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10th meeting

Monday, 9 September 1974, at 11.20 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran)

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (A/AC.167/5)

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Working Group for its draft report (A/AC.167/L.5), which was the outcome of very fruitful work that would facilitate the Committee's task. He invited the Chairman of the Working Group to introduce the draft report.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain)*, Rapporteur, speaking as Chairman of the Working Group, introduced the draft report. In the report, the Working Group had sought, on the basis of the summary prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.167/L.4), to reflect the outcome of the examination of the views of Governments undertaken by the Committee at its first and second sessions. It had summarized the views of Governments at three different levels. Firstly, in paragraphs 14-18, it had set forth the views of Governments in some detail, although mostly without direct quotations. Secondly, in paragraph 13, the Group had presented six basic approaches to the question of convening a world disarmament conference. At the third level, the Group had felt the need for a brief general summary of views to be placed at the end of the report.

Having concluded the series of meetings devoted to the preparation of the text of the draft report, the Working Group had proceeded to discharge the second part of its mandate, namely, that of carrying out consultations with the five nuclear-weapon States in order to ascertain their views on that text. China had suggested a change in the order of the views set forth in paragraph 13, so that the view of the largest group of States was placed first, the remaining subparagraphs being presented in descending order of support by States. It had also suggested the deletion of the general summary at the end of the draft report and had requested that the statement setting forth its own views should be amended. France had put forward no suggestions or objections, except to state that the final paragraph would have meaning only if it reflected the need for the agreement of the five nuclear-weapon States with regard to the convening of a conference. The Soviet Union had raised

* The full text of the statement by the representative of Spain will be issued as document A/AC.167/L.6, in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee.
(Mr. Elias, Spain)

no objections of substance. The United States had suggested the inclusion of two new paragraphs in the section comprising paragraphs 14-18, and had also suggested the deletion of the general summary. The United Kingdom had also suggested the deletion of the general summary, which is considered unacceptable.

The original text of the draft had then been amended in the light of the foregoing views. The wording of the fourth subparagraph of paragraph 13 remained subject to consultations, since a request by China for the inclusion of a reference to those States possessing the largest nuclear arsenals was opposed by the Soviet Union. Similarly, in the eighth subparagraph of paragraph 15, China had requested that the reference to its name, as well as the inverted commas enclosing its views, should be deleted; however, the Soviet Union, supported by the United States, had pointed out that, if the desire of a State to have reference made in the report to another State or States was acceded to, then the name of the State expressing that desire should also be mentioned. The subparagraph in question was therefore also subject to consultations.

Of the five nuclear-weapon States, three had expressed opposition to the general summary in the last part of the original text; one had supported its retention, with certain reservations; and one had raised no formal objection, but had also expressed reservations.

The Working Group had accordingly discussed a series of alternative final paragraphs, but had been unable to reach agreement on any of them, and had accordingly decided to delete the general summary and leave it to the Committee to draft an appropriate final paragraph or paragraphs, if that was deemed necessary.

He also read out the text of two paragraphs submitted by the delegations of Argentina and Mexico, which would be subject to consultations and to the views that might be expressed in the Committee. Those two delegations had also suggested that the procedures followed until now should be pursued continuously with a view to assisting in finding a way to begin the preparations for convening the conference.

In conclusion, he praised the competence, enthusiasm and spirit of compromise of the members of the Working Group and the excellent co-operation shown by the Secretariat; he hoped that the draft report could form the basis for a consensus in accordance with the Committee's mandate.

/...
The CHAIRMAN thanked the Chairman and members of the Working Group for their excellent work in producing the draft report.

He could confirm the Rapporteur's presentation of the views of the nuclear-weapon States. In the case of China, he wished to add two clarifications. Firstly, with regard to the fourth subparagraph of paragraph 13, the Chinese delegation had requested the inclusion in the second sentence, after the words "nuclear-weapon States", of a reference to the two nuclear-weapon States that possessed the largest nuclear arsenals, that would be along the lines of the eighth subparagraph of paragraph 15. In addition, the Chinese delegation had requested a reordering of the various subparagraphs of paragraph 14.

As to the final paragraph or paragraphs of the report, the Chinese delegation had stated that, if it was desired to have a concluding section in the report, it could submit an appropriate text.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) thanked the Chairman and members of the Working Group for their excellent efforts in producing the draft report and for having undertaken consultations with the nuclear-weapon States, whose views would be very useful in drafting the final version of the report.

He proposed that the full text of the statement made by the Chairman of the Working Group in introducing the draft report should be reproduced and circulated to the members of the Committee.

Finally, he thanked the delegation of Mexico for having kept his own delegation fully informed of the progress of the Working Group.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) thanked the Chairman of the Working Group for his statement and supported the proposal by the representative of Argentina. He asked whether the text of the proposal which China was ready to submit could be made available to the Committee, together with the text of any alternative proposals for a concluding section.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished him to request the Secretariat to reproduce in full the statement by the Chairman of the Working Group and to prepare an unofficial document containing the various alternatives for a final paragraph or paragraphs.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.
CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (A/AC.167/L.5)

The CHAIRMAN stated that the two documents before the Committee contained a number of variations of a general declaration to be included at the end of the draft report. The three dots at the beginning of the paragraph in the second text, which had been proposed by one of the nuclear Powers, had been printed by mistake and should be deleted. The two documents, together with the text of the comments made by the Rapporteur at the previous meeting, would be circulated in all the working languages at noon the following day.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the third session of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference was beginning its work in a favourable atmosphere, for the two previous sessions had created conditions that could advance the consideration of the vital question concerning the convening of a world disarmament conference. The Working Group had used the data provided by those two sessions to elaborate a draft report which would be submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session. In accordance with the Committee's decision, the United Nations Secretariat had issued a document summarizing the views and suggestions and the official statements of Governments of States Members of the United Nations on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems. The document, which would be carefully studied by all Members of the United Nations, would make it possible to gain a better understanding of the views of Member States on the convening of such a conference, to draw the right conclusions from those views and to take steps to settle that problem, which was of vital importance to peace, security and the future of the peoples.

Turning to the draft report prepared by the Working Group, he congratulated all the members of the Working Group and the Rapporteur, who had had to overcome obstacles and difficulties to perform their task. The initiative of the representative of Argentina, who had been responsible for the proposal that a Working Group should be set up to prepare a report, had been fully justified.

The idea of convening a world disarmament conference continued to enjoy wide
support among the various countries, particularly among the non-aligned States, as could be seen from the decisions of the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which had met at Cairo, Lusaka and Algiers. Far from weakening, that trend was growing even stronger, for in view of the continuation of the arms race the need for disarmament was becoming more and more essential if safety on the planet was to be ensured and if all countries, particularly the developing countries, were to be helped to accelerate their economic development by using for such development the funds saved through disarmament measures. The United Nations had since its creation, held dozens of international conferences devoted to various subjects - population, the law of the sea, the environment, town planning and the like - but never yet had the States of the entire world met to set forth their positions on the question of disarmament and to agree on the adoption of measures designed to limit and end the arms race and to lead to general and complete disarmament. Yet there was no need for any further demonstration of the importance of that question.

The position of the Soviet Union and the countries of the Socialist community on the subject was well known. As Mr. Brezhnev had stated, the Soviet Union and the Socialist countries had long been ready to take their seats at the table of the World Disarmament Conference. He also cited a statement made at the twenty-fourth Pugwash Conference: a world disarmament conference in which all the nuclear-weapons States and the other major military Powers participated could contribute to disarmament, either by promoting an agreement on disarmament measures or by warning the world that no progress had been made in that direction. The Soviet Union agreed entirely with that view; it was imperative to convene a world disarmament conference at which reason and good sense would triumph over madness and rashness before the arms race triggered a catastrophe which would involve incalculable losses in human lives and material damage and would, according to recent scientific data, destroy the ozone layer of the stratosphere, exposing all forms of life on earth to the deadly effect of ultraviolet rays and thereby threatening the very existence of mankind.

Returning to the document prepared by the Secretariat, he pointed out that it contained the official statements of nearly two thirds of the Members of the Organization. Only a few isolated States had expressed opposition to the convening of a world disarmament conference. He emphasized the significant influence of the non-aligned countries, which were in favour of convening that conference, and
(Mr. Malik, USSR)

recalled the Indonesian representative's opinion that the conference could give a new impetus to disarmament efforts and lead to the adoption of effective measures.

To suppose that much progress had been made in the preparation of the conference would be naïve; it would be to ignore the power of inertia, the influence of sceptics and those who opposed international détente. Nevertheless, there was reason to hope that all the obstacles would be overcome and that all States would soon recognize the need to convene the conference; that was shown by the participation in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee of representatives of all the geographic groups in the United Nations and of three nuclear-weapons Powers, not just one as had been the case after the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, when the question had been considered for the first time. His delegation was convinced that the improvement of the international political climate and the possibility of adopting concrete measures to halt the arms race and settle disarmament questions were contributing to the success of the Committee's work. It therefore felt that it was vital to supplement political détente with military détente. The United Nations and its Member States had an important role to play in that field.

The results of the Committee's work showed that many problems relating to the convening of the conference had been defined and provisionally settled. They included the questions of participation in the conference (53 States had stated that they favoured participation by all States), its duration, the nature of the provisional agenda (which should be sufficiently broad), the organization of the conference in close co-operation with the United Nations, and the need for proper preparation. With regard to the last question, there were two possible approaches: to drag out the discussions to such a point that the final objective was lost sight of or, on the contrary, to show a constructive spirit and to work honestly and seriously to promote the convening of the conference. The Soviet Union had chosen the latter course. Thanks to the efforts of Mr. Hoveyda and the other officers of the Committee, many difficulties had been smoothed over, particularly with regard to questions of organization and to the co-operation of the nuclear Powers with the Committee.

His delegation felt that the Working Group had done its work well; the draft report it had prepared showed that the views of States on many important points had drawn gradually closer. There was a reason to state, on the basis of that
document, that there was wide support for the idea of convening a carefully prepared conference in which all States - small, medium or large, and including the nuclear-weapons Powers - would participate. Clearly the document was the product of the individual efforts of the members of the Working Group, but it was also the fruit of a compromise between the views of the various States or groups of States, between the supporters and the opponents of the conference. The wording of certain passages of the text could undoubtedly be improved. However, his delegation had no objection to the draft report in its present form. Naturally it reserved the right to express its views on any suggestion or wording that might be submitted during the consideration of the draft report by the Committee.

