extermination against Viet Nam and other countries in Indo-China. If the authors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1 truly wish to have the principles and purposes of the 1925 Geneva Protocol respected, they should propose in the United Nations specific measures capable of sparing present and future generations from wars of extermination by means of chemical and other sophisticated weapons such as those used in the recent American war in Viet Nam. In the view of my delegation, such a draft resolution should mention, inter alia: first, unequivocal condemnation of those who have deliberately violated the 1925 Geneva Protocol and used chemical weapons as a means of waging a war of extermination against the countries of Indo-China; secondly, the immediate and long-term consequences of the use of chemical weapons and toxic chemical products against human beings and against the environment of the victim countries as well as against the military personnel of the belligerents; thirdly, the responsibility of the State which has used such weapons and chemical products to contribute to healing the wounds caused by the chemical warfare to human beings and to the environment of the country or countries that were the victims.

(Mr. Vo Anh Tuan, Viet Nam)

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1 does not meet any of these criteria. Instead of dealing with the question that is at the heart of the concern of world public opinion, namely, the extremely dangerous consequences of American chemical warfare for the three countries of Indo-China as well as for the American and allied military forces, the authors of the draft resolution are asking the United Nations to carry out an inquiry on the basis of tendentious information, which would create an extremely dangerous precedent of interference in the internal affairs of other States. They are also asking the United Nations to amend the 1925 Geneva Protocol, which is abnormal from the legal point of view. It follows that the authors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1 and those who are backing them are pursuing a clear objective: that of making propaganda against the socialist countries, including Viet Nam, and this within the framework of a hysterical campaign in favour returning to the cold war, speeding up the arms race and sabotaging détente and international peace and security. Such a draft resolution is totally unacceptable to my delegation. My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1.

Lastly, I should like to bring to the attention of the Committee that this morning, on behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Bulgaria, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the delegation of my own country, Viet Nam, we submitted to the Secretariat a series of proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Sweden to introduce the amendments contained in document A/C.1/35/L.47.

Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden): The delegations of India, Nigeria, Yugoslavia and Sweden have submitted amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.23/Rev.1, on the question of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The amendments are contained in document A/C.1/35/L.47.

On behalf of the abovementioned delegations I should like to introduce the proposed amendments.

I believe that they are generally self-explanatory and I shall therefore restrict my remarks to the significance of a few of the changes we should like to see in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.23/Rev.1.

First, as regards operative paragraph 5, the amendment proposed is with a view to fully reflecting the widespread support in the United Nations for the early initiation of multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty in the Committee on Disarmament. It is essential to provide an appropriate framework for such negotiations and it is therefore suggested that the Committee on Disarmament should take the necessary steps, including the establishment of a working group, to initiate substantive negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty at the beginning of the 1981 session of the Committee on Disarmament.

With respect to operative paragraph 6, the sponsors of the amendments are of the view that the negotiations in the Committee on Disarmament should cover all aspects of the comprehensive test-ban treaty. Even if we consider it important to deal with the institutional and administrative steps necessary for establishing, testing and operating an international seismic monitoring network and an effective verification system, we doubt that it would be in the interests of effective multilateral negotiations to single out one element and to deal with it separately from the comprehensive test-ban process as a whole. For that reason an addition to operative paragraph 6 is suggested, to the effect that the efforts in the Committee on Disarmament, with respect to the said institutional and administrative steps, should be determined "in the context of its negotiations on such a treaty".

Finally, the sponsors of the amendments are of the view that it is of paramount importance that a draft of a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be submitted to the General Assembly before its second special session devoted to disarmament. We have therefore suggested a new operative paragraph 8, which calls upon the Committee on Disarmament to exert all efforts in order that a draft comprehensive test-ban treaty be ready in time, before the second special session devoted to disarmament. If there is general agreement, and if it would facilitate the procedure, we would suggest that these amendments should be dealt with as a whole in the decision process.

Mr. SOURINHO (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (interpretation from French): I should like to make some comments on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1 on chemical and bacteriological weapons, sponsored by a certain number of countries, most of whom belong to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) military alliance. The purpose of this draft resolution appears to be, in accordance with the global strategy of that organization, to sow doubt and suspicion and hence to exacerbate tension in international relations through all possible means; that military bloc poses as a great champion of international conventions, whereas history has taught us during the last three decades that it is precisely that bloc that so systematically and consistently has trampled underfoot all international morality and conventions, including the Geneva Protocol of 17 June 1925 on the use in time of war of asphyxiating, toxic or other gases.

In the course of the many wars of aggression perpetrated against the peoples of the developing countries, that are weak and poor, certain imperialist Powers, headed by the United States, did not stop at anything in order to bring those people to their knees and to submit to their domination and diktat. They did so by having recourse to the most cruel and inhuman means such as the use of chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Imperialist barbarism reached its climax during what was known as the second Indo-China war, waged by the United States against the three peoples of Indo-China for nearly 15 years.

(Mr. Sourinho, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

During that long war, which left indelible traces on our civilian population and our environment, as is borne out by the studies of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) contained in a book entitled "The ecological consequences of the second Indo-China war", published in 1976, the United States, which instigated the draft resolution now before our Committee and so enthusiastically introduced by the delegation of New Zealand, a country that also participated in the American war effort against the three peoples and countries of Indo-China, had, according to the SIPRI studies, made considerable use of chemical weapons against the environment and the civilian population of Laos, Viet Nam and Kampuchea.

