Chairman: Mr. VELLODI (India)

Agenda item 4: (continued)

(a) Consideration of various aspects of the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, in order to expedite negotiations aimed at effective elimination of the danger of nuclear war.

(b) Consideration of the agenda items contained in section II of resolution 33/71 H, with the aim of elaborating, within the framework and in accordance with the priorities established at the tenth special session, a general approach to negotiations on nuclear and conventional disarmament.

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room A-3550, 866 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

80-61314
Agenda item 5: (continued)

(a) Harmonization of views on concrete steps to be undertaken by States regarding a gradual agreed reduction of military budgets and reallocation of resources now being used for military purposes to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries, noting the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

(b) Examination and identification of effective ways and means of achieving agreements to freeze, reduce or otherwise restrain in a balanced manner, military expenditures, including adequate measures of verification satisfactory to all parties concerned.
The meeting was called to order at 4:15 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 4 (continued)

(a) CONSIDERATION OF VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE ARMS RACE, PARTICULARLY THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE AND NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE NEGOTIATIONS AIMED AT EFFECTIVE ELIMINATION OF THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR

(b) CONSIDERATION OF THE AGENDA ITEMS CONTAINED IN SECTION II OF RESOLUTION 33/71 II, WITH THE AID OF ELABORATING, WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRIORITIES ESTABLISHED AT THE TENTH SPECIAL SESSION, A GENERAL APPROACH TO NEGOTIATIONS ON NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL DISARMAMENT

The CHAIRMAN: This morning we had commenced consideration of the Chairman's revised working paper on agenda item 4 (A/CH.10/CRP.8/Rev.1). During the short discussion we held, several delegations expressed reservations concerning some of the paragraphs in that paper. For the benefit of those who were not present this morning and also to recapitulate what we discussed this morning I shall try to enumerate the main points of that discussion. If I leave out any point made by any delegation I hope that the delegation concerned will complement what I say.
The main reservations expressed with regard to the working paper, A/CN.10/CRP.8/Rev.1, were the following. With regard to paragraph 4, there was the feeling that the first sentence was somewhat too pessimistic and that it also was not in keeping with the actual state of affairs, in the sense that some arms control or arms limitation talks are still in process, however slowly they are proceeding. In a document containing proposed amendments that is now being circulated, I have suggested alternative language for this first sentence. There was also, I believe, a reservation expressed regarding the concept in the second sentence concerning the resumption and continuation of the talks that have been interrupted.

With regard to paragraph 5, the main objection was to the last sentence. I explained that, in an effort to make the language of this sentence more acceptable than that originally contained in A/C.10/CRP.8, I had taken the preambular clause from the Final Document. Some representatives felt, however, that even with that preambular clause the sentence was not acceptable. In particular, there was objection to the phrase "including withdrawal of foreign military forces and dismantling of foreign military bases".

Paragraphs 6 and 7 elicited no comments.

On paragraph 8, there was one comment relating to the first sentence. As I understood it - and I would like the representative of France to tell me a little more clearly perhaps what the precise problem is with regard to that sentence - he or his deputy this morning said that they had difficulty in particular in connexion with the mandate of the Committee on Disarmament with regard to nuclear disarmament. After the representative of France has clarified that point, we can perhaps look at it again, but there is a reservation concerning that first sentence.
With regard to the second sentence in paragraph 8, there was a suggestion that instead of "initiate action," we might use an expression such as "favour action" or something similar. Here again, I should like to have some further clarification, because I went over this sentence again and again, and it did not seem to me that it needed any change. However, I should like to hear the views of representatives of this subject.

Paragraph 9 gave rise to reservations expressed by several representatives related to the second sentence, particularly the reference to the "progress in conventional disarmament, particularly between the two major alliances systems". There were objections raised to the reference to the "major alliances systems". I am not suggesting any alternative language, and I should like some more discussion on this.

On paragraph 10, there was nothing. On paragraph 11, the point was made that since some delegations had expressed strong objections to the proposed study. That fact should also be mentioned in order to achieve balance. There was also a suggestion made by the representative of India to remove the phrase "of the conventional arms race" in lines 1 and 2 of paragraph 11. I should like to say to the representative of India that I have looked at it again, and that I do feel that if we are employing that entire phrase, "on all aspects of the conventional arms race and on disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces," and since it is in inverted commas - I have taken it from the working paper submitted by Denmark - I would hope that he would not press for a change of what appears within the quotation marks. If it is considered necessary to make reference to the proposal submitted by Denmark that, of course, can be done.
With regard to the request that a sentence should be added stating the fact that some representatives had expressed strong objections to the study, here again I have suggested language for a sentence that could be added at the end of paragraph 11.

Those are the only comments I wish to make. I should like to make one suggestion regarding procedure. As I indicated this morning, we have to complete the consideration of this working paper today. We also have to take up the report on agenda item 5, and at an appropriate time I shall call on Mr. Sucharipa to tell us what has happened on that item. We have to make substantive progress on both agenda items 4 and 5 and if possible even conclude consideration of them today, perhaps at the meeting this evening, so that tomorrow we can concentrate on agenda item 3. The report on that item will be out by tomorrow morning, and Ambassador Adeniji will introduce it then. As most members are aware, there are still some points in it that need to be sorted out, so we shall certainly need all the time at our disposal tomorrow to consider agenda item 3. We shall also have to look at the structure of the report and complete all of that by tomorrow evening, so that on Friday afternoon we can consider the report, adopt it I hope, and then have the concluding statements by representatives.

With regard to agenda item 4, I would like to open the debate now and hear representatives, after which it may perhaps be necessary to have some informal consultations so that at our evening meeting we may complete the consideration of agenda item 4. The floor is open to representatives. Those who spoke this morning may certainly speak again if they have other points they would like to submit, and in particular, representatives who were not present this morning will have an opportunity to comment on the Chairman's revised working paper on agenda item 4.
In order to make a start on this, I would request representatives to look at paragraph 4 and tell me whether they have any observations to make on the sentence I have now suggested as the first sentence of that paragraph. I believe most delegations have the paper before them, but since it has been submitted only in English, perhaps if I read it out the interpretation may help some representatives. The sentence would now read:

"The Commission noted with profound regret that there had been a marked lack of progress in the implementation of the Programme of Action agreed upon at the special session and that even the talks on a few limited arms control and limitation measures have either been suspended or are proceeding very slowly."
I should like to ask the representatives whether they are prepared to accept that new sentence in place of the previous one. Also, may I ask whether the reservation on the other point in paragraph 4 relating to the resumption of the talks that have been interrupted remains, or whether representatives now find it possible to accept the sentence as it stands.