In his opinion, however, the Committee should not limit itself to submitting its report to the General Assembly as if it were a mere summary of its work. The Committee itself should look to the future, and, although his delegation had no wish to provoke controversy, it felt that the report should recommend the General Assembly to expand the Committee's terms of reference and to assign it more specific tasks with a view to the preparations for the World Disarmament Conference. The Committee would thus be better able to carry out fully the mission entrusted to it by the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session. It would also facilitate the work of those who would later prepare draft resolutions on the Committee's report and submit them to the General Assembly.

His delegation was convinced that the Committee would succeed in that new task, which would require co-operation by the Chairman and Bureau and all the members and by the sincere supporters of the convening of a world disarmament conference.

The CHAIRMAN said that in the Bureau's view it would be preferable not to hold a general discussion but to ask delegations to make comments on the text of the draft report, particularly on the points left unresolved. That suggestion was aimed solely at organizing the work of the Committee in the best way, and delegations were, of course, not obliged to stay within that framework if they felt that it was too narrow.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether the two documents which had been circulated to members of the Committee were anonymous or were the work of several sponsors.
The CHAIRMAN said that the documents represented a synthesis of the proposals made by various delegations at the meetings of the Working Group or at other consultations but had not been officially submitted by any particular delegation.

He suggested that the Committee should proceed to the consideration of the first two parts of the report, which did not seem to raise any difficulties and could perhaps be adopted on a provisional basis.

Part I - Introduction

The CHAIRMAN said that if there was no objection he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt the text of part I of the report on a provisional basis.

It was so decided.

Part II

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the text of paragraph 7 could not be completed before the end of the session, and that was why gaps had been left.

Mr. CARRANCO AVILA (Mexico) said he feared that if the Committee adopted part II as it stood, it would subsequently be unable to introduce new elements as it might wish to do after studying the Rapporteur's statement.

The CHAIRMAN said he had been careful to specify that the text would be adopted on a provisional basis, since the final version obviously could not be prepared before the end of the session. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt the text of part II of the report on a provisional basis.

It was so decided.

Part III

The CHAIRMAN recalled that, as the Rapporteur had pointed out in his statement, it had not been possible to reach a consensus on several points in part III. He asked the members of the Committee whether they wished to take up that part at once or whether they would prefer to wait until the relevant documents were available in all the working languages.
Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) congratulated the Working Group, which had accurately reproduced in its draft report the various views that had emerged. It had been possible to adopt the first two parts without difficulty because they were confined to the statement of facts and therefore did not raise any problems. However, they might have been a little less brief. He was sorry that it had not been possible to study the text until that morning; although his delegation had followed the deliberations of the Working Group and had kept its Government informed, it had not yet received instructions from the latter. The two paragraphs setting out China's position, which were marked with an asterisk, should also be considered. It should be ascertained whether their wording had been accepted by the nuclear Powers or whether it was subject to alteration. The order in which those paragraphs were considered was of little importance, but he could not see how the Committee could take a decision before the delegations had been able to receive instructions from their respective Governments.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Rapporteur had answered those questions in his statement, the text of which would be circulated in all the working languages. No consensus had been reached on the two paragraphs concerning China's position, and one of the nuclear Powers, in particular, wished to see the existing wording changed.

Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) said that perhaps he had not made himself clear. The Rapporteur had reported on the discussions concerning the order in which the various subparagraphs of paragraph 13 were set out, but it should be made clear whether the order followed in document A/AC.167/L.5 was final or whether it could be altered.

The CHAIRMAN said that the order followed in the document was indeed the order which the Working Group had agreed to adopt in setting out the views expressed by Governments. There was also a divergence of views with regard to the conclusion of the report: several delegations had felt that the report should end, if not with a conclusion in the true sense, at least with a statement of a general nature; others had not shared that view. In sum, as the Rapporteur had stated, there were still three elements of the report on which the Working Group had been unable to reach agreement: one subparagraph of paragraph 13, one subparagraph of paragraph 15, and the paragraph or paragraphs of the conclusion.
(The Chairman)

He assumed that delegations wished to have sufficient time for a careful study of the documents now before them or to be circulated later, and he therefore suggested that consideration of part III, particularly the points left unresolved, should be postponed until the following afternoon.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the report by the Chairman of the Working Group (A/AC.167/L.6) and to the various proposals for a closing paragraph of the draft report (A/AC.167/L.5) which had been distributed. He recalled that the Committee had to consider paragraphs 13 and 15 of the draft report, about which there had been no consensus, and also the desirability of including a closing paragraph. If the Committee decided that the report should have a closing paragraph, a decision would then have to be taken as to its contents.

Mr. GUVEN (Turkey) said that the Rapporteur had produced an excellent draft report which should assist the Committee in reaching a consensus. It might be felt that the report as it stood adequately conveyed the views of the members of the Committee, but if a group of members was in favour of adding a closing paragraph, he invited the Committee to consider a new text which he would circulate.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina) recalled that at the Committee's 11th meeting the representative of Mexico had indicated that his delegation and that of Argentina were not prepared to accept sections I and II of the report as they stood. He proposed the insertion, between the present paragraphs 10 and 11, of an additional paragraph reading as follows:

"The Chairman of the Working Group submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee document A/AC.167/L.5 containing the draft report prepared by the Working Group. In introducing the report, the Chairman stated (A/AC.167/L.6) that the Working Group had authorized him to transmit to the Ad Hoc Committee on its behalf the suggestion that there should be continued application of methods and means used until now for helping to clear the way towards the initiation of the preparation for convening a world disarmament conference. For that purpose members of the Ad Hoc Committee who are to maintain

/...
contact with the nuclear Powers could explore informally the possibility of reaching agreement on the solution of some, at least, of the disarmament problems most frequently mentioned in debate; and consultations between the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee and the Permanent Representatives of the five nuclear Powers with a view to reaching a general agreement on the question of convening a world disarmament conference should be kept on a permanent basis."

He suggested that informal consultations should take place about the proposed additional paragraph.

Mr. Rydbeck (Sweden) said that his delegation had no wish to see changes in the Working Group's excellent draft report. He hoped that negotiations between the parties concerned would lead to a satisfactory solution of the difficulties about paragraphs 13 and 15. It was an encouraging sign that the Working Group had had the active participation of all the nuclear-weapon States in drafting its report. The Chairman had put a question to the Committee. In replying, he would recall that his delegation had repeatedly expressed support for the idea of holding a world disarmament conference but the question at the present juncture was rather what would be the most useful attitude for the Committee to adopt in the light of the mandate given to it by the General Assembly. Having regard to the number of views which had been expressed and to the fact that the Committee worked by consensus, he did not think it necessary to provide the report with a conclusion which might turn out to be a repetition of preceding paragraphs. The report as it stood gave the General Assembly an adequate basis for discussion and, if it so desired, for decision. His delegation would back the proposal put forward by the representative of Argentina if it found general support.

Mr. Ludwiczak (Poland) congratulated the Rapporteur on the Working Group's draft report. The Working Group had been given a challenging task in view of the importance of the subject with which it dealt, the potential influence of the report and the difficulties involved in drafting it. The draft report was proof of diplomatic skill and directed the work of the Committee along the right lines.

His remarks on the draft report were based on three premises: that the convening of a world disarmament conference was of the utmost importance, that it was essential to pursue disarmament efforts by means of such a conference, and that
it was necessary to remove both natural and artificial obstacles on the road to that goal. Merely by reflecting accurately the views and suggestions of Governments on the convoking of a world disarmament conference, the draft report had revealed the concern of the international community over the magnitude and gravity of the arms race and the need to decide on practical ways and means of putting an end to it. It indicated massive recognition of the need for a universal forum for discussion of disarmament, which would be provided by a world disarmament conference. While the report reflected objectively the differing approaches, its dominant theme was universal support for a conference.

As a concomitant of that main theme, the draft report set out the conditions for successfully holding a world disarmament conference, particularly with regard to the participation and co-operation of all the nuclear-weapon States. It summarized the views of Governments on the main objectives of such a conference and on its agenda and organizational aspects. It was a matter of satisfaction that the draft justified the efforts which had gone into its preparation; it was a politically important document constituting a solid foundation on which the Committee should build. The Committee had now reached the stage at which it should, as his delegation had stated at the 8th meeting, discuss and agree on conclusions and recommendations for submission to the General Assembly.

The Committee had the factual basis on which to undertake that task in the draft report, which had been agreed upon after intensive consultations both within the Working Group and between it and other members of the Committee and the five nuclear Powers. It had a moral basis in the general agreement reached within the Working Group, after long discussion, that the report should contain conclusions and in the selection of one of the texts currently before the Committee in an informal working paper. Finally, the Committee had a political basis for action since it was a body composed of over 40 countries which had been specially created by the General Assembly to examine the views of Governments. His delegation had, together with others, worked consistently to that end in the Working Group. It felt that the report should reflect the general support for a world disarmament conference and the need to ensure the participation and co-operation of all the nuclear States as well as the reluctance of some states to start immediate preparations for a conference. The report should bring out all those aspects of the problem while at the same time suggesting ways and means of facilitating the start of preparatory work for
convening the conference. The tide was running in favour of accelerating substantive negotiations aimed at achieving specific measures of disarmament.

Mr. THOMPSON-FLORES (Brazil) said that he wished to raise some points in connexion with paragraph 14 of the draft report. He proposed the addition at the end of the first subparagraph of the phrase "giving primary consideration to nuclear disarmament". That opinion had often been expressed in the debates of the Committee and was also to be found in the summaries of views contained in document A/AC.167/L.4. In the third subparagraph, which reflected the view of his own delegation, he proposed that the final phrase, "and in its relations to development", should be amended to read "and the economic development of countries", which was closer to the language used in the General Assembly resolutions. He further noted that the final subparagraph stated that "there was no need for duplication" of the activity already being carried on by the First Committee of the General Assembly, thus clearly indicating that one or more Governments did not favour the convening of a world disarmament conference. In paragraph 13, however, it was stated in the last sentence of the fifth subparagraph that the General Assembly could note, by consensus, the possible usefulness of a world disarmament conference convened at an appropriate time. There appeared to be some contradiction between the two paragraphs.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain), Rapporteur, said that the language used in the draft report had been agreed upon as the result of a compromise between those holding different views. In paragraph 14, subparagraphs 1 to 6 expressed the views of Governments which were in favour of convening a world disarmament conference, and the Working Group had consequently allowed itself more latitude in conveying their ideas; the last subparagraph recorded a more negative attitude, and the Working Group had tried to reflect accurately what the country concerned had stated in language similar to that used in the summary of views by the Secretariat (A/AC.167/L.4). That negative attitude was also reflected in paragraph 13: the first sentence of the fifth subparagraph stated that according to another line of thinking a world disarmament conference could not contribute at the present time to the achievement of concrete arms control agreements.