The chemical agents used to destroy nature were known as agent Orange, agent White and agent Blue. Those agents that have quite similar physical properties differ in terms of their composition and their devastating effects on the environment. Through their combined effects they caused terrible destruction to plant and animal life in our three countries and indescribable suffering to our civilian population. Apart from those agents the American army also experimented with a number of herbicidal formulae which, from their colour, are called agent Orange II, agent Scarlet, agent Green and agent Purple. Those agents have devastating effects on food crops, including rice which is the staple food of the Indo-Chinese peoples.

The chemical agents used against human beings are agents CS, CS I and CS II. Those agents cause intense weeping, sneezing and respiratory problems. Agent CS I renders affected places uninhabitable for 15 days, while agent CS II has the same effect but for between 30 and 45 days. In addition to those agents the United States also used agents called silver iodide and lead iodide in order to manipulate the atmosphere so as to prolong the rainy season and cause flooding in certain regions of the country and thus facilitate their military actions or thwart the enemy's.

The SIPRI studies have stressed that the misuse of all those chemical agents by the United States gave rise to incalculable and lasting destruction to our ecosystem which will perhaps take several generations to recover.

Taking into account what I have said, we were entitled to expect the First Committee to consider the conditions inflicted upon the three peoples of Indo-China rather than a very tendentious and polemical draft resolution like the one now before us.

(Mr. Sourinho, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

As far as we are concerned, this draft resolution not only is one of the most fantastic, because it is based upon alleged information whose accuracy, according to the sponsors themselves in the sixth preambular paragraph, is difficult to establish, but also is very dangerous, in a number of respects.

First, this draft resolution, based as it is on unreliable information, ill conceals the intention of its sponsors to intervene in the internal affairs of States, and for the time being we do not know exactly which are the countries referred to by the sponsors of the draft resolution. If they have been unable to name or identify the countries which are contravening the Geneva Protocol, with solid proof in support of the allegation, it would be entirely futile to spend any length of time on this draft resolution. Indeed it will be recalled that during the general debate in the First Committee Laos and certain other countries were the targets of cynical slanders by certain delegations, particularly that of the United States and its new friends from Peking, but their slanders were based exclusively on rumours or alleged information given by some Mong people who had found refuge in the refugee camps on the other side of the Mekong. However, these Mong people are merely wretched individuals formerly in the pay of the United States who, after the withdrawal of United States troops from Indo-China, continued still, with the aid and support of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Peking hegemonists, to struggle against our new régime. Thwarted in this aim, they escaped justice by crossing the Mekong and set themselves to creating fabrications in order to draw the attention of their former masters to their plight and to obtain from them special treatment. For example, the former Mong general, Vang Pao, an obsequious lackey of the Special United States Forces during the 1960s, received such treatment and continues to receive it in the State of Montana, where he now lives with his gang.

(Mr. Sourinho, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

What is regrettable is that the first person who hastened to be the spokesman for these detestable individuals was the Honourable Robert K. Dorman, a member of the United States Congress, who on 2 October last embarked in the United States Congress on an exercise which, to say the least, is rather extraordinary, when he compared the situation in my country to that prevailing in Hitler's Germany. The futile case he made could not possibly have taken in anyone, although it was presented by a distinguished representative of a great people. However, it is ironical that Mr. Dorman, who has never even set foot in our country but has only been in the refugee camps on the other side of the Mekong, claimed to have a better knowledge of what is happening in Laos than the personnel of the United States Embassy in Vientiane, which is the only Indo-Chinese capital that has continued to maintain diplomatic relations with Washington after the events of 1975, that is, after the resounding defeat suffered by the United States in Indo-China. Reading Congressman Dorman's report to Congress, we have the feeling that he was moved by feelings of revenge towards our country rather than humanitarian sentiments towards the Mong people, so assiduous was he in whipping up hostility in the United States Congress towards Laos, a small, weak and poor country.

Secondly, the draft resolution, in calling on the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in operative paragraph 5, to carry out an investigation into the policies of member States, degrades in an inadmissible way the role of the Secretary-General. It is quite clear that this kind of chore is incompatible with the lofty functions of the Secretary-General, which consist principally and above all of contributing to the maintenance of peace and the promotion of international co-operation in all fields. Furthermore, this role of investigator which the sponsors of the draft resolution wish to confer upon him will only serve to place him in an embarrassing situation and create further obstacles to the performance of his noble mission.

(Mr. Sourinho, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

Thirdly, the draft resolution seems to be aimed at sowing doubt and confusion and diverting international public opinion from the efforts made by the international community to continue seriously the negotiations on chemical weapons with a view to producing in the near future an international agreement binding on all Powers. This draft resolution in all probability is aimed, furthermore, at justifying the attempts by certain Powers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), particularly the United States, whose Congress has recently taken a decision to allocate \$3.5 million for equipment and facilities with the object of producing new generations of chemical weapons, which are known as "binary" weapons.