Mr. WILKINSON (United States of America): I am sorry to say that the reservation I expressed this morning still remains with regard to this particular sentence. Therefore I have to ask for the deletion of the words "that it call upon the concerned Powers to resume and continue the talks that have been interrupted and". In our view, those words should be eliminated. Unfortunately, we feel that this particular phrase does not take account of the circumstances and the reasons why certain talks referred to here have been interrupted. Without an explanation of those reasons, a call for the General Assembly to resume those talks would be unsatisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN: For the time being, I shall put that phrase in brackets and we shall have to return to it.

Mr. PALENYKII (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In paragraph 4 of your text, Mr. Chairman, it is pointed out very properly that some talks on disarmament have been either suspended or have come to an impasse. That fact cannot fail to arouse concern, particularly if one considers it against the background of the international situation that lately has become more complicated. In those conditions, the Commission, very properly and in accordance with its mandate, after having acknowledged that fact, should recommend to the General Assembly that it call upon the concerned Powers to resume and continue the talks that have been interrupted or have ceased. That view expressed by the Commission represents a significant factor in facilitating the policy of détente and limiting the arms race. In general this recommendation would be in keeping with General Assembly resolution 34/83 C.
The Soviet delegation supports the provisions contained in the document that you have prepared, Mr. Chairman, to resume and continue negotiations on disarmament, and the Soviet Union is prepared to make a decisive effort to implement these measures on both a multilateral and bilateral basis. Our proposals in that regard are very well known.

The CHAIRMAN: As there is a difference of opinion on this particular point, may I suggest that the Commission leave it to the Chairman to see whether acceptable language may be found to satisfy the delegations concerned. I hope that we shall not have a substantive debate on this matter, because I think the facts are known. It is really a question of finding words that are acceptable to all of the delegations.

May I return to the first sentence. I take it that as far as that is concerned, there is no serious problem.

Turning to paragraph 5, I ask representatives to look at the last sentence there. This morning the representative of France made another point on this paragraph. I sincerely hope that he will not press the point, which was to replace the word "especially" in the fifth line by the words "inter alia". In my view, taking into account the importance of the lines that follow, the word "especially" is appropriate. I ask the representative of France to bear that in mind when he makes his observations. I know that his delegation have found difficulty with the last sentence. May we concentrate on that sentence now.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): With regard to the word "especially", we would prefer an expression such as "inter alia", because the principles listed are equal and we do not want to establish any kind of hierarchy here. However, if any delegation has any objection to this proposal, we could accept the word "especially".

With regard to the last sentence in the paragraph, we have a major problem which has been explained at sufficient length. In an effort to resolve the problem, may I suggest that the sentence begin as follows:
(spoke in English)

"The Disarmament Commission bore in mind the inherent right of States"
and so on.

"Some delegations noted that in this connexion the withdrawal of
occupation troops, especially from regions of crises and tension, would
contribute to the achievement of the goals of disarmament."

(continued in French)

We believe that that language takes into account the views that were
expressed here with regard to those situations.

The CHAIRMAN: May I read out the suggestion of the representative
of France. He suggests that the last sentence of paragraph 5 be divided into
two, eliminating in the process certain phrases. The first sentence would
read as follows:

"The Disarmament Commission bore in mind the inherent right of States
to individual and collective self defence in accordance with the
Charter of the United Nations."

The second sentence would read:

"Some delegations noted that the withdrawal of great Power military
presence from regions of crises and tension would contribute to the
achievement of the goals of disarmament.

In other words, the phrase "including withdrawal of foreign military forces
and dismantling of foreign military bases" would be deleted.

I should like delegations specifically to refer to this sentence, and
in particular to the suggestion made by the representative of France.
Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): I noted a certain discrepancy between what was stated by the representative of France and what the Chairman has just recalled as being the proposal of France. From what I noted down, the French proposal would be to have a first sentence which would have the Disarmament Commission bear in mind the inherent right of States to self-defence, and then a second sentence which would start with the words, "Some delegations noted that the withdrawal of occupation troops, especially from regions of crisis and tension, would contribute to the goals of disarmament."

That is how I understood the French representative's suggestion. I should like to be clear in my mind as to what exactly is the proposal that he has made so that I would be in a position to comment on it.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The representative of Pakistan has, I believe, understood our proposal correctly. We find that, as you said yourself, Sir, when reading it out, the word "forces" is indeed preferable to the word "troops". And the end of the sentence would be "would contribute to the achievement of the goals of disarmament," which reproduces the language of the last sentence of the present paragraph 5.

Perhaps I could read the whole passage:

(spoke in English)

"The Commission bore in mind the inherent right of States to individual and collective self-defence in accord with the Charter of the United Nations. Some delegations noted that in this connexion the withdrawal of occupation forces, especially from regions of crisis and tension, would contribute to the achievement of the goals of disarmament."
Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): My comments will bear upon both the text of paragraph 5 which the Chairman has proposed and the amendment that has been suggested by the representative of France.

First of all, I should like to compare the general contents of paragraph 5 with what is contained in paragraph 9 of document A/CN.10/19 proposed by the non-aligned countries, which begins with the words:

"The Commission affirms the importance for the achievement of disarmament measures of strict adherence by States to the principles of the United Nations Charter..."

Part of this is covered in the previous sentence, but I think that it would be appropriate to state at the end of this particular sentence not that it would contribute to the achievement of disarmament but that it is important for the achievement of disarmament. I think that there is a slight distinction between the two.

As regards the comments and proposal of the representative of France, my delegation would have no objection to noting the inherent right of States to self-defence. This is of course a Charter principle, and we respect it. But I think that it is usual when we refer to the question of the inherent right of States to self-defence to accompany this with a reference to an equally importance principle, that of self-determination of peoples. I think that is the other principle where the use of force is legitimate, and therefore perhaps we would need to accompany the phrase, "The Commission bore in mind" - or "bears in mind" - "the inherent right of States to individual and collective self-defence" with "as well as the right of peoples to self-determination."