He thought that the Committee should consider the proposals made by the Brazilian representative with regard to the first and third subparagraphs of paragraph 14.
Mr. THOMPSON-FLORES (Brazil) said that, in paragraph 14 of the draft report, the tense of the verb used in the second clause of the last subparagraph was inconsistent with the conditional mood used in the other subparagraphs. He accordingly proposed that the Committee should consider replacing the words "there was no need" by the words "there would be no need at this time", and suggested that the Rapporteur might be given the task of negotiating such an amendment.

If, on the other hand, the amendment was unacceptable, his delegation would insist that, in the third subparagraph of paragraph 14 - which reflected the view of his delegation, among others - the word "could" be replaced by the word "must". Such a change arose from the need to give equitable treatment to all points of view; it would also be more consistent with the fifth subparagraph of paragraph 13.

Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia), speaking in a wider context, emphasized the increasing urgency of convening a world disarmament conference in order to avoid the dire consequences of a nuclear war. With the rapid advances in weapons technology, the big Powers were devoting an alarming volume of resources to military purposes; apart from the obvious dangers of such a situation, funds that would otherwise have been available for development were squandered and world inflation was aggravated. Furthermore, as the Secretary-General pointed out on page 3 of the introduction to his report (A/9601/Add.1), the hidden risk of escalation in the direction of nuclear confrontation was present whenever conventional warfare broke out in certain critical areas.

There was an obvious need for a world disarmament conference. Any obstacles in the way of convening it must therefore be overcome and efforts must be made to ensure that it received sufficient support. At such a conference - as in the case of recent sessions of the General Assembly - no single country or group of countries would be able to prevail over the others.

Turning to the draft report (A/AC.167/L.5), he commended the Chairman of the Working Group for having improved the wording of the first subparagraph of paragraph 13 as compared with the original text. Since, however, that subparagraph reflected the view of the non-aligned countries, his delegation would have preferred the crisper and more succinct wording of the Political Declaration of the Fourth Conference of Non-aligned Countries held at Algiers in 1973 (A/AC.167/L.4, annex II, section V).

/...
Mr. Job, Yugoslavia)

As to the question of having one or more final paragraphs in the draft report, his delegation would be in favour of including a general statement of some kind but had no dogmatic views with regard to its placing. He tentatively suggested the alternative wording already before the Committee, which read:

"It appears that the idea of a WDC is universally accepted. Such acceptance, however, is subject to certain conditions and prerequisites, detailed in this report, regarding, inter alia, appropriate timing, careful preparation and the need for the participation of all nuclear-weapon States."

That text might possibly be combined with another of the alternatives already suggested in such a way as to make it clear that the largest number of States was eager to overcome the obstacles to such a conference.

His delegation hoped that the Committee would make some general recommendations to the General Assembly and that its work would provide a basis for the Assembly to take a further step towards convening a world disarmament conference.

Mr. Guven (Turkey) said that he wished to raise a question regarding the wording of the first of the two paragraphs submitted by the delegations of Argentina and Mexico, which were reproduced on page 6 of the report by the Chairman of the Working Group (A/AC.167/L.6): what was meant by the words "expert and experienced body", and why should its composition be limited to about 30 members?

Mr. Prat Gay (Argentina) assured the representative of Turkey that he would provide an answer at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Thompson-Flores (Brazil) said that, in the fifth subparagraph of paragraph 14 of the draft report, the expressions "equality of participation" and "public accountability" were not very clear. He therefore suggested that the Rapporteur should consult the delegations in question with a view to improving that wording.

The Chairman assured the representative of Brazil that that would be done.

Mr. van der Klauw (Netherlands) suggested that a time-limit should be imposed for the submission of any further proposals in writing, after which attention should be paid to the important question of a conclusion. Conversely, that question might be dealt with first.
The CHAIRMAN agreed that a time-limit would be appropriate and suggested
4 p.m., Wednesday, 11 September.

It was so decided.

Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands), turning to the question of negotiations
on paragraphs still outstanding, said that, if any State or group of States felt
that its opinion was not reflected in the right way, it had every right to request
a change in the wording. It was more a question of editing than of reaching a
consensus.

Any conclusion to the report would necessarily be very vague. If, however, the
general view favoured a conclusion, that would be acceptable. On the other hand,
his delegation could also accept the Swedish representative's view that a conclusion
was unnecessary. For the purpose of formulating a conclusion on the basis of a
consensus, he was afraid that further time-consuming negotiations might be needed;
the question must therefore be considered without delay.

Mr. de SOTO (Peru) observed that the Working Group had prudently
refrained from using a formula such as "conclusions" or "summary of the report"
but had referred only to "closing paragraph(s)". It would certainly be extremely
difficult to draw any specific conclusions from the report. However, it should be
possible to draft a clear and concise final paragraph which would reflect a general
consensus and thus enable the report to conclude on an optimistic note. There had
been no systematic opposition in the Working Group to the inclusion of such a
paragraph, even though no agreement had been reached on how it should be drafted.

The CHAIRMAN observed that, at the current meeting, at least one
delegation had voiced opposition to the inclusion of such a paragraph.

Mr. YANG (Philippines) asked why no mention was made of China and the
United States of America in paragraph 7 of the draft report.

Referring to the two paragraphs marked with asterisks in section III, he asked
whether consultations were taking place and, if so, who was participating in them.

The CHAIRMAN said that paragraph 7 would be finalized in due course,
according to whether the two nuclear-weapon States in question continued to
maintain contact with the Ad Hoc Committee or actually participated in its work, as
they had the right to do if they so desired.
(The Chairman)

With regard to the two paragraphs marked with asterisks, he said that the Rapporteur had already held consultations with the State in question at the request of the Working Group. At the 10th meeting, he had informed the Ad Hoc Committee of their outcome. The position of the People's Republic of China was that a reference to the nuclear-weapon States that possessed the largest nuclear arsenals should be included in the fourth subparagraph of paragraph 13 and that both its name and the inverted commas should be deleted from the eighth subparagraph of paragraph 15. It would be difficult for him to conduct further negotiations with that State with a view to reaching a compromise unless the Ad Hoc Committee expressed its views on those questions.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines) thanked the Chairman for his explanation, which had clarified the situation.

The CHAIRMAN, summing up the discussions which had taken place during the current and previous two meetings, said that a number of views had been expressed concerning the substance of the Ad Hoc Committee's work. At least three delegations had clearly expressed their desire for the inclusion in the report of some form of general statement. Two of those delegations considered that the most appropriate place for such a statement would be the end of the report, while the third had not expressed any views in that connexion. One delegation had expressed the view that it would not be desirable to include such a paragraph. Another delegation had supported that view but had stated that it would be prepared to consider proposals for a text. Another delegation had stated that it would be difficult to draw a specific conclusion from the report but that it should be possible to draft a general statement for inclusion at the end of the report. Yet another delegation had stated that the views of the group of States to which its country belonged should be set out in the report in wording which corresponded more closely to that used in the summary of views and suggestions prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.167/L.4). Finally, one delegation had commented on the wording of some of the paragraphs in section III of the draft report and had proposed a number of amendments.

/...
ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the limited time remaining for adoption of the draft report and the need to maintain contact with the two nuclear-weapon States not participating in the Ad Hoc Committee's work, it would be desirable for the Committee to plan its work rather carefully.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina) expressed the view that discussion at the coming meetings should be limited to the amendments proposed to the draft report, the question of the final paragraph or paragraphs, and the two paragraphs with asterisks.

The CHAIRMAN said that the amendments proposed to specific paragraphs should not give rise to any difficulty, since they sought only to reflect more accurately the views of the countries or groups of countries concerned. The two paragraphs with asterisks and the question of a general statement or final paragraph or paragraphs would have to be the subject of negotiations with the nuclear-weapon States not participating in the Ad Hoc Committee's work, and delegations should therefore state their views on those issues as soon as possible.

Mr. van der KLAAUW (Netherlands) said that it would be unfortunate if the Ad Hoc Committee was unable to finalize its report because some nuclear-weapon States could not agree to the wording. He proposed that the next meeting should be an informal closed meeting with no summary record in order to enable delegations to express their views more freely.

Mr. THOMPSON-FLORES (Brazil) supported the proposal by the Netherlands representative.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the proposal was adopted.

It was so decided.

Mr. de SOTO (Peru) asked whether the informal meeting would be devoted to discussion of the final paragraph or paragraphs. If so, it could be assumed that there was a consensus in favour of including such a paragraph or paragraphs, since otherwise there would be no point in holding the meeting.

/...
The CHAIRMAN said that both the question of the final paragraph or paragraphs and that of the two paragraphs marked with asterisks would have to be discussed.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.
13th meeting  

Wednesday, 11 September 1974, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran)

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (A/AC.167/L.5) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to continue consideration of the draft report (A/AC.167/L.5). He drew attention to the proposal by the Argentine and Mexican delegations that a new paragraph should be inserted between paragraphs 10 and 11, and to the amendments proposed to paragraphs 14 and 16 by the Brazilian delegation. The Committee might also wish to consider the informal suggestion concerning two closing paragraphs that he had made that morning at the informal meeting. Those two paragraphs would read:

"From study of views and suggestions, it appears that the idea of a WDC convened at an appropriate time and following careful preparations is generally accepted in principle.

"While opinions on the urgency of convening the conference and the ripeness of political conditions differ widely, an overwhelming number of States which have expressed opinions believe that participation of all nuclear-weapon States and militarily significant Powers in such a conference is essential for its success. If, nevertheless, that participation is to be assured, certain preconditions will have to be met and, furthermore, some reasonable condition for the success of the conference on the basis of preparatory work must exist."

Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria), repeating the statement he had made that morning at the Committee’s informal closed meeting, commended the Working Group and its Chairman for the excellent draft report before the Committee and thanked the Chairman of the Working Group for his useful introduction (A/AC.167/L.6).

There were two or three issues which still had to be settled. The first concerned the two subparagraphs marked with asterisks, which were closely interrelated. His delegation sincerely hoped that the difficulties in that connexion could be overcome through consultations and would not be an impediment to adoption of the report.