Fourthly, the best means of banning the use of chemical weapons and for that matter all destructive weapons, in our view, consists first and foremost of discontinuing the manufacture and improvement of such weapons and subsequently destroying all stockpiles of such weapons in the military arsenals of the various Powers. In this regard, one wonders who it is at the present time that is blocking the efforts being made to that end by the international community if it is not the NATO bloc itself. The collective hypocrisy of the countries making up that military alliance has just been exposed in the vote held last week in the Second Committee on a draft resolution submitted by a certain number of developing countries which had been victims of colonialist and imperialist wars of aggression: that is, the draft resolution relating to the material remnants of war. The abstentions of those countries with regard to that draft resolution, which was quite reasonable and timely, exposed the motives which had prompted those same countries to submit in the First Committee the extraordinary draft resolution on chemical weapons.

From the foregoing it is clear that for my delegation this draft resolution, both in spirit and in letter, is totally unacceptable, and I am sure the same can be said - at least we hope it can - for many other delegations. That is the reason why we call on all members of the First Committee to vote against this draft resolution, thus restoring dignity to the work of the Committee, which in the past has never had occasion to deal with such a high-handed draft resolution.

(Mr. Sourinho, Lao People's  
Democratic Republic)

With the idea of neutralizing the negative impact of this draft resolution on the work of the Committee, my delegation has associated itself with several other delegations in submitting amendments to the text - amendments to which the delegation of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has just referred. We ask delegations that are sincerely working for an improvement of the international climate and for genuine disarmament in regard to chemical and all other kinds of weapons of mass destruction to support those amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Mexico, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.20.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish):  
In resolution 34/73 of 11 December 1979, one of the two adopted last year in connexion with the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, the General Assembly stated unequivocally its "dissatisfaction" - that is the word that appears in the resolution - at the fact that no progress had been made with respect to consideration of the question of a test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

In the other resolution, adopted on the same date, resolution 34/83 B - which, although more general in nature, nevertheless included provisions which are very pertinent to the question of testing - the Assembly stressed that

"negotiations on specific disarmament issues conducted outside the Committee on Disarmament should not in any way constitute an impediment to the negotiations on such questions in the Committee"

and urged the Committee

"to proceed, without any further delay, to substantive negotiations on the priority questions of disarmament on its agenda".

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.20, originally sponsored by the delegations of Kenya, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Mexico, to which were subsequently added the delegations of Ecuador, Ireland, and Yemen, and which I now have the honour of introducing, reflects those statements made last year as well as the decisions of the Second Review Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty. At that Conference, as is well known, the non-nuclear-weapon States, in refusing to give their approval to a purely academic final declaration, emphasized that the patience shown during the 10 years that have elapsed since the entry into force of the Treaty would soon be exhausted and that the cessation of the nuclear arms race must be made effective at an early date, as expressly provided for in article VI of that instrument.

The first two preambular paragraphs of this draft resolution stress the sui generis nature of this subject since apart from recalling that the complete cessation of nuclear-weapon tests is a basic objective of the United Nations to the attainment of which it has repeatedly assigned the highest priority, it goes on to stress that since 1974 the General Assembly has stated its conviction that

"the continuance of nuclear-weapon testing will intensify the arms race, thus increasing the danger of nuclear war".

It adds - and this supports what I have called the sui generis nature of the question - that the Assembly has adopted more than 40 resolutions on this

subject and that in seven of those resolutions it condemns nuclear-weapon tests in the strongest terms. This may be seen from the following brief recapitulations: In its resolution 1762 A (XVII) of 6 November 1962 the Assembly "Condemns all nuclear weapon tests"; in resolution 2828 A (XXVI) of 16 December 1971 the Assembly "Reiterates solemnly and most emphatically its condemnation of all nuclear weapon tests"; in resolution 2934 C (XXVII) of 29 November 1972 it "Reiterates once again with the utmost vigour its condemnation of all nuclear weapon tests"; in resolution 3078 A (XXVIII) of 6 December 1973 it "Condemns once again with the utmost vigour all nuclear weapon tests"; and finally, in its resolutions 3257 (XXIX) of 9 December 1974, 3466 (XXX) of 11 December 1975 and 31/66 of 10 December 1976, the General Assembly, using the same words in all three resolutions, "Condemns all nuclear-weapon tests, in whatever environment they may be conducted".

The next four preambular paragraphs of the present draft resolution - the third to the sixth - are designed to stress, by quoting official statements by the General Assembly, the Secretary-General and the group of experts which at the Secretary-General's request carried out the recent study on this subject, that the problem can be solved now. The third preambular paragraph reiterates the assertion repeatedly made by the General Assembly that

"whatever may be the differences on the question of verification, there is no valid reason for delaying the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban".

The fourth preambular paragraph recalls that it has been declared by the Secretary-General since 1972 that

"all the technical and scientific aspects of the problem have been so fully explored that only a political decision is now necessary in order to achieve final agreement".

The preamble concludes in its seventh paragraph, the purpose of which is to recall that the three nuclear-weapon States which act as depositaries of the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water undertook in that Treaty almost 20 years ago to seek the achievement of "the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons" - an undertaking whose implementation we are still awaiting despite the fact that it was explicitly reiterated five years later in the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

EMS/9

A/C.1/35/PV.43

33-35

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

As for the six operative paragraphs of the draft resolution before the Committee, the sponsors do not pretend that any of those paragraphs taken in isolation will result in any innovations, even of a procedural nature.