But that concerns the first phrase. As regards the second sentence, my delegation would have great doubts about qualifying it so that it would read that only "some delegations noted" that withdrawal of forces, and so forth, is important because I do not think that there is
any delegation around this table which can favour the concept that foreign troops of occupation should not be withdrawn from various territories. And therefore I think that we should put the two sentences on a level of parity at least, and say that the Disarmament Commission stressed —"noted," I think, is a weak phrase — or underlined the fundamental importance of the withdrawal of occupation troops or military forces of occupation, especially from regions of crisis and tension, as being essential for the achievement of the goals of disarmament. This is how we should like to see the phrase revised, and I hope that the representative of France would be in a position to agree.

Mr. SHI Jinjun (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I should like to say something on the latter part of paragraph 5.

With regard to the phrase "withdrawal of foreign military forces and dismantling of foreign military bases," this morning we heard the suggestion to delete this. We feel that it should be retained here. It is also necessary to point out that all foreign occupation forces should be immediately withdrawn from the territories they are occupying by invasion, since we feel that the principles of the United Nations Charter and the guidelines of international relations are at stake here. Therefore, any attempts to legalize the occupation of the territories of foreign countries are impermissible.

Mr. de la Gorce (France) (interpretation from French): I wanted only to say that I am entirely in agreement with the suggestions of the representative of Pakistan with regard to our proposals concerning paragraph 5.
Mr. VENKATESMARAH (India): In the revised formulations on the last sentence given by the representative of France and comments made on it by others, I find that the phrase "dismantling of foreign military bases" seems to have fallen by the wayside. My delegation feels that this is a very important aspect of the recommendations and that this phrase should be retained.
Mr. MUJESINOVIĆ (Yugoslavia): Before I speak about paragraph 5, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you for your additional efforts in producing this paper in your attempt to bring about consensus in our consideration of item 4 of our agenda. While I admire your very successful work, I note that many points which my delegation wanted to see included in this text, particularly in paragraph 2, could not find their way into the text. I understand that you had in mind your effort to bring about consensus and obviously you considered that those were ideas that could not command a consensus. Since my main emphasis had really been placed on those suggestions in paragraph 2, the other suggestions I made were within that context and some of them have found a place in your text.

Now, with regard to the discussion of paragraph 5, I found that the language suggested by the Chairman is very good, and provides, legally and politically speaking, a consensus text: legally because it refers to the rights of States and peoples as provided for by the Charter; Article 51 of the Charter is very specific in this respect, and the remainder of the sentence in the paper before us is practically given within the context of that Article. I do not see why anyone should have any legal problems with this.

Politically speaking, it has always been the position of my country that foreign troops should be withdrawn from the territories of other countries and that foreign military bases should be dismantled, but I see that some delegations have difficulties with this. In an effort to promote a consensus, I would accept the proposal of the representative of France on the first and second sentences, as further amended by the representative of Pakistan. I would welcome some reference to the dismantling of foreign military bases, but I know that this presents a problem to many delegations which maintain foreign military bases under certain treaties. It remains only to appeal to them to look at this phrase within the context of the language of the Charter, which covers the concerns expressed by those delegations.

Mr. GONZALES (Cuba)(interpretation from Spanish): First, I should like to join those who have congratulated you, Mr. Chairman, for having made this tremendous effort which has made it possible for a broad consensus to emerge.
I should like to refer to the last sentence of the paper's paragraph 5. We consider that this last sentence does reflect the views of a large number of delegations, as it directly reflects what appeared in the working paper submitted by my delegation in document A/CN.10/16, which has been discussed.

This sentence contains certain points which we consider are reflected in a well-balanced manner. We would be in a position to agree to language similar to that which has been proposed for paragraph 11, language which would point out what has been discussed here and what has been supported by many delegations. If need be, we could mention the objections which certain delegations may have on this point.

It seems to us that as this document reflects the conclusions of our debate and that many delegations referred in their statements to all of the elements contained in the last sentence of paragraph 5, these elements should appear in the document. Perhaps we could find language which would be similar to that which has been proposed to settle the differences which exist on paragraph 11 of the paper.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to suggest that members of the Commission comment specifically on the amendment proposed by the representative of France, as further amended by the representative of Pakistan. It should be noted that the language that I proposed for paragraph 5 has been objected to and it is in this context that an amendment has been proposed. The Commission can look at the language as amended by the representatives of France and Pakistan after it appears in writing to see if it is acceptable. I should like to request that delegations direct their observations to the amended version of the last sentence of the paragraph.

I should like to ask the Secretariat to have the sentence as amended distributed as quickly as possible.

There are two or three more rather important points to cover, and this is why, in order to expedite work, I am perhaps going from one paragraph to the other. On paragraphs 6 and 7 there were no comments. However on paragraph 8 there was a comment, and I should like to ask a question of the representative of France. This morning, his delegation expressed some difficulty with the
first part of paragraph 8, particularly with the words,
"...and that it should, therefore, continue its efforts to undertake
substantial negotiations, with the participation of all nuclear weapon
States, on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament...".
or, to be even more precise, on the words "on the cessation of the nuclear
arms race and nuclear disarmament". May I ask the representative of France
to tell the Commission what specifically is his difficulty with the existing
first sentence of paragraph 8?

Mr. de la GORCE (France)(interpretation from French): We have no
objection to a restatement of the responsibilities of the Committee on Disarmament
with regard to nuclear disarmament. This matter is entirely obvious and clear
to us, and is entirely in keeping with the mandate of the Committee and also
with its agenda. But what, in our view, is somewhat doubtful is the invitation
to "continue its efforts to undertake substantial negotiations". Before we
proceed to any negotiations, we have perhaps some other stages to complete.

Therefore, in order to arrive at a more general language without in any way
challenging the mandate of the Committee on Disarmament, my delegation would
suggest the following: "The Commission noted that the Committee on Disarmament
should fully discharge its responsibilities in the field of nuclear disarmament."
That is the same wording as in the present text.
"The Committee on Disarmament should therefore undertake action with a view to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament in conformity with its mandate in order to achieve the objective specified in paragraph 50 and other relevant paragraphs of the Final Document." Such would be our proposal.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to mention only one point, since this is a text that I have prepared. I hope delegations will not mind if I were to say a few words to justify my having put it in this particular language.

I am saying this because perhaps the main difference between what is contained there and what the representative of France is proposing is the substitution of the phrase "... to undertake substantial negotiations" by the phrase "...to undertake action". I included the question of negotiations because the Committee on Disarmament is the negotiating body and because paragraph 50 on nuclear disarmament in the Final Document did specifically ask for urgent negotiations.