/.../
(Mr. Jankowitsch, Austria)

The second outstanding issue was that of the closing paragraph. The Committee ran the risk of becoming bogged down in a linguistic discussion on whether to use the term "conclusion" or the term "closing paragraph". While he did not wish to bring up the question of the Committee's mandate, he considered that it would be perfectly appropriate to leave the task of drawing conclusions from the report to the General Assembly, particularly as it was evident that no doubt prove more complex than originally expected in the light of the number of alternatives which had been submitted up to the present time. However, his delegation was ready to support the proposal made by the Peruvian delegation in that connexion.

Nine of the 12 suggested alternatives made reference to "conditions" or "necessary conditions" for convening a world disarmament conference. At the Committee's first session, his delegation had stressed that the problem of conditions was extremely important, and it still held the view that no hasty action should be taken in that regard. It would be preferable for the Committee to submit a report without a conclusion rather than submit no report at all because agreement could not be reached on a conclusion. His delegation's firm conviction that disarmament measures were becoming more and more urgent had been further strengthened by the twenty-fourth Pugwash Conference, held recently in Austria, which had highlighted the imminent danger of irreversible proliferation of atomic weapons. A world disarmament conference could contribute to solving the problems.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain) supported the Argentine and Mexican proposal for the insertion of a new paragraph after paragraph 10. The proposed text reflected only the fact that the Working Group had authorized its Chairman to transmit the suggestion in question to the Ad Hoc Committee and did not prejudge any decision which the Committee might wish to take in respect of the suggestion itself. The doubts expressed by the United Kingdom representative concerning the proposal seemed to relate to the Committee's possible decision rather than to the facts set out in the text of the paragraph.

Turning to the Brazilian amendments, he said that his delegation endorsed the idea behind the proposal to substitute the word "must" for "could" in the third subparagraph of paragraph 14. However, it considered that the imperative form might be used more appropriately in other paragraphs of section III. It supported both the proposal to replace the phrase "in its relations to development"
in that subparagraph by "the economic development of countries" and the
amendment to the last subparagraph of paragraph 14.

With regard to the two subparagraphs marked with asterisks, which were
closely interrelated, he supported the suggestion made that morning by the
Chairman at the informal closed meeting concerning the use of foot-notes as a
means of solving the problem.

As to the question of the closing paragraph or paragraphs, his delegation
endorsed the views expressed by the Peruvian representative at the 12th meeting.
It felt that the report would be incomplete without one or two closing paragraphs.
However, in view of the importance of achieving a consensus, it would be prepared
to accept the view of the majority on that issue. Of the alternatives suggested,
his delegation preferred the Chairman's. Another possible solution might be to
draft two closing paragraphs, the first reflecting the entire spectrum of views
expressed and the second reflecting the substance of the suggestion transmitted to
the Committee by the Working Group. In order to help the Committee to reach a
consensus, his delegation suggested that the last closing paragraph might read:
"The Ad Hoc Committee considers that it is still necessary to study the evolving
conditions for convening a WDC." However, he would be perfectly willing to
withdraw that proposal if it gave rise to any difficulty.

Mr. GROSEV (Bulgaria) thanked the Chairman and members of the Working
Group for their efforts, the outcome of which was encouraging. The draft report
(A/AC.167/L.5) was the result of a compromise between the various points of view.
It could have been improved in certain ways, and a conclusion could have been
drafted in the light of the overwhelming sentiment in favour of a world
disarmament conference.

The third session had been a productive one. As in the case of the preceding
sessions, it indicated that the fundamental issue before the Committee was now
ripe for action and was of central concern to the overwhelming majority of
Member States.

The draft report provided an opportunity to learn the points of view of all
Governments. It basically reflected support for a world disarmament conference,
so that it was now possible to deal with the concrete problems connected with the
preparation of such a conference.

/...
(Mr. Grosev, Bulgaria)

It was clear from paragraph 13 of the report that the vast majority favored the convening of a conference as soon as possible after due preparation, with the participation on an equal footing of all States, including the nuclear-weapon States. The non-aligned and socialist countries, as well as others, had clearly expressed their support for the convening of a conference. That position was clearly distinct from the views of certain countries which opposed the convening of a conference. In fact, the proponent of the view that the conference should be convened only after certain conditions had been fulfilled by the largest nuclear-weapon States showed contempt for the present circumstances favouring the convening of a conference and was consciously placing obstacles in the way of preparing it. In their desire for disarmament, the peoples of the world must not yield to ultimatums. The various views on the question of disarmament, as well as the identity of those who held them, must be clearly revealed, despite the fact that such a step would add to the work of the Secretariat.

His delegation held the view set forth in paragraph 13 of the draft report that the political conditions for the convening of a conference, being especially promoted by détente and the ever-increasing importance of disarmament, had become ripe. The vast majority of Member States shared that view, and they were increasingly desirous of proceeding to the preparation of a conference.

The question of disarmament was directly linked with the most urgent problems of mankind: How could the problem of preserving the environment be solved without removing the threat of nuclear war? How could development needs be satisfied unless military budgets were reduced and resources reallocated to development? Hence the very valid question: should the move towards the convening of a conference be impeded simply because of opposing views? And why should the desire of the overwhelming majority of Member States to work towards the convening of a conference be thwarted by the imposition of prior unrealistic conditions? The Conference of the Committee of Disarmament and other bodies were working without prior conditions; why, then, should a world disarmament conference not be convened, thus lending impetus to the attainment of agreement on general and complete disarmament? The ideal situation would be for all States and Governments to participate in the preparation and convening of the conference.

/...
A positive aspect of the current situation was that three nuclear-weapon States were participating in the Committee's work, whereas previously only one had done so. The remaining two, having been unable to prevent the establishment of the Committee, and finding themselves isolated, were seeking, in the consultations undertaken by the Chairman, to have their own point of view reflected. However, they should go further by actually participating in the work of the Committee if they sincerely desired progress in the field of disarmament.

His delegation therefore again wished to stress the need to move towards the convening of a conference with a view to satisfying the genuine interests of the peoples of the world. The views set forth in the draft report indicated that there were favourable prospects for convening a conference, which should consider the complete banning and destruction of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and should seek mutually acceptable means of putting an end to the arms race.

His delegation therefore felt that it was time for the Committee to make concrete proposals for an approximate date for convening the conference - which could be held, for example, in 1976 or 1977 - as well as proposals concerning the siting of the conference, for which Vienna, Geneva or any other European city would be convenient.

It was also time for the Committee to propose that the General Assembly should broaden its mandate and make it the preparatory committee for the conference.

Mr. PUTSAGNOROV (Mongolie) said that the Committee had done significant work within the terms of its mandate. That work had been considerably lightened by the contribution made by the Secretariat in preparing the summary of views in document A/AC.167/L.4. He thanked the Chairman and members of the Working Group for their work in preparing the draft report, which was evidence of the fact that disarmament was one of the most pressing problems of the present day.

The work of the Committee and its Working Group indicated that the solution of the complex problem of disarmament was hampered by the current differences in approach to the problem. Nevertheless, the progress of the Committee's work offered hope that, with patient and determined effort, a gradual move could be made in the right direction, particularly in the light of the general improvement in the international situation.

/...
(Mr. Putsagnorov, Mongolia)

It was very significant that an overwhelming majority of States favoured the convening of a world disarmament conference. An important positive factor was the participation of the Soviet Union, France and the United Kingdom in the Committee's work; so, too, was the establishment of working contacts with those nuclear Powers not present in the Committee.

The value of the draft report lay in the fact that it reflected the positions of all non-nuclear-weapon States as well as those of the nuclear-weapon States and could accordingly serve as a basis for future efforts to solve the problem.

His delegation was ready to support the draft report as a whole but noted that it contained certain formulas that detracted from the significance and urgency of convening a world disarmament conference as well as from the Committee's work.

His delegation hoped that agreement would be reached with regard to the two subparagraphs marked with asterisks and reserved the right to state its views on that issue if necessary.

His delegation felt that it would be appropriate to include a closing paragraph, which should clearly reflect the actual state of international public opinion, i.e., that the idea of convening a conference enjoyed the widest support of Member States. He shared the view expressed by the representative of Peru that the closing paragraph should strike an optimistic note.

It was very important for the Committee to make a recommendation to the General Assembly on the extension of its mandate so that it could take further steps towards practical preparations for convening the conference.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) said that, as he understood it, the Argentine and Mexican delegations were proposing that contact and consultations with the nuclear-weapon States should continue after the Committee's current session had ended. However, the Committee would have adopted its report and thus completed its work, and the Chairman would have completed his official duties. Any subsequent contacts or consultations would therefore of necessity be unofficial.

The body of the report was acceptable to his delegation, as was the Chairman's suggestion concerning the use of foot-notes. The wording of the two closing paragraphs suggested by the Chairman also seemed acceptable. With regard to the first of those paragraphs, his delegation considered that the term "generally accepted" reflected the situation more accurately than the term "universally accepted".
Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina), speaking also on behalf of the Mexican delegation, expressed appreciation for the support given to the Argentine and Mexican proposal by the delegations of the Netherlands, Sweden, Czechoslovakia and Spain. He fully supported the suggestions and views of the Spanish representative.

Replying to the comments by the French representative, he observed that the wording of the suggestion set out in the second sentence of the proposed text was that approved by the Working Group and used in the penultimate paragraph of the report by the Chairman of the Working Group (A/AC.167/L.6). While he did not wish to enter into a discussion on the limitations of the Committee's mandate, he pointed out that one of the tasks entrusted to the Committee under General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) was to examine conditions for the realization of a world disarmament conference. The very fact that the Committee had been instructed to take such conditions into account proved that they were liable to fluctuation or modification. The Committee's duties would not be completed until the General Assembly had adopted a resolution on the basis of its report, and the Chairman, Rapporteur and members of the Committee and the Working Group would have a very important role to play in the meetings of the First Committee as well as in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly. In that context, the Working Group's suggestion would be a useful tool for promoting the cause of a world disarmament conference.

The CHAIRMAN said that the usefulness of the suggestion had not been challenged. The point raised by the French representative was of a juridical nature; the question, as he saw it, was whether the non-existent Chairman of a non-existent Committee could be asked to take any action.

Mr. de SOTO (Peru) proposed that the second Brazilian amendment to the third subparagraph of paragraph 14 should be subamended to read: "development, particularly of developing countries".
(Mr. de Soto, Peru)

Turning to the question of the closing paragraph or paragraphs, he reiterated his delegation's view that the report should close on an optimistic note which would enable the General Assembly to make further progress in its consideration of the issue. In that connexion, he fully supported the proposal made by the representative of Spain concerning a last closing paragraph. That paragraph should, in his view, be preceded by a paragraph which reflected the views expressed in the Working Group and Committee and which struck an optimistic note.