(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

That would hardly be possible in connexion with a subject such as the one we are dealing with, all of whose elements have been so exhaustively explored in the past 25 years. What we do believe is that the provisions in operative paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of our draft resolution taken together provide us with a well-balanced realistic system whose implementation could culminate in the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests.

With a view to the achievement of that final objective, in those three of the operative paragraphs, we urge States to do what we ask in them, in keeping with the responsibilities of those to whom they are directed. All States that have not yet done so are urged to adhere without further delay to the Treaty Banning Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water and meanwhile to refrain from testing in the environments covered by that Treaty. That, then, would be the acceptance of a kind of limited moratorium by nuclear-weapon States not parties to the Moscow Treaty.

All States members of the Committee on Disarmament - among which, as is well known are the five nuclear-weapon States - are requested to support the creation by the Committee, upon initiation of its 1981 session, of an ad hoc working group which should begin the multilateral negotiation of a treaty for the prohibition of all nuclear-weapon tests and to use their best endeavours in order that the Committee may transmit to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session the multilaterally negotiated text of such a treaty.

The depositary States of the Moscow and the Non-Proliferation Treaties are called upon, by virtue of their special responsibilities under those two Treaties and as a provisional measure until the new comprehensive test-ban treaty enters into force - a treaty that would probably have annexed to it, as contemplated in the Final Document, a protocol covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes - to bring to an end without delay all nuclear test explosions, either through a trilaterally agreed moratorium or through three unilateral moratoriums.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.20 are convinced that, if each and every one of its provisions were to be implemented in good faith, the eventual result would be the attainment of the goal that has been so fruitlessly pursued by the United Nations and the international community for so long - namely, the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): I have asked to speak in connexion with draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1, which was introduced by the first speaker at this afternoon's meeting.

As the representative of Viet Nam indicated in his statement, a number of the sponsors have submitted amendments to that draft resolution. Because of the long-standing and well-known interest of Poland in early and effective progress in the negotiations on the elimination of chemical weapons, my delegation felt bound to be a sponsor of the amendments. However, in view of the statement made by the representative of New Zealand, I should like to make these preliminary observations.

The sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1 address the important issue of the continued effectiveness of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. This problem is highly pertinent to the efforts being pursued by the international community with a view to the earliest prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons and the destruction of this class of weapons of mass annihilation.

My delegation would naturally like to define carefully its position in respect of the issues raised in that draft resolution. As far as my delegation is concerned, we would appreciate certain clarifications as regards the text contained in the document in question.

First, we should be interested to know what kind of reports the sponsors have in mind. Do they mean governmental declarations and reports or do they refer to press reports only? We should also like to know, if governmental reports are involved, what these reports are. On the other hand, if press reports are meant, in the first place we are constrained to observe that the proposal to entrust the Secretary-General with the task of verification of such reports and of politically motivated press speculations could establish an undesirable and even dangerous precedent in United Nations practice. As we know, neither the Charter of the United Nations nor the practice of the past 35 years provides or supports such a press control function for the Organization and its Secretary-General.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

Another problem on which, in my delegation's view, some elucidation might be in order is the question of the precise territorial scope of military operations referred to in the fifth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. What time span do these reports cover? Do they cover, for instance, the latest reports and allegations of the use of chemical weapons in the ongoing Iraq-Iran conflict?

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to announce the following additional sponsors of draft resolutions: Greece, A/C.1/35/L.23, L.33 and L.39; Singapore, A/C.1/35/L.33; Congo, A/C.1/35/L.46.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.35, which has 22 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Norway at the Committee's 38th meeting on 21 November 1980.

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 adopts the draft resolution without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.35 was adopted.

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

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): In connexion with the draft resolution that we have just adopted, I should like to recall that in the closing statement I made on behalf of the United States at the biological weapons Review Conference the United States expressed concern over a compliance question which we have pursued under article V of the Convention. Unfortunately, our concerns have not been resolved. We remain determined to pursue this problem to a satisfactory resolution, consistent with the terms of the Convention and, as we have previously stated, we plan to communicate further with the parties to the Convention at a later time.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now begin the voting procedure on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.37.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): As is well known, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.37 addressed an urgent appeal for the adoption of this text by consensus when it was introduced in the Committee.

Indeed, last week to that end we gave an unofficial version of the draft text to all the parties concerned, even before it was distributed by the Secretariat, in order that delegations might have time to study it. At that time we also pointed out that the sponsors were perfectly willing to consider with an open mind and a spirit of compromise any reasonable suggestions aimed at improving the text, because we were very keen on having this draft resolution adopted by consensus.

In short, as happened two years ago, the sponsors have continued to show a flexible, constructive approach. They have declared themselves ready to accommodate, in so far as possible, all suggestions concerning the actual wording of the text and specific requests by interested delegations. A number of the sponsors have held informal consultations in order to determine any possible difficulties to which the text might give rise for some of us.

I must say that, without being able to have a specific discussion on the wording of the draft resolution, we noted that a consensus was not possible, for reasons that had nothing to do with the actual language of the text. We regret that fact, but unfortunately this is the situation notwithstanding the sponsors' sincere hope for unanimity.