Mr. INAN (Kuwait): I was wondering simply about the legal implications of the wording. As I understand it, this Commission is a subordinate body of the General Assembly and the Committee on Disarmament, I believe, is also a subordinate body of the General Assembly. So is it proper to say "...the Commission noted that the Committee on Disarmament should" take one course of action or another? Are we really competent to tell the Committee on Disarmament what to do or not to do, or should not the wording be changed so that we address ourselves to the General Assembly so that the General Assembly may take some action? I am not taking sides on the substance, I refer only to the legal implications.
The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Kuwait, and perhaps he has a point there which could be kept in mind.

Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In my very short statement I should like with respect to this item to support what was said by the representative of Kuwait. The Chairman said correctly that this is a point which should really be taken into account, because if the Committee on Disarmament is to receive guidelines and recommendations from both the Disarmament Commission and the General Assembly, it will become quite confused. We know that the Commission and the Committee itself are working side by side; the Committee is the negotiating body, and the Commission is the organ for the discussion and examination of disarmament questions.

As far as the contents of paragraph 8 are concerned, I am entirely in agreement with regard to the efforts which should be made in the field of nuclear disarmament. But this particular mention of the Committee generates some doubts in our minds.

Mr. de QUEIROZ DUARTE (Brazil): I should like, Mr. Chairman to support the formulation that you yourself have presented to us in paragraph 8. My delegation thinks that when the Committee on Disarmament is called upon 'to undertake substantial negotiations', this expression does not preclude the necessary preparations for such negotiations. This is true in the case of the item on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, as it is true also in the case of other items on the agenda of the Committee. The Committee has several items on its agenda and in order to negotiate on them it has taken whatever preliminary steps have become necessary.
As far as the proposal of the representative of Kuwait is concerned, I think it is an interesting point for us to debate. I should just like to remind the Commission that what we are preparing is a report that will have to be approved by the General Assembly. Thus the recommendation to the Committee that is contained in this paragraph will be transmitted to the Committee as approved by the General Assembly.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): In the first instance, as far as the point made by the representative of Kuwait is concerned, my own concern is not so much the functional relationship between the Commission and the Committee on Disarmament vis a vis the General Assembly. It is rather whether the wording here is suitable and it seems to me that it is not.

I think that the Commission can express its view on disarmament issues in general. It is a deliberative body and in the course of deliberation it should be able to express views on matters such as are contained in this paragraph. In my view, perhaps we should say here that the Commission was of the view that the Committee on Disarmament should fully discharge its responsibilities. But, that apart, it would seem to me that your formulation here, Mr. Chairman, corresponds to what the various members of this Commission have stated, and I think the view of the Commission in this respect should correspond with the views of its members.

It is important, I think, to emphasize the negotiating function of the Committee on Disarmament in this respect. As you yourself stated, Mr. Chairman, it is the multilateral negotiating body, and if we cannot make direct references to the undertaking of substantial negotiations by a multilateral negotiating body, I do not see the need for us therefore to make any comments at all on this matter. I do not have in toto the proposal of the representative of France, but from listening to it I have the impression that again we are avoiding the question of negotiations on the part of the Committee on Disarmament. This is an avoidance which I think perhaps would not be appropriate in this particular section.
Mr. VENKATESHWARAN (India): What I wanted to say has actually been expressed fully by the representative of Nigeria. I would support his suggestion that the word "noted" should be replaced by the phrase "expressed the view". But neither of those expressions, "noted" or "expressed the view" can be misinterpreted as giving directives to the Committee on Disarmament because, as has already been pointed out, the report has to be approved by the General Assembly, and I think there should be no trouble on that account.

Mr. MUJEZIMOVIC (Yugoslavia): The Commission, as an organ of the General Assembly composed of the whole of the membership, has, in our understanding of its mandate, the right both to express views and to make recommendations to different bodies and parties negotiating any treaty on any subject in the field of disarmament, whether multilateral, regional or bilateral. Hence, I do not think we should restrict ourselves in this regard in any way. That is my delegation's firm belief and its understanding of the mandate.

Secondly, I would suggest that we replace the word "action" by the word "negotiations", because what we are really interested in is that the Commission should enter into real negotiations on the matters which are on its agenda in accordance with the priorities agreed upon during the tenth special session.

Mr. MAGMAR (Egypt): I fully agree with the point of view expressed by my colleague from Nigeria and endorsed by my colleague from India with regard to substituting the word "noted" by the phrase "expressed the view".

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): I agree with the views expressed by the Ambassadors of Nigeria and India and by others regarding this paragraph. However, I have one additional comment on its last sentence.
As will be recalled, the working paper of the non-aligned countries, document A/CN.10/20, with regard to further action on nuclear disarmament includes action to prevent a new spiral in the nuclear arms race. Here I would prefer to add the words "a further and dangerous spiral" but that is a minor point. However, there is one concept which has been omitted, and I am sure that this must be a deliberate omission, but it is a point to which we attach importance, namely the question of the non-use of nuclear weapons. The non-aligned document, as will be recalled, does contain a separate sentence on measures regarding the non-use of nuclear weapons. I would suggest that here we should perhaps add, in the last line, after the words "nuclear disarmament measures" the following, "and measures regarding the non-use of nuclear weapons proposed in section II of the report".

I take it that this is a reference to the draft declaration, and in the draft declaration there are two references to the question of the non-use of nuclear weapons. There is still some discussion regarding the agreed language on those two points, but the concept is included in the draft declaration. I think it would be quite legitimate to refer here to those provisions in the draft declaration.

Mr. RAHALLI (Morocco) (interpretation from Arabic): I should first like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on having made this positive effort. My delegation associates with the delegations of Nigeria and Yugoslavia with regard to the need to substitute for the word "noted" the phrase "expressed the view".

Secondly, if I have correctly understood the proposal made by the Ambassador of France, it is to delete part of a sentence at the beginning of paragraph 8. He does not wish there to be any reference made to negotiations and to the participation of all nuclear-weapon States. I think that in this context, if we are talking about the mandate of the Committee on Disarmament, whose membership includes all the nuclear-weapon States, it is no longer necessary to refer here to "the participation of all nuclear-weapon States".
However, according to the French proposal, we would refer not only to measures to be adopted but also to negotiations relating to the substance of the matter. We have no objection to the French proposal, as long as reference is made to negotiations and we do not stop at merely mentioning the measures that should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: May I be permitted to recapitulate the discussion we have had on paragraph 8?