Mr. YANGO (Philippines) said that there seemed to be general agreement in the Committee that the Chairman should continue his contacts and consultations with the nuclear-weapon States with a view to overcoming the obstacles discussed that morning at the Committee's informal closed meeting. He fully supported the Chairman's suggestion concerning the use of foot-notes in paragraph 15.

His delegation considered that the draft report should contain a closing paragraph with a general statement of the Committee's views in order to show that progress had been made towards the convening of a world disarmament conference. However, it recognized the difficulties which had been encountered by the Working Group in devising a formula that would be acceptable to all. In that connexion, it considered that the suggestions made by the representatives of Spain and Peru were both pertinent and interesting and deserved favourable consideration. It was also ready to accept the text suggested by the Chairman, subject perhaps to some drafting changes. The text suggested by the Spanish representative could perhaps be inserted in the draft report after that suggested by the Chairman.

The juridical point raised in connexion with the Argentine and Mexican proposal was well taken. However, the contents of the first two sentences of the suggested text should not give rise to any juridical difficulties and might appropriately be incorporated in the closing paragraph or paragraphs.

His delegation had no difficulty in accepting the amendments proposed by the Brazilian delegation.

The draft report was to be commended for its layout and its balanced nature. As early as the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, his delegation had proposed that the opportunities of convening a world disarmament conference should be explored. It was therefore extremely important that the Committee should succeed in adopting its report. The Chairman should be given a full mandate to conduct all necessary negotiations concerning paragraph 15 and the closing paragraph or paragraphs.
Mr. SCALABRE (France) said he agreed with the Chairman's view that juridical difficulties were created by the suggestion that there should be continued application of methods and means used until now for helping to clear the way towards the initiation of the preparation for convening a WDC. The suggestion had obviously been motivated by the desire of the members of the Working Group to achieve further results, and he was certain that the Bureau and members of the Committee would continue their efforts after the session had ended. He was not opposed to such initiatives, which might prove very fruitful, but wished to point out that, in the final analysis, the mandate had been entrusted to the Committee as a whole, rather than to individual members. If work continued after the adoption of the report, there would have to be a fourth session, because, presumably, whoever carried out the work would have to report on it to the Committee. The rules and procedures of the United Nations system clearly precluded any further action by the Committee after it had adopted its report to the General Assembly. He would welcome the views of the Office of Legal Affairs on the question, but in the meantime he was compelled to maintain his reservations.

Mr. SNID (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation supported the proposal submitted by the delegations of Argentina and Mexico concerning the continuation of consultations between the Chairman and the Permanent Representatives of the nuclear Powers. He believed that the juridical difficulties mentioned by the French representative were by no means insurmountable, and he was convinced that it would be most desirable for the Chairman to continue his efforts. With regard to the contents of the concluding paragraphs, his delegation agreed with the views expressed by the Algerian delegation at the informal meeting. It could accept the first of the two draft paragraphs submitted by the Chairman and would prefer the term "universally accepted". However, it had some misgivings about the second draft paragraph and would need further time to study it. It would prefer to have the adverb "widely" in that paragraph either deleted or replaced by a more flexible term.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina) said he believed that it was possible to devise a formula which would make the proposal of the Mexican and Argentine delegations acceptable from a legal standpoint. Accordingly, he wished to suggest /...
(Mr. Pret Cay, Argentina)

that the first sentence of the text should be replaced by "The Chairman of the Working Group, in an oral report contained in document A/AC.167/L.6, submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee ...", followed by the views of the members of the Working Group on the need for continued consultations.

Mr. Thompson-Flores (Brazil) said that his delegation's first amendment to paragraph 14 of document A/AC.167/L.5 related to the third subparagraph and not the second. In view of the Rapporteur's explanations on paragraph 14, his delegation would be willing to substitute the word "should" for the word "must". His delegation could also accept the subamendment suggested by the Peruvian delegation to the third subparagraph of paragraph 14, on the understanding that the last phrase would read "economic development, particularly of developing countries". His delegation could also accept the new subparagraph proposed for insertion in paragraph 14 by the Japanese delegation which read: "The holding of a WDC should not impair nor result in slowing down or interfering with the efforts already under way through existing channels of negotiation in the field of disarmament and arms control." Finally, his delegation could accept the draft text submitted by the Chairman for the closing paragraphs and would prefer the formulation "generally accepted".

Mr. Logan (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was also satisfied with the concluding paragraphs proposed by the Chairman and, like the French delegation, would prefer the phrase "generally accepted". However, his delegation had some difficulty with the amendment proposed by the Argentine delegation. His delegation fully realized that the Chairman of the Working Group was authorized to transmit to the Ad Hoc Committee the suggestion which had been made by the two delegations. That was precisely why the penultimate paragraph of the report of the Chairman of the Working Group appeared as it did, but that there was no reason why it should be included in the Committee's report to the General Assembly.

Mr. Tulinov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation supported the proposal and amendment thereto submitted by the delegations of Argentina and Mexico. It also supported the Spanish proposal concerning the last closing paragraph. However, in view of the discussions at the informal
meeting, his delegation wished to propose that in paragraph 15, after each subparagraph, there should be a foot-note listing the countries which had expressed views and indicating where the appropriate references could be found, rather than the device suggested by the Chairman, i.e. brackets at the end of each subparagraph containing the words "For further information, see views expressed by ... in document ...".

Mr. Scalabre (France) said that he saw little or no difference between the use of foot-notes, as suggested by the Soviet delegation, and the use of brackets, as suggested by the Chairman. However, he felt that the Chairman's proposal would be more acceptable to the States which had been absent.

The CHAIRMAN noted that some progress had been achieved earlier on the subparagraph preceded by an asterisk in paragraph 15. In view of the discussions which had taken place at the informal meeting, he felt that section (b) of the subparagraph preceded by an asterisk in paragraph 13 could be reworded to read: "to end all forms of military presence on the territory of other countries by those concerned". If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished him to proceed with the negotiations on that basis.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN, turning to the amendments suggested by Brazil, said that they appeared to be acceptable to the Committee, account being taken of the subamendment to the third subparagraph of paragraph 14 whereby the word "must" would be replaced by the word "should" as well as of the subamendment proposed by Peru to the third subparagraph of paragraph 14.

Turning to the question of a conclusion, he asked whether his own unofficial suggestion would be acceptable, on the understanding that the words "generally accepted" were used rather than the words "universally accepted".

Mr. Tulinov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied that the Chairman's suggestion was unacceptable to his delegation.

The CHAIRMAN accordingly noted that a consensus had not yet been reached on a final paragraph.

/...
Mr. de Soto (Peru) said, with regard to the Chairman's suggestion, that he preferred the words "universally accepted"; adoption of the words "generally accepted" would be a step backwards and would alter his delegation's views on the remainder of the Chairman's text.

On the other hand, since the Chairman's suggestion was unacceptable to the Soviet Union, consideration might be given to the proposal made by the representative of Spain earlier in the meeting.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) said that he could accept the Spanish proposal and suggested that it should replace the proposal made by the delegations of Argentina and Mexico.

Mr. CARRANCO AVILA (Mexico) said that, in order to reach an accommodation with the United Kingdom and France, the delegation of Argentina and his own delegation wished to suggest that an additional section entitled "Work of the Working Group" should be inserted in the draft report after section II. That would clarify the reason why the two delegations had made their original proposal. The new section could begin with paragraph 10 of the draft report, followed by the paragraph proposed by Argentina and Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would consult with the two absent nuclear-weapon States with regard to the three proposals made by Argentina and Mexico, Japan and Spain respectively.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina) said that his delegation had doubts with regard to the Japanese proposal, since the world disarmament conference should be a forum where all States worked together, in contrast to the existing bilateral channels of negotiation.

Mr. OSHIMA (Japan) pointed out that the views set forth in his delegation's proposal had already been made clear in its past statements and, furthermore, that those views had been expressed by certain other delegations. However, he would be able to elaborate on his proposal at a later stage if the representative of Argentina so desired.

Mr. SCALABRE (France), referring to the Japanese proposal, said that his delegation had reservations concerning the phrase "existing channels of negotiation". /...
Mr. van der KLAAUW (Netherlands) said, with reference to the Japanese proposal, that since such a view had been expressed by one or more Governments, it should be incorporated in the Committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that it might be more appropriate to include that proposal in paragraph 15 rather than in paragraph 14.

As to the proposal by Argentina and Mexico, he wished, in his personal capacity, to suggest a simple compromise solution which would make it a little more general: the last sentence should be deleted and the following wording added to the second sentence: ", particularly by maintaining contact with the nuclear Powers in order to explore informally the possibility of reaching agreement on the solution of some, at least, of the disarmament problems, especially those most frequently mentioned in debates".

That amendment could apply to the period of the forthcoming session of the General Assembly, in which some delegations present in the Committee would wish to undertake negotiations for the purpose of preparing a draft resolution. It could also apply in the event that a new Committee was established to deal with the question of a world disarmament conference. Such an approach would avoid the legal stumbling blocks and should satisfy the delegations of Argentina and Mexico.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) and Mr. LOGAN (United Kingdom) said that they could support the Chairman's suggestion.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina) and Mr. CARRANCO AVILA (Mexico) said that they would consider the Chairman's suggestion and would state their views at the following meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.
CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (A/AC.167/L.5) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN informed the members of the Committee that the negotiations undertaken since earlier that morning with the delegations of the nuclear-weapon Powers which were not attending the meetings of the Committee were continuing. One of the members of the Iranian delegation, who was fully acquainted with the different positions, was currently holding conversations with one of those delegations in order to attempt to find an acceptable formula. The representative of Turkey had also just proposed a new text for the final paragraph which had been developed following consultations with several delegations and which had been immediately transmitted to the delegations of the two nuclear-weapon Powers concerned.

The Committee had before it two different wordings for the closing paragraph and a draft text proposed by the Spanish delegation designed to replace that paragraph or to be added to it. The situation was the following: some members of the Committee and one of the nuclear-weapon Powers did not accept the text which he himself had attempted to elaborate in order to reflect all points of view. The Chinese delegation had rejected both texts but the negotiations would be continued until the end of the current session: if it then proved impossible to arrive at any agreement, that would be stated in the report. The text which he had proposed had, at first glance, seemed acceptable to the United States delegation, but the latter would not be able to give a definitive reply until it had received instructions from its Government.