Moreover, we do not believe that a discussion on this specific point would be desirable although, having studied carefully all the documents and records relating to this question, we would be quite ready to have one.

As representatives know, a similar resolution was adopted by the thirty-third session of the General Assembly by 126 votes to 9, with 1 abstention. Today, I am in a position to state that there has been a positive development compared to that situation. The results of the consultations carried out by the sponsors have led us to the conclusion that this year there is not likely to be a single vote against this draft resolution.

(Mr. Ersun, Turkey)

I repeat, there will be no vote against this draft resolution this year. Although we are disappointed by the lack of unanimity, nevertheless we regard this evolution as a step in the right direction and we express the hope that the small number of countries which will abstain today on this draft resolution, thus reserving their position, will be in a position to join the overwhelming majority next year and certainly before the second special session devoted to disarmament.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on the representative of Czechoslovakia, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

Mr. HANDL (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): In the view of the delegations of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the delegation of my own country, Czechoslovakia, the question relating to a review of the composition of the Committee on Disarmament should be resolved within the framework of that body itself on the basis of consensus. In its report for 1980 the Committee stated the intention to carry out such a review at an appropriate time. Therefore, we think that the provision in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.37 which prescribes when and how this question should be resolved is an interference with the prerogatives of the Committee on Disarmament, which is an independent organ with a special status with regard to the General Assembly.

For these reasons, our delegations will abstain during the voting on this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.37.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.37 was adopted by 127 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should just like to make it clear that my delegation interprets paragraph 28 of the Final Document, mentioned in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, as something which cannot affect in any way the provisions of paragraph 113 of that same Document and, indeed, should be understood in the light of the provisions in that paragraph, which reads:

"For maximum effectiveness, two kinds of bodies are required in the field of disarmament - deliberative and negotiating. All Member States should be represented on the former, whereas the latter, for the sake of convenience, should have a relatively small membership." (resolution S-10/2)

Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria): My delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.37 on the understanding, inter alia, that the invitation to States to participate in the work of the Committee on Disarmament on matters which are of pertinent interest to them should be in strict accord with the provisions of the rules of procedure of the Committee on Disarmament, bearing on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.38, which has 35 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Poland at our 36th meeting on 20 November 1980.

Mr. MENZIES (Canada): I should like to say that the document in English which has been distributed as A/C.1/35/L.38 omits the name of Canada as a sponsor, and I would hope that this omission would be remedied.

The CHAIRMAN: I had already made an announcement to the effect that Canada had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.38, but as there are a few technical formalities to be observed the Secretariat would welcome it if any member of the Canadian delegation could actually sign the draft resolution so as to confirm the position of his delegation as one of the sponsors of this draft resolution.

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 it is so decided.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.38 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions after the decision taken by the Committee.

Mr. ARTEAGA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Venezuela has a very great interest in the elaboration as soon as possible of a binding international instrument designed to prohibit chemical weapons. The attainment of a measure of this scope would certainly provide a powerful momentum to the efforts being continually made within the framework of the United Nations to promote the goals of disarmament and the limitation of arms and to contribute also to the elimination, or at least the reduction, of tension which is at present characteristic of the international situation.

In the relevant deliberations of the Committee on Disarmament, our delegation expressed its position as to the outlines and fundamental principles that should govern the various aspects relating to the production of an agreement on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and of their destruction. Although we recognize the usefulness and advantages of bilateral negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons undertaken by the United States and the Soviet Union, we believe them to be a complementary process to the multilateral negotiations that should be conducted within the Committee on Disarmament.

(Mr. Arteaga, Venezuela)

Unfortunately, it has not been possible so far to overcome the obstacles and differing positions which have prevented agreement on a convention on this subject.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.38 just adopted by this Committee expresses views on how the question should be dealt with, views which we, of course, share and support. However, we would have preferred the wording included in the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on chemical weapons established this year by the Committee on Disarmament to the effect that the discussions had confirmed the general recognition of the urgent need to negotiate and elaborate a convention on chemical weapons. We think it would be desirable to stress the urgency of the matter concerned, on the justifiable grounds of the possible development of new factors that may complicate even further the prospects for producing in a reasonably short time the results hoped for.

Furthermore, we would have preferred a reference to have been included in the preamble endorsing the Committee on Disarmament as a negotiating forum and the fundamental role that it must and can play in order to contribute decisively to the achievement of a genuine disarmament measure that would once and for all do away with chemical weapons.

On the basis of the above considerations, the Venezuelan delegation joined in the consensus reached on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.38.

Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria): My Government remains of the view that the conclusion in June 1925 in Geneva of the Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare represents a significant milestone in the humanitarian considerations that should govern the conduct of wars.

It further believes that the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction, which complements the Geneva Protocol, represents the very first step towards outlawing these unacceptable weapons in combat situations.

In supporting draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.38 just adopted, I should like to state that my delegation did so on the understanding that the Committee on Disarmament, which has itself been seized of the question of chemical weapons,

(Mr. Ayewah, Nigeria)

will exert its very best endeavours to accelerate its work and be able to comply with the time frame envisaged for it in the second Disarmament Decade consistent with the priority which that Committee attaches to the question in its agenda

It is the expectation of my delegation, therefore, that the Committee on Disarmament will urgently negotiate and submit an agreed text on a treaty prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of all chemical weapons and on their destruction, and do so before the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament scheduled for 1982. My delegation, however, regrets that the sponsors of this draft resolution did not reflect the sense of urgency that would have enabled the Committee on Disarmament to conclude its draft of a convention on chemical weapons by the second special session devoted to disarmament. In spite of that obvious lapse, we have agreed to go along with the general thrust and content of the draft resolution.