The representative of France has proposed a new formulation. We shall have it in writing later, but essentially what it says is that the first sentence should be divided into two. He has no difficulty with the first part of the sentence, but he has suggested that the second part should read:

"The Committee on Disarmament should therefore undertake action with a view to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament in conformity with its mandate in order to achieve the objectives specified in paragraph 50 and other relevant paragraphs of the Final Document."

It has been pointed out by several delegations that the negotiating character of the Committee on Disarmament should be reflected specifically. That was one point. The representative of Pakistan has suggested the addition in the second sentence of the words:

"... and for the adoption of nuclear disarmament measures and measures regarding the non-use of nuclear weapons proposed in section II of the report."

We shall also receive that in writing.
I should like to make two observations. I sincerely hope that the representative of France will agree to retention of the reference to the negotiating character of the Committee on Disarmament in the sentence.

As far as the "non-use" is concerned, I should like to make one observation, and I hope that the representative of Pakistan will consider this. While I would tend to agree with him that perhaps the phrase "nuclear disarmament measures" might be construed specifically to include disarmament measures and, from that point of view, not measures relating to non-use and other measures which are not perhaps strictly disarmament measures, I wonder whether one should single out a particular proposal relating to these measures or whether it might not be better for us to say "and for the adoption of the measures in the field of nuclear disarmament proposed in section II of the report". That is just a thought, but we shall have the suggestions in writing when we take a second look at this paper.

I might indicate what I propose to do. I propose to go through this paper, and then have a brief introduction as far as the situation on item 5 is concerned. Perhaps we shall even have a small discussion, and thereafter we shall adjourn and come back at 8 p.m. By that time the various formulations proposed will be available in writing, and we shall have the second reading and, I hope, conclude.

Mr. WILKINSON (United States of America): I hope I shall not be prolonging our discussion on paragraph 8. It seems to us that the suggestion to say that the Commission "expressed the view", rather than "noted", is perfectly satisfactory. We should also like to support the amendment proposed by the representative of France with either the words "undertake action" or, if others prefer, the words "undertake negotiations", which we feel would be appropriate in view of the character of the Committee on Disarmament.
Finally, I would agree with your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, to cover the point made by the representative of Pakistan. This point would be covered if the language you have suggested for the second sentence of paragraph 8 is maintained substantially as it is now.

Mr. de la GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): In view of the preceding statements, to which we have listened with great interest we should like to indicate that we would be ready to accept the following language, which is based upon what has been said, particularly by the representative of the United States and more specifically regarding the desirability of the word "negotiations". My delegation has always supported with great conviction the idea that the task of the Committee on Disarmament was essentially to negotiate. In the light of these factors, I should like to submit the following language. The first sentence would read:

(spoke in English)

"The Commission expressed the view that the Committee on Disarmament should fully discharge its responsibilities in the field of nuclear disarmament. The Committee on Disarmament should, therefore, continue its efforts to undertake negotiations with a view to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament in conformity with its mandate in order to achieve the objective specified in paragraph 50 and other relevant paragraphs of the Final Document."

(continued in French)

We hope that this wording will be acceptable to the Commission.
The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of France for his helpful suggestion. We shall have the language in writing when we come back to this paragraph.

We now come to paragraph 9, on which there were fairly substantive comments this morning. The comments by and large are related to the second sentence and particularly to the phrase "particularly between the two major alliance systems". Several speakers this morning expressed serious reservations regarding the retention of that phrase. Therefore I should like to suggest that we spend about 10 minutes on that part of paragraph 9.

Mr. MUJEZINOVIC (Yugoslavia): I have listened with great care to what the representatives of various countries had to say this morning on this second sentence and I realize that there is some validity in suggesting certain changes. Therefore, in order to meet this concern and at the same time to meet those of some of us who could live with the formulation you have proposed, Mr. Chairman, I should like to suggest the following change in the sentence. The sentence would read:

"The Commission also noted that in the conventional field, as in the nuclear field, the major responsibility rests on those States with the largest military arsenals, including members of the two major alliance systems,"

That would meet the concern expressed this morning in regard to the countries with the largest military arsenals but it would at the same time emphasize the fact that there would be included the members of the two major alliance systems, which are the countries with the largest military arsenals. Then the sentence would continue:

"and that progress in conventional disarmament, particularly by these States, would constitute a significant step in strengthening peace and security in the world."
The CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, particularly on the suggestion made by Yugoslavia?

Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Before the representative of Yugoslavia spoke, I had some objections to the words "particularly between the two major alliance systems", and my objections were based on the fact that this particular language, this reference to the "States with the largest military arsenals, includes not only those belonging to the two major alliances, but others as well, because the arms race in conventional weapons is a really broad concept which afflicts not only the countries which belong to military alliances, but also involves many other countries. Moreover, such a concept as States with the largest military arsenals" is already used in the Final Document of the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament and we are trying to adhere to that language. That is why I believe that this particular language, with its reference in the last sentence, is not really acceptable. What the representative of Yugoslavia has proposed is even less acceptable because he put forward an idea which would mean that negotiations with a view to disarmament should be conducted between the two military alliances and they are therefore being included in the whole disarmament process as the subjects, and that of course is not in keeping with the position of principle which was taken by our country. As is known, in the negotiations to bring about mutual disarmament in central Europe conducted in Vienna, we were conducting negotiations jointly with our allies, the socialist countries, and with several Western Powers which are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). At the very outset however, or even before the negotiations were started, during the preparatory consultations, we arrived at a certain agreement on positions to the effect that in those negotiations separate and specific countries would participate and not military blocs of any kind, and that position is regarded by us as extremely important, because all the commitments on reduction of weapons and armed forces should be implemented by each individual State and therefore each individual State should be responsible for such reductions, because only thus will the reductions in fact be effective.
That is why, in conclusion, I should propose to delete what has been included in paragraph 9 and also not to include what has just been proposed by my colleague and friend, the representative of Yugoslavia.

Mr. Summerhayes (United Kingdom): I want to comment on the same point, perhaps from a slightly different point of view. My delegation would find itself, I think, unable to accept the suggested amendment proposed by the representative of Yugoslavia because that would in effect tie us to a very narrow band of negotiations when we come to conventional disarmament. We have always thought of this as a subject of world-wide importance and particularly as a subject for regional disarmament discussions, and I do not believe that it would be wise for us, in the Commission, to put any kind of restriction of that kind on future conventional disarmament negotiations or even discussions which, I believe, will become important in the future in a much wider field.