The Chinese delegation would have no objections to the Spanish draft text being placed at the end of the report but the United States had made it known unofficially that the draft text appeared to raise some difficulties. The Committee would be informed that afternoon of the result of the consultation which had been undertaken. The United States would then give a final reply regarding the modifications proposed by the Chairman, but even if that reply were favourable,
the attitude adopted by two nuclear-weapon Powers gave little hope that an agreement would be reached on the text of any closing paragraph whatsoever.

Other wordings had also been proposed the day before. Even though they did not relate to questions of substance, they nevertheless had to be approved by the two nuclear-weapon Powers which were not participating in the Committee's deliberations. He invited the members of the Committee to make known their position on those proposals so that he could, that same evening, communicate the complete text of the report to the two Powers concerned.

Mr. ABDULJALIL (Indonesia) expressed his delegation's appreciation of the draft report prepared by the Working Group and paid a tribute to the Chairman for the competence with which he had guided the deliberations and the efforts he was making in order to arrive at an agreement with the great Powers. There was no point in restating his delegation's views which had been clearly set forth on several occasions, particularly in a letter to the Secretary-General contained in document A/AC.167/L.2/Add.6.

It now seemed clear that the difficulties of the task assigned to the Working Group had been underestimated. In order to comply with the decision of the General Assembly, the report should be prepared on the basis of consensus and that explained both the care required in its drafting and the vagueness and ambiguity of some of its terms. Despite the difficulties encountered, the Working Group had succeeded in categorizing a wide variety of opinions put forward and had emphasized the problems of convening the conference. The main difficulty was the opposition of two of the nuclear-weapon Powers which held that the convening of such a conference could not at the present time achieve concrete results. While their position could be appreciated, it could not be upheld without accepting an indefinite postponement of a decision which was in accordance with the wishes of world public opinion, as was shown by the resolution unanimously adopted by the General Assembly at its previous session. It must be recognized that only the international community as a whole could consider a problem of such importance and show the political will to act together. If a single great Power refused to participate in that undertaking, the Conference would be deprived of any significance and would have only a limited scope. His delegation therefore hoped...
(Mr. Abduljalil, Indonesia)

that the two nuclear-weapon Powers concerned would reconsider their position and concur with the widely held view that disarmament issues should be tackled on an urgent basis. Indonesia therefore believed that consultations between the Chairman and the great Powers should be on a continuing basis in order to reach a general agreement on the convening of a world disarmament conference in a relatively short time. It was also imperative that, in its conclusions, the Committee should make its views and suggestions known to the General Assembly.

For its part, his delegation had adopted a flexible approach and would agree to compromise proposals which would facilitate the convening of the conference. If the work of the Committee enabled the General Assembly to take further action on the question, it would have fulfilled its mandate.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee of the latest results of the consultations held. The Chinese delegation had accepted the proposals concerning paragraphs 13 and 15 which had been submitted the previous day. It also accepted the proposal by Spain subject, however, to the deletion of the word "evolving". On the other hand, it categorically rejected the draft text prepared by Turkey in agreement with other delegations. Finally, it agreed in principle to study the draft text which the Chairman had submitted to the Committee the previous day but it could not accept all the terms and would communicate its views on the matter later. He had also requested his colleague in the Iranian delegation, to whom he had entrusted the negotiations, to contact the United States delegation.

Mr. ELIAS (Rapporteur), speaking as the representative of Spain, asked for clarification regarding the proposal submitted by his delegation. He had understood that the United States felt that the paragraph might raise difficulties and that a final reply would be given that afternoon, that China had not raised any objection providing that the word "evolving" was deleted, and that France had submitted some observations but had not raised any objection. In those circumstances, he did not see why the Chairman had given the impression that even if the United States reply were favourable there would be no point in considering the text in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN said that he was surprised at having been misunderstood. He had merely said that the first reaction of the United States, which was quite unofficial, had appeared rather negative but that the Committee would consider the proposal of the Spanish delegation, it being understood that if a delegation opposed the inclusion of that paragraph, it would not appear at the end of the report.
Mr. OSHIMA (Japan) recalled that his delegation had, the day before, submitted an amendment to the draft report which would add a new subparagraph to paragraph 14. The amendment read: "The holding of a WDC should not impair nor result in slowing down or interfering with the efforts already under way through existing channels of negotiation in the field of disarmament and arms control."

In reply to the question raised at the previous meeting by the representative of Argentina, he would attempt to clarify the scope of his proposal without entering into a substantive debate since, as the representative of the Netherlands had rightly pointed out the day before, the task of the members of the Committee was merely to reflect in the report all views expressed by Governments as accurately and faithfully as possible. His delegation had already stated on several occasions that the convening of a WDC and the establishment of a preparatory committee for such a conference should in no way delay the negotiation of concrete disarmament measures in the existing forums, nor should it prejudice the functions of those forums (A/AC.167/L.4, p. 126). Since that opinion was shared by other delegations, particularly those of Australia and Canada (A/AC.167/L.4, p. 6 and p. 10), it seemed justified that it should appear in the Committee's report.

His delegation believed that the most suitable place to include the subparagraph in the report would be paragraph 14. That paragraph dealt with the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference, centering either on their hopes or their fears; that was precisely the problem dealt with in the Japanese proposal. However, he indicated that his delegation would not be opposed to the inclusion of the new subparagraph in paragraph 15 concerning the conditions for the realization of a world disarmament conference. He also hoped that if, as the Chairman had suggested, foot-notes were added to paragraph 15 mentioning the countries which supported the views contained in each subparagraph, some difficulties could be resolved, particularly those raised by the French delegation with regard to certain terms used in the Japanese proposal.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) said that he wished to clarify his delegation's position. It had no objection to the inclusion in the report of the draft...
(Mr. Scalabre, France)

paragraph submitted by the Spanish delegation, or to the contents of paragraphs 13 and 15; it had, in fact, supported some of the suggestions made by the Chairman on that subject. With regard to the Japanese proposal, he had simply said that while his delegation was not opposed to the inclusion of those few lines, that in no way implied that its attitude towards the work of the Geneva Disarmament Committee and the way in which it approached the question of disarmament had changed. As to the proposal of Argentina and Mexico, he had made some observations regarding it but he was not absolutely opposed to the text. The previous day the Committee had worked out a formula which his delegation had accepted and which the delegations of Argentina and Mexico were to study. The new text which they had just circulated seemed interesting and it should be possible to reach agreement, taking into account, however, certain counter-proposals which his delegation intended to submit. Nevertheless, his delegation did not wish to delay the work of the Committee in any way and if it proved impossible to reach agreement it could definitely not be held responsible.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina) thanked the Japanese representative for the explanations he had provided on the new subparagraph which he proposed to add to paragraph 14: his delegation would prefer to see it included in paragraph 13 but would concur with the general view in order not to complicate the work of the Committee.

Mr. CARRANCO AVILA (Mexico) said that the Argentine representative, on behalf of the delegations of Argentina and Mexico, had submitted a paragraph containing a suggestion which the Working Group, composed of 10 member States, had authorized its Chairman to transmit to the Ad Hoc Committee, composed of 40 member States. It was therefore an internal suggestion of the Ad Hoc Committee which two representatives, who were not concerned, now wished to modify. The delegations of Argentina and Mexico found it hard to believe that those delegations were authorized to alter the wording of that suggestion, and it would be impossible, at the present stage of the deliberations, to cancel the authorization given by the Working Group to its Chairman to transmit that suggestion to the Ad Hoc Committee. That was a thing of the past.

/...
The purpose of the paragraph in question was to give an account, in the Committee's draft report, of something which had occurred in the Working Group, of which the Committee was aware and which was mentioned in document A/AC.167/L.6. From the legal point of view, it was incomprehensible that any delegation should wish to alter the content of that suggestion. The suggestion, which concerned the ways and means of clearing the way towards the initiation of the preparation for convening a world disarmament conference, could either be accepted or rejected. It could not and should not be viewed as either a decision, a resolution or a formal acceptance, still less as an obligatory and coercive measure which was liable to have undesirable consequences.

The delegations of Argentina and Mexico had agreed on the text of a new paragraph 11 which would read: "The Chairman of the Working Group in a verbal report reproduced in document A/AC.167/L.6, introduced to the Ad Hoc Committee document A/AC.167/L.5 containing a draft report prepared by the Working Group." A new paragraph 12, which would begin with the words: "The Ad Hoc Committee, at the suggestion of its Chairman, accepted ..." and then follow the text prepared by the Chairman, would also be included in the text.

The CHAIRMAN informed members of the Committee that the text proposed by Mexico read: "The Chairman of the Working Group, in a verbal report reproduced in document A/AC.167/L.6, introduced to the Ad Hoc Committee document A/AC.167/L.5 containing a draft report prepared by the Working Group. The Ad Hoc Committee, at the suggestion of its Chairman, took note of the suggestion that there should be continued application of methods and means used until now for helping to clear the way towards the initiation of the preparation for convening a world disarmament conference, particularly the contacts maintained by the Chairman and members of the Ad Hoc Committee on a personal basis with the nuclear Powers in order to explore the possibility of reaching agreement on the solution of some, at least, of the disarmament problems most frequently mentioned in debates and with a view to reaching agreement on the question of convening a world disarmament conference."

Mr. LOGAN (United Kingdom) said that he was absolutely opposed to the idea that his delegation would not have the right to make comments on the
(Mr. Logan, United Kingdom)

paragraph which the Argentine delegation proposed to incorporate into the Committee's report. His delegation, which was participating in the work of the Committee in conformity with operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), had not had official knowledge of the draft report until some 10 days earlier. Since then the report had been and still was subject to further alterations and that was why the Chairman was negotiating with the representatives of delegations which were also participating in the work of the Committee pursuant to paragraph 3 of the General Assembly resolution. It would be very strange if only France and the United Kingdom were unable to comment on the amendments which had been made that week.

With regard to the text which had just been read out by the Chairman, his delegation was completely happy with the changes which had been made in its wording. It particularly welcomed the replacement of the words "accepted" by "took note of", because it felt that the Committee's mandate only empowered it to examine the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference. It also welcomed the insertion of the words "on a personal basis" in the second paragraph, because, like the French delegation, it was concerned to know what the precise status of the Chairman and Committee would be once the Committee's report had been adopted.

With regard to the Japanese proposal, he was entirely favourable to the inclusion of the new subparagraph which had been suggested.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) endorsed the remarks made by the United Kingdom delegation regarding the proposal of Argentina and Mexico, which seemed acceptable in its new form.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina) associated himself with the statement made by the Mexican representative and thanked the Chairman for the efforts he had made to find a common ground for agreement.