Mr. KOR BUN HENG (Democratic Kampuchea) (interpretation from French): Following the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.38, my delegation would like to make the following statement, with full respect for the good intentions and concern of the friendly countries which have sponsored this draft resolution.

We are sufficiently aware of the perfidious, cynical and criminal nature of the Hanoi authorities to be able to say in advance that they will not respect this draft resolution, because respect for the Charter and United Nations resolutions is the least of their worries. My delegation has already had occasion to inform this Committee of the use of chemical weapons and toxic gases in Kampuchea by the Vietnamese army of occupation. As if it were not enough to have to see the cynicism and arrogance of the delegation of Viet Nam in becoming a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.36/Rev.1, we are now witnessing the same unsavoury procedures and manoeuvres on the part of the regional expansionists of Hanoi, who are attempting to wash their hands of their crimes against the people of Kampuchea, crimes committed by the use of toxic chemical products and poison gases as well as by conventional weapons of all types and by starvation. It is not by shedding crocodile tears about the plight of the people of Kampuchea or by becoming a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.38 that the Hanoi authorities can wipe out their crimes against the people of Kampuchea.

While accepting the consensus, we should like to make it clear that we do not recognize the Kabul régime in the pay of the Soviet expansionists, although it bears the name of Afghanistan as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.38.

Finally, my delegation would like to reserve its right to reply later, if we deem it necessary, to the false allegations of the representative of the regional Vietnamese expansionists about my country, especially in regard to the use of chemical products and toxic gases.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now turn to draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.41/Rev.1. This draft resolution has 11 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Cyprus at the 40th meeting of the First Committee, on 24 November 1980. I call on the representative of Cyprus, who wishes to introduce some amendments to the text of the draft resolution.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I should like at this point to bring to the notice of the Committee the fact that there are some revisions to the draft resolution to be noted, as follows.

The first preambular paragraph should read:

"Noting with concern that the arms race, and particularly the nuclear arms race, continues unabated while efforts towards arms reduction or limitation have not yet produced concrete results".

The fourth preambular paragraph should read:

"Recalling that according to Article 1, paragraph 1, of the Charter, the primary purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security and to that end 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".

The ninth preambular paragraph should read:

"Considering that the objective of halting the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and proceeding to effective disarmament measures, compatible with national security, could be effectively served through applying the collective security system provided for in the Charter, parallel to disarmament efforts".

(Mr. Rossides, Cyprus)

Operative paragraph 4 should read:

"Requests the permanent members of the Security Council to facilitate the work of the Council towards carrying out this essential responsibility under the Charter;"

Operative paragraph 5 should read:

"Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly a progress report".

That is all. I hope that this product of compromise and agreement, with the changes that have been agreed on, can be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: As Ambassador Rossides has just said, the sponsors have expressed a wish that this draft resolution should be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts this resolution, as orally modified, without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.41/Rev.1 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Bulgaria to explain his position on the decision that we have just taken.

Mr. GRINBERG (Bulgaria): The delegations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR did not object to the adoption of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/35/L.41/Rev.1 without a vote because in principle they agree with the basic idea of this document regarding the need for parallel efforts both in the field of disarmament and in that of security.

At the same time, however, we should like to emphasize that some of the provisions in the draft resolution raise very serious doubts. This applies especially to operative paragraph 5, wherein the Secretary-General is requested to report to the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Grinberg, Bulgaria)

It is the considered view of the countries on whose behalf I am speaking now that under the Charter it is not for the Secretary-General to concern himself with such a task. It is for the Security Council itself, should it so desire, to submit reports to the General Assembly on any problem.

As far as the implementation of this draft resolution is concerned, the countries to which I refer intend to proceed from the necessity of strict observance of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter and will oppose any possible departure from them.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.42, which has 39 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of France at the 41st meeting of the First Committee, on 24 November 1980. The sponsors have requested that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I consider that the Committee agrees to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.42 without a vote?

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.42 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.46, which has 10 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 40th meeting of the First Committee, on 24 November 1980. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, 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,

Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.46 was adopted by 125 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.\*

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United States who wishes to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States): My delegation abstained on this draft resolution because we believe the study is neither necessary nor even desirable. Since the draft resolution has now been adopted we hope that the study will be carried out by Secretariat personnel with no additional expenditure of funds.

---

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

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now begin the voting procedure on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.28. This draft resolution has 27 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 38th meeting of the First Committee on 21 November 1980. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

Mr. PROKOFIEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union would like to explain its vote on the draft resolution on the report of the Committee on Disarmament, contained in document A/C.1/35/L.28.