Mr. Shi Jinkun (China) (interpretation from Chinese): In line 6 of paragraph 9, with regard to the phrase "... the major responsibility rests on those States with the largest military arsenals ...", we had on two occasions proposed to insert the word "two", but apparently this was not incorporated in the text and we should like to reserve our position on this point.

Furthermore, it was suggested that the word "the" before "major" be changed to "a". The meaning of the sentence is very clear: it is intended to pinpoint the responsibility of those countries with the largest military arsenals and if we change the word "the" to "a", the meaning of the original sentence will be greatly changed and it will be a retreat from the level of the Final Document of 1978 and that change will only make it all the more impossible for us to accept this paragraph.

I should also like to add one point, that is what we are discussing here is the major responsibility of the States and if we emphasize the responsibility of all States then there is no difference between major responsibilities and other responsibilities. Therefore we still think that we should pinpoint the major responsibility of those States with the largest military arsenals.
Mr. Akhri (Pakistan): My delegation could accept the phrase that is in the second sentence of paragraph 9; we could also accept the Yugoslav formulation that was read out a few minutes ago. However we have noted the various comments made on both the existing text and on the proposal of the representative of Yugoslavia and perhaps we can make another effort to try and formulate this concept along very factual and objective lines.

The objection which was raised by the representative of the Soviet Union was to the fact that there should be no call only, or particularly, on the two major alliance systems to disarm in the conventional field. However we have to note, and I think everyone knows this, that the major proportion of conventional arms expenditures are undertaken by those States and the Yugoslav formulation did not refer to alliances as entities, but to members of those alliances, so I do not think that to that extent the critique of the representative of the Soviet Union was quite justifiable. Nevertheless, in order to meet the point of view of the representatives who have expressed some difficulties concerning the Yugoslav formulation, may I suggest that perhaps we could resolve this difficulty if we reinsert in paragraph 9 a sentence taken from paragraph 12 of document A/CN.10/20, submitted by the non-aligned countries.
The second sentence of paragraph 12 of the working paper in document A/CH.10/PV.36 reads:

The vast proportion of conventional weapons produced in ever-increasing volume are retained and deployed by the two leading military Powers and members of their respective alliances."

That is a statement which can, I think, be borne out by statistics. Therefore, I would hope there would be no objection to the insertion of this sentence after the first sentence in paragraph 9, which could continue:

"The Commission..." and we delete the word "also." - "noted that in the conventional field, as in the nuclear field, the major responsibility rests on those States with the largest military arsenals."

Then there would be a last sentence which would read:

Progress in conventional disarmament, particularly by these States, would constitute a significant step in strengthening peace and security in the world.

The three sentences, taken together would thus bring out the purport of the suggestion made by the representative of Yugoslavia, but at the same time meet the objections of our colleagues from the Soviet Union and others who have expressed reservations.

I shall read out the three sentences again:

The vast proportion of conventional weapons produced in ever-increasing volume are retained and deployed by the two leading military Powers and members of their respective alliances. The Commission noted that in the conventional field, as in the nuclear field, the major responsibility rests on those States with the largest military arsenals. Progress in conventional disarmament, particularly by these States, would constitute a significant step in strengthening peace and security in the world."
Mr. SHI Jinkun (China)(interpretation from Chinese): I should just like to say that I agree fully with the proposal put forward by the Ambassador of Pakistan.

Mr. de la GORCE (France)(interpretation from French): I have listened with great interest to the comments made by some of the previous speakers with regard to the reference to systems of alliances and the special responsibility incumbent upon members of those alliances.

In this connexion, I should like to point out that some of the members of these alliances at least are not great military Powers and that they do not therefore bear major responsibility with regard to conventional disarmament. I would like to emphasize, however, an idea to which my Government attaches great importance, namely, that problems of disarmament should be approached on a regional basis and that equal weight should be given to the security problems of countries in a particular region, whether they be members of an alliance or not.

We feel that security considerations and needs are the same, whatever membership of an alliance there may be. We would therefore prefer to delete from this paragraph the reference to "alliances systems," and particularly to "the two ... alliance systems".

We note, moreover, that the great concentrations of conventional weapons are far from being restricted to the region in which my country is located. There are great concentrations of conventional weapons and political situations elsewhere that may entail risks and give reason for concern. Because of this, we should like to see this reference to alliances systems deleted, and to see introduced, perhaps, the notion of regional consideration of questions of conventional disarmament.

Mr. SHUSTOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I have listened with attention to the statements made by preceding speakers, including the statement made by the representative of Pakistan. I should like to say that they have in no way shaken my view, and
that I continue to insist that this last sentence in paragraph 9 should be deleted.

If we face objectively the situation as it exists, we should not overlook - besides the factors I have already mentioned - that there are States that are not members of any military alliances, but that are in possession of enormous, even colossal, military resources, with vast stockpiles of conventional armaments. I am not talking about nuclear weapons, which some of these States who are not members of military alliances also have, because in paragraph 9 we are talking only about conventional weapons. This, too prevents me from being able to agree with this formulation.

**Mr. Venkataraman (India):** I have listened with great interest to the various suggestions made with regard to this paragraph, but as the Chairman has pointed out time is of the essence in our deliberations, and my delegation feels that embarking on new formulations is not exactly going to help us to reach a consensus quickly.

I would therefore suggest that we adhere to certain consensus formulations we have evolved in the past, especially in the Final Document, which should be acceptable to all delegations because they have subscribed to these statements earlier. Perhaps that would be a way out of this problem, rather than seeking new formulations which would, I think, get us into a tighter position.

**Mr. de Queiroz Duarte (Brazil):** I should like to support the proposal just made by the representative of India. I think it will save us a lot of time and prevent us from engaging in a large-scale debate on matters that are already the subject of agreed formulations. I would suggest that we keep to the language that has already been proposed in the document.
The CHAIRMAN: I think it is fairly clear that this paragraph, and particularly the last sentence, will require further attention on our part. Several views have been expressed, and proposals have been made which will come before us in writing when we meet this evening. However, it does seem to me that of all the points in this document, this is perhaps the one that will require a great deal of effort on our part to find consensus language. I do hope that we will be able to work out something.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): My delegation has not as yet had an opportunity to comment on the rest of the paragraphs in this document, and we do have observations on several of them.