With regard to replacement of the words "accepted" by "took note of", he observed that two members of the Committee had opposed the original wording, whilst the other members, with the exception of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Czechoslovakia, the Netherlands and Sweden, had not commented on it.
The CHAIRMAN said that the Japanese proposal still had to be considered. The United Kingdom and French delegations had already stated their opinions on it and he would like to ascertain the views of the other members of the Committee so as to be able to circulate a final text to those members who were not present.

Mr. LENNKH (Austria) said that the Japanese proposal seemed acceptable to the extent that it was related to the views and suggestions expressed by Governments.

Mr. MERENNE (Belgium) said that his country's position depended both on whether a world disarmament conference was well prepared, which seemed assured, and, in particular, on whether the nuclear-weapon Powers would participate. His delegation was prepared to accept the inclusion of a concluding paragraph in the Ad Hoc Committee's draft report, but it seemed difficult to talk of disarmament without the collaboration of the nuclear-weapon Powers. His delegation would therefore be satisfied if, failing agreement among the five nuclear-weapon Powers concerning that concluding paragraph, the report was submitted to the General Assembly without a conclusion.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain), supported by Mr. van der KLAAUW (Netherlands) and Mr. BRUCE (Canada), said he considered the Japanese proposal acceptable. He suggested that it should be included in paragraph 14 of the report concerning the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference.

Mr. OSHIMA (Japan) thanked the delegations which had approved his proposal. He felt that it would be best to leave it to the Bureau to decide where the proposed subparagraph should be included.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Bureau would indeed consider that question.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.
15th meeting

Thursday, 12 September 1974,
at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran)

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (A/AC.167/L.5 and Corr.1 (English only)) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN announced that he had not yet received replies from the two nuclear-weapon States absent from the Committee concerning their views on a final paragraph. He therefore suggested that, in the meantime, the Committee might consider whether to adopt the Japanese text and, if so, where in the report it should be placed. Delegations should also feel free to raise any other questions related to the draft report. The Committee might then adjourn until the following afternoon in order to adopt the final version of the report. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed with his suggestion.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the delegation of Japan had agreed to leave the placing of its text in the report to the officers of the Committee. Accordingly, he wished to suggest, after discussing the matter with the Rapporteur, that it might best be placed after the second subparagraph of paragraph 14. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the Japanese text, and place it in the position that he suggested.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN further announced that a paper was being circulated containing the suggested wording for an explanatory note to be included after each subparagraph of paragraph 15; it would read as follows: "(For more precise information, see the views expressed by ... as contained in the annex to this report)." Another paper also being circulated contained lists of the States holding the views set forth in each subparagraph; the lists would be inserted in the space provided in the explanatory note.

He requested delegations to study the lists and to inform the Secretariat during the coming week if they felt the need to make any amendments to them before they were incorporated in the report.

/.../
Mr. LOGAN (United Kingdom) suggested that, in the new text for paragraph 12, a reference should be added to make it clear that the suggestion referred to in that paragraph had been taken from the penultimate paragraph of the oral report of the Chairman of the Working Group (A/AC.167/L.6).

Mr. CARRANCO AVILA (Mexico) felt that the Committee should not take note in the report of a suggestion whose text was contained in another document unless the text was also reproduced in the report.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that, as a compromise, the words "the suggestion" in the new text of paragraph 12 might be replaced by the words "a suggestion". It was so decided.

Mr. de SOTO (Peru) suggested that a formula might be devised that would make it clear that paragraphs 13-17 of the draft report did not necessarily reflect the views of the whole Committee but were rather a summary of the sometimes contradictory views of individual States.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that paragraph 13 differed from the following paragraphs in that it represented a consensus of the whole Committee. On the other hand, the following paragraphs represented the views and suggestions expressed by Governments and did not necessarily represent a consensus of the Committee. That was already clear from the introduction to each paragraph. Consequently, further explanations were not needed.

Finally, he said that, before the next meeting, he would consult with the two nuclear-weapon States absent from the Committee concerning the latest amendments on which the Committee had agreed.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.
16th meeting

Friday, 13 September 1974, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran)

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE (A/AC.167/L.5 and Corr.1; Conference Room Paper No. 3) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN said that in the time available to it the Secretariat had been able to produce the full text of the revised draft report in English only as a conference room paper (No. 3) and to provide the texts of the amendments in the other working languages as well. The paragraphs of the draft had been renumbered as a result of the insertion of two additional paragraphs. He proposed that the Committee should consider the early sections of the revised draft report chapter by chapter.

Chapter I

Chapter I was adopted.

Chapter II

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the ellipses in paragraphs 5 and 7. The figure "16" would be inserted in the first line of paragraph 5. With regard to the last line of paragraph 7, if representatives of the two non-participating nuclear-weapon States did not arrive by the end of the current meeting, they would be mentioned as having maintained contact with the Committee's Chairman. He had consulted the delegations of those two States with regard to the new paragraphs, namely 11 and 12. One State had agreed to the insertion of the paragraphs; the other had not yet replied. He had sent a message saying that if the latter State did not indicate its views by the end of the current meeting, he would, in accordance with custom, presume that it agreed.

Chapter II was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should consider the rest of the draft report paragraph by paragraph.

/...
Chapter III
Paragraph 15

Paragraph 15 was adopted.

Paragraph 16

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that a new subparagraph had been introduced as the third subparagraph.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) stated, with regard to the third subparagraph that its acceptance by his delegation did not imply any change in its reservations regarding disarmament negotiations and the forums in which those negotiations took place. His delegation considered that the General Assembly and the Security Council had a special competence in the matter of disarmament which should not be questioned. It would not oppose the adoption of the draft report but wished its opinion, which it had expressed on a number of occasions, to be reflected in the summary record.

Mr. de SOTO (Peru) objected to the use in the Spanish text of the subparagraph of the word "lentificar", which was a barbarism.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina) and Mr. ZULETA (Colombia) concurred with that view.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain), Rapporteur, said that the Secretariat had pointed out that the word "lentificar" was given as a neologism in the supplement to the Diccionario de la Real Academia Española. He agreed, however, that it was not as accurate as "demorar", by which it would accordingly be replaced.

Paragraph 16 was adopted.

Paragraph 17

The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the sentence which appeared in brackets at the end of each subparagraph would contain the appropriate list of countries. Delegations had been requested to check by the end of the following week, the accuracy of the lists which had been circulated.
Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia) requested that his country's name should be added to the list for the seventh subparagraph.

Mr. ABDULJALIL (Indonesia) inquired whether the lists would be distributed to other Member States.

The CHAIRMAN said that the report would be generally available when it appeared the following week. Further observations by Member States could appear in an addendum to the final version of the report.

Paragraph 17 was adopted.

Paragraph 18

The CHAIRMAN noted that the amendments to paragraph 18 had been those submitted by the Brazilian delegation to which the Committee had agreed with some slight modifications.

Paragraph 18 was adopted.

Paragraph 19

Paragraph 19 was adopted.

Paragraph 20

Paragraph 20 was adopted.

Final paragraph

The CHAIRMAN said that the members of the Committee and the delegations of the States referred to in operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) had been unable to reach agreement on the inclusion of a final paragraph or paragraphs. It had therefore not been possible to proceed by consensus. There had been one divergent opinion on the text proposed by the Rapporteur.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain), Rapporteur, said he had stated at the 13th meeting that he was putting forward his proposal in an attempt to reconcile divergent
views regarding the continuation of efforts to clear the way for the beginning of preparatory work on convening a world disarmament conference. Since, however, there had been no consensus on his proposal, he would withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN expressed his appreciation of the Rapporteur's proposal and of the spirit in which it had been made.

Mr. de SOTO (Peru) deplored the fact that it had been impossible to achieve consensus on a final substantive paragraph reflecting the almost unanimous acceptance of a world disarmament conference. When the Spanish proposal had first been submitted, he had expressed the view that it should be accompanied by another paragraph in order to conclude the report on an optimistic note, but the paragraph on its own would at least afford the General Assembly an opportunity to take action on the basis of a consensus of the Ad Hoc Committee. The text, which said that "The Ad Hoc Committee considers that it is still necessary to study the evolving conditions for convening a world disarmament conference", seemed to represent the minimum that could be expected after the General Assembly had unanimously accepted at its twenty-eighth session the idea of convening a conference and the Ad Hoc Committee had spent a year studying the matter. Delegations might oppose the paragraph for a variety of reasons; some might oppose it because they did not wish the idea of a world disarmament conference to be pursued further and others because they felt that the wording of the paragraph was not strong enough. He appealed to those who were generally in favour of a final paragraph not to be too meticulous about questions of emphasis. With regard to delegations holding a contrary view, he preferred to believe that they might be prevailed upon to accept the general feeling in favour of a final paragraph and would not be so adamant in their opposition as to prevent a consensus from being reached.

The CHAIRMAN said that seven members of the Committee had not agreed with the language of the paragraph proposed by the Rapporteur. One of the States referred to in operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) had also opposed the paragraph. There was therefore no consensus on the matter.
Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia) inquired whether any member of the Committee was totally opposed to the idea of a final paragraph, whatever the text. If there were no such members, the Committee, which was the master of its own procedure, could, if it chose, introduce a final paragraph. It might be inferred from the fact that a number of suggestions for a final paragraph had been circulated that there was no objection to it in principle. If, however, the objection was to a final paragraph as such, his delegation considered that the opinion voiced by the Peruvian representative might be accommodated elsewhere in the report. He wondered whether it might be useful to suspend the meeting for consultations in an attempt to achieve a consensus among those present.

The CHAIRMAN said that when he had begun negotiations the great majority of members of the Committee and some delegations of States referred to in operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) had not been opposed in principle to a final paragraph. However, one of the latter group of States had opposed the inclusion of any of the proposed variants and there had been no consensus among the remaining delegations as to the choice of a text. Fresh negotiations had taken place on the paragraph proposed by the Rapporteur. A number of members of the Committee had considered that it was inadequate by itself but that it could be accepted if another paragraph was added. Some delegations had changed their position; in brief, there had been no consensus on the text of the final paragraph and the Rapporteur had withdrawn his proposed text.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina) said he wished to propose a formula based on the Spanish proposal which, instead of serving as a final paragraph, might be inserted as a further subparagraph of paragraph 16. The formula would read: "It is still considered necessary to study the evolving conditions for convening a world disarmament conference."