With regard to the provisions of operative paragraph 2 of this resolution, the Soviet delegation would like to stress that the contents, scope and character of the information on negotiations being conducted outside the framework of the Committee on Disarmament fall within the competence of States taking part in the negotiations. In this regard, the Soviet delegation is unable to support this draft resolution and will abstain from voting.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.28. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast,

Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, 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, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The draft resolution was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

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

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): The United States supports the recognized role of the Committee on Disarmament as the single multilateral negotiating body and has supported the Committee's involvement in negotiations on specific issues determined by consensus within the Committee. In this regard, we should like to recall paragraph 120 (e) of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, in which it was recorded that

(Mr. Floweree, United States)

the Committee on Disarmament would adopt its own agenda taking into account the recommendations made to it by the General Assembly and the proposals presented by the members of the Committee. Clearly, it was not envisaged that the Committee would take up every issue on the international arms control and disarmament agenda without reflection on whether the subject was appropriate or ready for negotiation in the multilateral body. Logically, certain issues should be addressed by the countries directly concerned, and involvement by the Committee on Disarmament at an inappropriate stage would not be useful and could even jeopardize the productive potential of particular negotiations. Nuclear disarmament issues, for example, are the primary responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States, as stressed in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament. Measures of a bilateral or regional character are, of course, the primary responsibility of the parties directly concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.16. This draft resolution has 24 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 31st meeting of the First Committee on 13 November 1980. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions on this draft resolution before the Committee proceeds to take a decision.

Mr. DE MOHR (Italy) (interpretation from French): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.16. However, we are astonished at the financial implications mentioned in document A/C.1/35/L.49/Rev.1. We consider that the expenditures proposed are out of proportion to the study to be carried out. Therefore, my delegation reserves the position that Italy may take in the Fifth Committee.

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 adopts draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.16 without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.16 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions in connexion with the decision that the Committee has just taken.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): I should like to make a few remarks concerning draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.16, entitled "Economic and social consequences of the armaments race", which the Committee has just adopted by consensus. My delegation participated in the consensus on this draft resolution, but the appearance of document A/C.1/35/L.49 and Rev.1 has caused us to have some reservations on the exercise.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

My Government views with serious concern the economic and social effects of the continued rise in military expenditures. Detailed studies in this field are already being undertaken by two groups of qualified experts established by the General Assembly, namely, the United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and development and the continuing examination of the issue of the reduction of military budgets. It is the view of my Government that those two important projects offer the most constructive approach to the question of the economic and social effects of military expenditure and procurements in general, and that the exercise established in draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.16 therefore involves some unwarranted duplication of the work being undertaken in the exercises concerning disarmament and development and the reduction of military budgets.

We therefore feel that the financial and administrative implications of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.16, even as set out in the revised version of document A/C.1/35/L.49 represent an unnecessary and unjustifiable allocation of resources which could be used more constructively in other areas. We believe that the work requested by the draft resolution could be conducted within existing financial and administrative arrangements.

The United Kingdom reserves the right to express further views on the financial implications of this draft resolution at an appropriate time.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): The Government of the United States is not convinced of the compelling need to update the study on the Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures, given, first, the other studies that are already under way in this area and secondly, especially, the stringent financial circumstances in which the United Nations now finds itself.

While my delegation joined in the consensus adoption of this draft resolution, we hope that the expenses of compiling the report will be kept to the bare minimum and within the levels now authorized. We shall therefore be giving the costs careful scrutiny in the Fifth Committee.

Mr. FINDLAY (Australia): While Australia has participated in the consensus on the draft resolution on economic and social consequences of the armaments race, we should nevertheless like to register our concern at the

high costs involved in updating the 1977 study. We welcome the revised cost estimate presented in document A/C.1/35/L.49/Rev.1, yet even this estimate should serve as a reminder to us all that we in the disarmament field need to set our priorities in and direct our not unlimited resources to those areas where the most tangible and lasting benefits are to be achieved.

The Australian delegation hopes that the Fifth Committee will scrutinize the proposed budget for this item even more carefully than is usual.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): I should like to make some observations with regard to the draft resolution we have just adopted, draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.16, entitled "Economic and social consequences of the armaments race....".

My delegation wants to underline its serious preoccupation with the question of the economic and social effects of the present rise in military expenditures. In order to take a closer look at that problem, two groups of qualified experts have been established by earlier resolutions of the General Assembly. These are the groups engaged in the study on the relationship between disarmament and development and the ongoing examination of the issue of the reduction of military budgets.

On several occasions, the Federal Republic of Germany has pointed out its support for both these exercises and it has actively contributed to furthering the work either by being represented in them or by submitting detailed information.

In the opinion of my Government, these two important undertakings may still be considered as the most constructive approach with regard to the evaluation of the economic and social consequences of military expenditures. We should like to make sure that the results of the ongoing work of these two study groups are fully used in upgrading knowledge about the economic and social consequences of the arms race as required by the draft resolution we have just adopted.

My delegation expresses the hope that the full use of the results achieved by the two study groups to which I have referred may lead to some - and, we hope, substantial - savings on the amount indicated in document A/C.1/35/L.49/Rev.1 on the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution we have just adopted, A/C.1/35/L.16.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of Romania, who has asked to make a statement at this stage.

Mr. MARINESCU (Romania)(interpretation from French): I should like first of all to express the satisfaction of my delegation at the fact that draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.16 has been adopted by consensus. I am sure that I am speaking, too, for the other sponsors of the draft resolution.