With regard to paragraph 10, we would like to add here the concept that conventional disarmament should be pursued in a balanced manner. That concept was contained in the working paper of the non-aligned countries, document A/CN.10/20, but it does not figure here. If there are no objections, we believe that this concept of limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in a balanced manner could be added in the middle of paragraph 10.
Mr. RAHILALI (Morocco) (interpretation from Arabic): I have a proposal with regard to paragraph 10 which I hope will raise no problem. It concerns the penultimate line on page 2 of document A/CN.10/CRP.8/Rev.1 where it is stated that "account should be taken of", and so on. The text which my delegation would like to have adopted for this paragraph is the one that appears in the working paper of the group of non-aligned countries that is annexed to document A/CN.10/20 and provides that

(spoke in English)

"account must be taken of the principles regarding the right of each State to preserve its security, independence and territorial integrity"
(A/CN.10/20, Annex, para.13)

(continued in Arabic)

Thereafter the sentence would end as it does in the document before us.

The CHAIRMAN: I have noted the comments made by the representatives of Pakistan and Morocco with regard to certain additions to paragraph 10, and we shall come to that when we have them in writing.

May I now turn to paragraph 11. Some discussion was held on it this morning and the view was expressed that it should be completed by the inclusion of a sentence to the effect that some delegations expressed strong objections to such a study. For that reason, I have suggested a sentence for inclusion at the end of paragraph 11. The text has been distributed to representatives and I should like to hear their observations.
Mr. PALENYCH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to outline our position in respect of the sentence to which you have just referred, Mr. Chairman, and also in respect of what is now contained in paragraph 11. This is in addition to what was already said by our delegation this morning. It seems to me that the sentence that has been added and now appears in paragraph 11 is appropriate, correct, and reflects in a concise but comprehensive way the views expressed by the Soviet delegation and several other delegations this morning, and I agree with the sentence. But in expressing my agreement I should like to propose a few amendments and perhaps additions to the sentence that precedes the last sentence in paragraph 11.

It seems to me that after the first sentence, which is an acknowledgement of fact, the following words should be added: "On this question no consensus was achieved." Then the sentence would continue as at present, "The discussions in the Commission showed that some delegations expressed wide support". In fact we do not need the word "wide"; it could say: "some delegations expressed support", and then continue as it stands now to the end of the sentence. After the full stop, we would add the sentence that you prepared, Mr. Chairman, after the meeting this morning.

Mr. STENBJERRE (Denmark): While I agree that there is no consensus in this Commission on paragraph 11, I do not think that we can agree with the statement just made by the representative of the Soviet Union on how opinion in the Commission is divided. As far as we could see there was wide support for such a proposal and we accept the proposal you have made, Mr. Chairman, to add one sentence to the text as it stands. But we would not be able to accept the proposal to go backwards - if I may put it that way - from the mention of the "wide support" which we consider exists as a matter of fact in the Commission.
Mr. de QUEIROZ DUARTE (Brazil): Having listened to the observations on paragraph 11, and if we are to reflect the positions that have been taken and explained by different delegations in the debate on item 4 (n), I would suggest that after the additional sentence proposed in the paper distributed by you, Mr. Chairman, a further sentence be inserted that would take account of the position expressed by my delegation and also held I believe by others.

That sentence could read as follows:

"Other delegations, while not objecting in principle to the proposed study, considered that it would only be justifiable in the light of substantial progress in nuclear disarmament."

I am prepared to give that sentence in writing to the Secretariat if desired.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): I have noted your observation on paragraph 11, Mr. Chairman, to the effect that the earlier reference to the conventional arms race forms part of a quotation. However, I should like to suggest that after the words "in principle" in the second sentence the following words be inserted:

"the proposal for the study of disarmament relating to conventional weapons and armed forces to be undertaken"

and so on, so that our position will be suitably reflected in this paragraph.

In addition, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to revert to paragraph 10. I did not have the time to mention this. The representative of Pakistan asked that the word "balanced" be inserted before the words "limitation and reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons". I suggest that in addition to the word "balanced" the words "and equitable" be inserted. I find that that expression is used in paragraph 29 of the Final Document, which states that "The adoption of disarmament measures should take place in such an equitable and balanced manner", and so on.
Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan): First of all, as regards the suggestion made by the representative of India my delegation would be prepared quite readily to accept the insertion of the new idea.

As regards paragraph 11 and the various changes and additions that have been proposed, I should like at this stage to raise a matter of fundamental importance. My delegation has given some thought to this particular paragraph and the difficulties to which it has given rise, and I should like to share my own doubts about the appropriateness of reflecting different viewpoints in a paper that is supposed to be adopted by consensus. I know that this approach has been followed in the paper that has been circulated on item 5, but I have some doubts as to whether we should follow this approach with regard to item 4 because, as is known, on item 4 we have had a very extensive debate in the Commission and very specific and important positions of principle were expressed by various delegations. If the approach that is to be adopted is one that would reflect various points of view in the manner that is proposed for paragraph 11, my delegation would have to give serious consideration to saying whether our own views, which were shared by many other delegations with regard to certain specific situations on the current international scene, should not also be reflected in the manner that the last phrase in paragraph 11 that is to be added proposes to do.

I would submit that that would create substantial difficulties. I should not like to do this, but if the approach of the paper is to be one where divergent viewpoints are to be reflected my delegation would have to consider seriously whether our own point of view on various subjects is adequately reflected in this document, which we had approached as one that would be adopted by consensus.
Mr. NUNEZ MOSQUERA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I should briefly like to refer to paragraph 11, which we are now discussing.

While my delegation understands that studies on disarmament could contribute to achieving results in that area, it is none the less true that they could be used to delay the achievement of effective agreements relating to disarmament. In particular, with regard to conventional weapons my delegation considers that some areas of understanding have been pinpointed and they should be enhanced without prejudging the results of the proposed study if we consider that it would not take into consideration all of the aspects encompassed in the concept of conventional weapons. We are thinking particularly of foreign military bases and so-called local conflicts in which an attempt is always being made by the reactionary forces to defend their spurious interests and plunder the natural resources of other States, particularly developing States.

My delegation therefore supports the inclusion at the end of paragraph 11 of the sentence that was distributed this afternoon in the second part of the revised document.

Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany): May I just be allowed to make a few observations supporting first what has been proposed by the representative of India regarding the study envisaged. I think it is of great importance for the coming Assembly session to know exactly what we had in mind in asking for such a study to be undertaken.