Mr. de SOTO (Peru) observed that the Committee was hampered by the fact that it was a "pluridimensional" body which had to function at three different levels of consultation among members, non-member participants and the absent nuclear-weapon States.
He wished to know whether those States that had objected to the former Spanish proposal were participating nuclear-weapon States or absent nuclear-weapon States. If they belonged to the former category, he hoped that the delegations concerned would state their objections. Since the Spanish proposal had been withdrawn, he wished to reintroduce it as the Peruvian proposal in the hope that a consensus could be reached. The text of the proposal could either form a final paragraph or appear elsewhere in the report.

The CHAIRMAN replied that objections to the former Spanish proposal had been raised both by members of the Committee and by one of the participating nuclear-weapon States.

Mr. van der KLAAUW (Netherlands) said that it would be wrong to include the new Peruvian proposal in the body of the report as a view expressed by a Government: it was not an official view of a Government but simply a suggestion made in the Committee. On the other hand, although he had doubts as to the inclusion of that proposal as a final paragraph, he would not oppose it.

Mr. OSHIMA (Japan) said that, while his delegation viewed with sympathy the desire of some delegations to have a final paragraph in the report, the absence of a consensus made it very difficult. However, as a possible compromise solution he wished to propose the inclusion, either in paragraph 12 or as a closing paragraph, of the following text: "The Ad Hoc Committee took note of the suggestion, on the proposal of its Chairman, that it would still be necessary to study the conditions for convening a world disarmament conference."

Mr. BENHMAIL (Algeria) wished to state again that without a final paragraph the report was unfinished. He was therefore proposing the following compromise formula as a final paragraph: "The Ad Hoc Committee considers that, although the idea of convening a world disarmament conference is widely accepted, it is still necessary to study the matter further."

Mr. JED (Yugoslavia) suggested that a consensus might still be salvaged by placing some kind of final paragraph in the consensus part of the report, namely chapter I or chapter II. His delegation, for its part, would prefer the
(Mr. Job, Yugoslavia)

Algerian proposal. If some delegations found it unacceptable, however, he wished to propose the following formula: "The Ad Hoc Committee considers that it is necessary to study further and keep under constant review the evolving conditions for convening a world disarmament conference."

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that all the new proposals would entail further negotiations with the two absent nuclear-weapon States before any such formula could be incorporated in the report. He doubted whether it would be possible to obtain their agreement before the end of the meeting.

Mr. TAYLHARD (Venezuela) drew attention to paragraph 19 (d), which constituted a conclusion as drawn by one delegation. He felt that, in order to counterbalance that view, it should also be possible to include the view of the majority of delegations that it was still necessary to study the conditions that might eventually be conducive to the convening of a world disarmament conference.

Mr. MAGLIUOLO (Italy) recalled that, during the drafting of the report, the members of the Working Group and particularly his own delegation, had explored every possibility of reaching a compromise formula for a final paragraph, but to no avail. Renewed efforts were now being made in the Committee itself; yet, however praiseworthy such efforts might be, they seemed to be doomed to failure, since, given the need to reach a consensus on the report, even a single delegation could block the adoption of any particular paragraph. That limitation had been applied strictly even in connexion with the inclusion in the report of a summary of the views of a particular State. The failure to respect the normal practice of permitting the State concerned to decide how its views were summarized in the report was not due to a lack of goodwill but rather to the politically delicate exercise in which the Committee was engaged.

His delegation took the view that, by preparing the report, even without a final paragraph, the Committee had already taken a positive step in discharging its task; the situation compared very favourably with that of a year earlier. The fact that the Chairman had been able to open negotiations with the two absent nuclear Powers was a considerable step forward. While he understood the impatience of certain delegations to see the Committee move faster, the report was an
objective one which he hoped would enable the General Assembly to evaluate the possibility of making further progress towards convening a world disarmament conference.

Mr. de Soto (Peru) had no objection to the Algerian proposal. As to the former Spanish proposal, which his own delegation had since reintroduced, he appealed through the Chairman to the representatives of the participating nuclear-weapon States to indicate their objections. It would appear that, in their view, it was not necessary to study the conditions for convening a world disarmament conference - a view that he found quite surprising.

The Chairman observed that it was for the delegations concerned to state their views; if they did not wish to do so, he could not compel them to.

Mr. Prat Gay (Argentina) said that he could accept the Algerian proposal, the former Spanish proposal reintroduced by Peru, or the Japanese proposal. He suggested that the Chairman should ascertain the views of the two absent nuclear-weapon States with regard to the Algerian and Japanese proposals. If neither of those alternatives was acceptable, the report should be adopted as it stood.

Mr. Tulinov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation could accept the Algerian proposal; if it was unacceptable to some delegations, however, he could accept the Yugoslav proposal.

Mr. Scalabre (France) said that the sentence originally proposed by the Spanish representative was acceptable to his delegation. Moreover, it seemed to be the only text on which the Committee could hope to obtain the agreement of both the absent nuclear-weapon States. The sentence proposed by the Algerian representative would be acceptable to his delegation only if the phrase "in which all the nuclear Powers would participate" was added after the word "conference".

Mr. Logar (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was quite satisfied with the sentence originally proposed by the Spanish representative, either with or without the adjective "evolving", and would have no objection to its inclusion in chapter II of the report. It would also be prepared to accept the Japanese proposal. As far as the Algerian proposal was concerned, however, it would not be
able to accept any formula which made no reference to the conditions which, in its view, would have to be satisfied for a World Disarmament Conference to be held.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether there was any objection to the sentence originally proposed by the Spanish delegation and subsequently reintroduced by the Peruvian delegation.

Mr. TULINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation would have wished the report to include an optimistic summary and analysis of the views expressed during the discussions held in the Committee and the Working Group. If a closing paragraph was to be included, he would be prepared to consider the wording proposed by the Spanish representative. However, in view of the difficulties which the Committee had encountered in its attempts to devise a generally acceptable formula, it might be preferable to abandon that idea and to let the General Assembly draw its own conclusions from the report. His delegation regretted that it did not seem possible to reach agreement on that issue in spite of the constructive proposals made by the Algerian and Yugoslav representatives.

Mr. LUDWICZAK (Poland) said that the sentence proposed by the Spanish delegation would be acceptable for inclusion in a closing paragraph only if it was accompanied by another sentence or sentences which restored a proper balance by reflecting other aspects of the question considered by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether there was any objection to the Yugoslav proposal. He reminded the Committee that one of the absent nuclear-weapon States was opposed to the use of any adjective to qualify the word "conditions".

Mr. LOGAN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation would be prepared to accept the Yugoslav proposal if the phrase "and keep under constant review" was omitted.

Mr. TULINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it would be difficult for his delegation to accept any formula in which the word "conditions" was not qualified by an adjective such as "evolving" or "developing".

Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria) withdrew his proposal.
Mr. JOE (Yugoslavia) observed that the sentence originally proposed by the Spanish delegation had been intended as a closing paragraph of the report. It was in that context that one of the absent nuclear-weapon States had objected to the adjective "evolving". The delegation concerned might perhaps be prepared to reconsider its position in the light of the amendments proposed by his own delegation, taking into account the fact that the sentence would no longer form a closing paragraph but would be included in chapter II of the report.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the delegations of the two absent nuclear-weapon States had just been contacted by telephone. One of them had not been in a position at that time to comment on the Yugoslav proposal. The other had stated that it could accept inclusion of the sentence in any part of the report provided that the adjective "evolving" was deleted. If the adjective was retained, the delegation in question would have to consult its Government.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina) proposed that the Committee should adopt the draft report as a whole without any further changes.

Mr. de SOTO (Peru) considered that the issue was important enough to warrant further negotiations with the delegation concerned. Only one word was involved, and that delegation might be prevailed upon to withdraw its objection.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the delegation in question had agreed to accept the sentence originally proposed by the Spanish delegation only after lengthy negotiations and on the express condition that the word "evolving" would be deleted.

Mr. van der KLAAUW (Netherlands) supported the proposal by the Argentine representative. The question of further study could be taken up in the General Assembly when the Committee's report and any related draft resolutions were being discussed.

Mr. LOGAN (United Kingdom) said that, as Mr. de Soto had pointed out, only one word was at issue. He therefore proposed the omission of the words "the evolving" and the substitution of "contemporary".

Mr. BRUCE (Canada) said it seemed clear from the Chairman's remarks that any further negotiations on that specific point would have very little chance of succeeding. Consequently, he supported the Argentine proposal.
The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft report as a whole, as amended. It was so decided.

Mr. PRAT GAY (Argentina), Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia), Mr. DAYRELL DE LIMA (Brazil), Mr. TULINOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) and Mr. BENATIONAL (Algeria) expressed their delegations' appreciation for the untiring efforts made by the Chairman, Rapporteur and other officers of the Committee, thanks to whom it had been possible for the Committee to adopt its report by consensus and thus progress a step further towards achievement of the desired goal.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) joined with previous speakers in congratulating the Chairman and officers of the Committee. He paid a special tribute to the Chairman, thanks to whom satisfactory contact had been maintained with the two absent nuclear-weapon States.

Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia), Mr. ABDUDDJALIL (Indonesia), Mr. SIKAULU (Zambia), Mr. YANGO (Philippines) and Mr. de SOTO (Peru) said that their delegations, too, were fully appreciative of the very valuable work performed by the Chairman, Rapporteur and other officers of the Committee. They expressed regret that it had not been possible to reach agreement on a closing paragraph, which would have formed a valuable basis for future work.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain), Rapporteur, thanked the delegations which had expressed appreciation of the Working Group's efforts. Both the Committee and the Working Group had, in his view, done useful work which represented a step forward towards achievement of what had long been one of mankind's goals. To have perhaps contributed, however, slightly, to promoting the cause of mutual understanding and confidence was a source of great personal satisfaction to him.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee's report would no doubt assist the General Assembly in taking new decisions concerning the world disarmament conference which everyone hoped would be held one day. The conclusion which could be drawn from the Committee's deliberations over the past week was that progress on such difficult terrain could only be made step by step. Many of the obstacles which had arisen in respect of the Committee's report had been overcome.
Nevertheless, he considered that he had failed in his task since he had not been able to bring about agreement on the optimistic concluding paragraph which the majority of the Committee's members had wished to see included in the report. It had been demonstrated that, in the field with which the Committee was concerned, even a small adjective could be an insurmountable obstacle. He was confident, however, that the General Assembly would draw positive conclusions from the report and take the required decisions.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The CHAIRMAN declared the third session of the Ad Hoc Committee closed.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.