I cannot, however, conceal my astonishment at the insistence on the financial implications of this draft resolution, which I understood to have been adopted unanimously. I am the more amazed since, while we share the concern of previous speakers about the financial implications of the draft resolution, we cannot fail to note that the methodology applied by the Secretariat to assess the financial implications of this study is the same as that used in the case of other resolutions which have been adopted in the past and which involved even greater sums of money. In the Fifth Committee, of course, all proposed expenditure will be studied very carefully, including the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.16 and of all the other resolutions adopted previously.

We hope that those delegations which have been so upset by expenditures amounting to a few hundred dollars will have the same feelings when they come up against military expenditures which can be counted in the hundreds of billions. We are convinced that the study, the updating of which is requested in this draft resolution, is worth the expenditure and we hope that the delegations of all Member States will give their support to this draft resolution thus creating the necessary conditions to ensure that the study will be carried out and completed.

The CHAIRMAN: I had intended to take up draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.7 as well today, but I must inform the members of the Committee that intensive consultations are still under way regarding the size of the preparatory committee which it envisages. We have been postponing a decision on this text from day to day, and I have now received a request to allow a little more time for the consultations to continue. Although I must emphasize that we have fixed the afternoon of tomorrow, 26 November, as the final deadline for completion of action on all the draft resolutions on all the disarmament items, it is my preference - and I am sure that the Committee shares this preference with me - that we should not proceed to a vote on the draft resolution in question, because should we start the preparatory process for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament by voting I fear that that might perhaps vitiate the very good, congenial, harmonious and friendly atmosphere that has prevailed in the First Committee throughout this session. It is my sincere hope that every member will contribute to maintaining the same spirit in 1981 until, happily, we reach the special session some time in 1982.

Having made those remarks, I propose, since I hear no objection, not to take up draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.7 until tomorrow, on the clear understanding that tomorrow is the final day, and that a decision will have to be taken on it then.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

Mr. SOLA VILA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): This morning the delegation of the United States, in explaining its vote on the draft resolution proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, interpreted tendentiously some of the paragraphs in that document and made allusions to Cuba.

As always, the interpretations of the United States delegation are capricious. I wish once again to reiterate that the Cuban forces in that area are there at the request of a legitimate Government and will remain there as long as the country requesting our co-operation and our country consider it necessary, in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the norms of international law.

Mr. FLOWEREE (United States of America): I should like to address myself to some remarks made by the representative of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam in speaking on draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1.

First, I wish to state that the United States has not opposed Viet Nam's participation in the Committee on Disarmament. In fact, the records of the Committee will show that the United States delegation specifically stated its agreement to Viet Nam's participation.

Secondly, I should like to note that draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.43/Rev.1 calls for an impartial investigation. It seems to us that any Member country of the United Nations ought to favour an impartial investigation. The United States for its part would welcome such an investigation of any allegations of the use by the United States of chemical weapons anywhere in the world, and we trust that other countries would also co-operate in any United Nations investigation to help determine the facts.

Mr. FAN Ta-chun (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Vietnamese representative in his statement this afternoon has once again resorted to lies to level utterly baseless slander against China. He fabricated the myth that China has used chemical weapons. The Vietnamese representative's vilification against China is a vain attempt at diverting public attention from allegations that the Vietnamese aggressors have used chemical weapons in Laos and Democratic Kampuchea. If the Vietnamese authorities have a clean record on the question of using chemical weapons why, then, should they be so terrified of an impartial

(Mr. Fan Ta-chun, China)

investigation by the international community? Does this not rather demonstrate that the Vietnamese representative has a guilty conscience? These attempts on the part of the Vietnamese representative are completely futile.

The Chinese delegation fully supports an impartial investigation conducted by the international community into the use of chemical weapons by certain quarters.

Mr. VO ANH TUAN (Viet Nam) (interpretation from French): I regret to have to speak at such a late hour, but I shall be very brief.

I merely wish to reaffirm what I said before in my statement this afternoon. I knew what I was saying, and everything I said was perfectly true. That is why my delegation rejects the regurgitated slanders by the representative of China against Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will begin its consideration of agenda item 50, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", on Friday, 28 November. I therefore urge delegations to inscribe their names on the list of speakers to enable the Committee fully to utilize the time available to it and to conclude its work on time.

Before we adjourn this meeting I would say that I think all representatives must have heard with great shock and profound sorrow the tragic news about the devastating earthquake which has struck Naples and its vicinity. Although the full details of that tragedy are still to be ascertained, the reports that have been received so far through international media confirm that loss of life runs into the thousands, that thousands of square miles of territory around Naples have been devastated, and that some of the priceless cultural heritage, not only of Italy but also of all mankind, have been destroyed in that sudden natural disaster.

I am confident that I speak on behalf of all the members of the Committee in conveying to the delegation of Italy our profound sorrow and deep condolences over this tragedy, and request it to convey our sincere sympathy to the people and Government of Italy.

Mr. DE MOHR (Italy) (interpretation from French): On behalf of the Italian delegation I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and all delegations for the expressions of condolence following the natural catastrophe which has just afflicted Italy. I should also like to say to you, Sir, and through you to the delegations of all those countries, how much we appreciate those expressions of solidarity. Your sentiments will certainly be conveyed to my Government.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.