Therefore I think that the argument whether there is wide support or a consensus relates to two identical concepts. This is reflected in the Chairman's report which states that there was wide support. This means, in other words, that there was not 100 per cent support. It means also that there was no consensus. There is no need to draw attention to it again. It already has been said once.
With regard to the objections which we have heard and to which we attach, of course, great importance, there may be a chance to cut it all short by putting the sentence which you have proposed at the end of paragraph 11, with a slight change at the end. I shall read it out. It would then state: "On the other hand, some delegations expressed strong objections to such a study on the ground that it will detract attention from real progress in other fields of high priority." This perhaps coincides with the point of view of many delegations here.

The CHAIRMAN: May I at this stage suggest that we return to item 4 at the beginning of our next meeting and request Mr. Sucharipa of Austria, who chaired the informal meetings on item 5, to report to the Commission on the work done on this item.

Mr. AKRAI (Pakistan): As I stated earlier, my delegation has not had an opportunity to comment on the other paragraphs of this paper and if I may be permitted I should like to indicate briefly some of the changes that we should like to see in the document that has been circulated.

The changes are mainly with regard to paragraph 2. The last part of the first sentence reads as follows:
"... particularly the nuclear arms race, has further escalated and there are graver prospects of even further intensification of the arms race."

Here we should like to give some causal connexion and to add the phrase, "due to the deterioration in the current international situation." The second sentence would then make sense because it states that international peace and security is threatened, and so forth.

In the second sentence some ideas contained in the paper submitted by the non-aligned countries have not, I think, been adequately covered. After the words "occupation of States, hegemonism," we should very much like to see the following phrase added: "Great-Power rivalry and attempts to create spheres of influence and domination." This would be in paragraph 2.
As regards paragraph 3, I think that the thoughts expressed in that paragraph seem to be left hanging and to need an introductory sentence similar to the one contained in working paper A/CN.10/19. We propose the following as the first sentence for paragraph 3 of the present paper:

"The present deterioration in the international situation poses a grave threat to international peace and security. In this context, the Commission recalled", and so forth.

With regard to paragraph 7, my delegation would suggest that the words "The Commission recalled that the special session had declared..." might be replaced with the words "The Commission reaffirmed that, as the special session had declared...", or "The Commission reaffirmed the declaration of the special session that, among all disarmament measures..." and so forth.

Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India): Like my colleague from Pakistan, I should like to take this opportunity of making an observation. With regard to paragraph 5, I believe that in earlier discussions it appeared that there were some differences of opinion on the wording of the second portion of that paragraph. It occurs to my delegation that we could accept, as a consensus text and a compromise formula, wording which already exists in paragraph 26 of the Final Document, with some small changes.

I would suggest that in the fifth line of the paragraph, we insert a full stop after the words "international peace and security" and then add:

"It stressed the importance of respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of States, non-use or threat of use of force, non-recognition of situations created by use of force in international relations, non-intervention and non-interference, self-determination of peoples under colonial and alien domination, effective collective international security through the United Nations and the peaceful settlement of disputes, having regard to the inherent right of States to individual and collective self defence under the Charter. Some delegations noted that the withdrawal of foreign forces from occupied territories and the dismantling of foreign military bases would make an important contribution to the achievement of the goals of disarmament."
AGENDA ITEM 5 (continued)

(a) HARMONIZATION OF VIEWS ON CONCRETE STEPS TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY STATES REGARDING A GRADUAL AGREED REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS AND REALLOCATION OF RESOURCES NOW BEING USED FOR MILITARY PURPOSES TO ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT, PARTICULARLY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, NOTING THE RELEVANT RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(b) EXAMINATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF EFFECTIVE WAYS AND MEANS OF ACHIEVING AGREEMENTS TO FREEZE, REDUCE OR OTHERWISE RESTRAIN, IN A BALANCED MANNER, MILITARY EXPENDITURES, INCLUDING ADEQUATE MEASURES OF VERIFICATION SATISFACTORY TO ALL PARTIES CONCERNED

The CHAIRMAN: In connexion with this item, I should like to call upon Mr. Sucharipa to tell the Commission the results of the informal meetings over which he presided.

**Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria):** I shall be very brief. Members of the Commission will recall that the Commission devoted three formal meetings and, I believe, three subsequent informal meetings on an exchange of views on item 5 (a) and (b). At the end of this series of meetings, the Commission agreed to set up an informal open-ended drafting group with the task of elaborating the section of the Commission's report dealing with agenda item 5.

The recommendations contained in documents A/CN.10/CRP.10 and Add.1, which are now before the Commission, are the results of the work of this drafting group. Members will note that this report is composed, in essence, of four different elements. The first paragraph summarizes a number of important and basic considerations which represent views generally held and agreed upon by all members of the Commission.

In the second to the fifth paragraphs are reflected a number of additional issues which were raised in the course of the discussion and on which various views were expressed. Although it was not possible to achieve consensus on these issues, the drafting group nevertheless felt that, in order to provide a solid basis for future efforts to harmonize opinion, it would be most useful to reflect the views expressed on these issues in our report.
The sixth paragraph contains a summary of the Romanian and Swedish working paper which, as is well known, constituted a major contribution to our Group's work.

The seventh and eighth paragraphs, contained in document A/CH.10/CRP.10/Add.1, deal with the concrete recommendations to be submitted to the General Assembly with regard to the further consideration of the issues examined by the Disarmament Commission under its agenda items 5 (a) and (b). Members will notice that the first of these two paragraphs contains two sets of square brackets, as well as one set of sub-square brackets. The drafting Group spent a considerable amount of time and effort in its search for a compromise solution on these issues. Unfortunately, it became apparent that, at least at the level of the Drafting Group, it would not be possible to arrive at an appropriate consensus on these issues.

It is my sincere hope—and I am sure, that of the drafting group as a whole—that with your guidance, Mr. Chairman, it will be possible, perhaps even tonight, to find a commonly acceptable solution to this problem which is reflected in the square brackets.

In conclusion, I should like to thank all delegations which participated in the work of the Drafting Group for their contributions and for the support they extended to me. I should also like particularly to thank the Secretariat and Mr. Davinic for their assistance.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to take this occasion, on behalf of the Commission and certainly on my own behalf, to express deep gratitude to Mr. Sucharipa for the work which the Commission, in informal meetings under his chairmanship, has done on agenda item 5. I should also like to thank him for his introduction of the Drafting Group's recommendations.

As we all know, there has been a considerable effort on the part of all those who participated in the work on item 5 to find a generally acceptable text on that item. At the same time we also note that in the recommendations there are still some square brackets; it will certainly be our endeavour in the Commission to do everything we can to remove the square brackets and arrive at an agreed text. We shall come back to this at our meeting later today.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.