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6th meeting

Monday, 24 June 1974, at 11:15 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran)

OPENING OF THE SESSION

The CHAIRMAN declared open the second session of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN recalled that at its last session the Committee had requested the Secretariat to prepare a document summarizing the views and suggestions of Member States with regard to the World Disarmament Conference. That document was now before the Committee in Conference Room Paper No. 2. Owing to lack of time, it had not yet been translated into all the working languages and was therefore being circulated in the English version only. It should be emphasized that the document was merely a draft and not a definitive text, since it had seemed likely that some Governments would wish to expand upon or modify the statements of their views. Indeed, the German Democratic Republic and Algeria had requested the Secretariat to add a few paragraphs to the part of the summary concerning them; those were to be found in addenda 1 and 2 to Conference Room Paper No. 2.

Complying with the wish expressed by the Committee, he had contacted the representatives of nuclear weapon States which were not participating in the Committee's deliberations. They had affirmed their willingness to co-operate with the Committee in accordance with the invitation extended to them in General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), which, it should be recalled, had been adopted unanimously. They were, however, of the opinion that, having already stated their position at the twenty-eighth session of the Assembly, they had nothing to add for the time being; if they thought it necessary, they would provide further information in due course.

He proposed that the Committee should revert to a problem which had given rise to lengthy discussion at the 5th meeting, namely, the form of the list of participants. It had been decided to draw up a provisional list pending the
(The Chairman)

Committee's final decision in the matter. In the meantime, the Bureau had considered the problem and had arrived at the conclusion that if all points of view expressed were to be taken into account, there were two possible approaches: first, to draw up a list on which States would appear in alphabetical order, placing an asterisk after the names of States possessing nuclear weapons and participating in the Committee's work in accordance with paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII); secondly, to divide the over-all list of participants into three parts consisting, respectively, of the States members of the Committee referred to in paragraph 2 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII), the States referred to in paragraph 3 of that resolution and the States attending the Committee's meetings as observers.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that he saw no need to introduce the concept of "participation". It would be better simply to refer to members and States attending the Committee's meetings without making verbal distinctions.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) gave States possessing nuclear weapons the same rights as the designated members of the Committee. In point of fact, therefore, they were participating in the work of the Committee, and that was why the Bureau had proposed drawing up a list of "participants".

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) expressed confidence that the Bureau had studied the matter at length before deciding on the two approaches it had proposed. Although his delegation had already raised the matter at the Committee's first session, it would nevertheless like to suggest a third formula which, in its view, was both simple and in keeping with the provisions of the resolution 3183 (XXVIII), which made no mention of participants. Without introducing a new category of States which had not been envisaged in the resolution, it was possible to draw up a list which would include, in its first part, the list of designated States members of the Committee and, in its second part - whose heading he would leave it to the Bureau to devise - a list of the States referred to in paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII).

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) supported the proposal made by the representative of Mexico, whose views seemed to coincide with his own. The suggested formula would enable the Committee to avoid many pitfalls.
Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) also supported the Mexican proposal. Resolution 3183 (XXVIII) had placed in two separate paragraphs the 40 non-nuclear-weapon States which had been designated members of the Committee and the States possessing nuclear weapons, which had been invited to co-operate with the Committee. That distinction should be respected in the list of participants.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the difficulties encountered at the Committee's 5th meeting had arisen precisely from the fact that the representative of one of the States referred to in paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) had maintained that enjoying the same rights was tantamount to being a member of the Committee, but other representatives had not been willing to accept that view. That was the stumbling block which the Bureau had wished to avoid.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that the members of the Committee were aware of the efforts the Bureau was making to solve the problem. The question at issue was not the participation of nuclear States in the work of the Committee; on the contrary, many delegations were pleased to have those States participate in the Committee's work. However, the Committee could not take upon itself the prerogatives of the General Assembly, which had decided that 40 States, which were expressly designated, would have the status of members and that other States, which were covered by the provisions of paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII), would enjoy the same rights and, in particular, the very important right to adhere to the final consensus on the basis of which the report would be drawn up but would not be regarded as members. The Mexican proposal therefore appeared to be well founded from a legal standpoint.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the list was not entitled "List of the members of the Committee" but rather "List of participants" and that it respected the distinction between the 40 member States designated in paragraph 2 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) and the States referred to in paragraph 3 of that resolution.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) unreservedly endorsed the Argentine representative's observations. Whatever feelings of esteem it might have for one delegation or another, the Committee must adhere to the terms of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), which laid down its mandate. The terms of the resolution were perfectly clear: paragraph 2 listed the 40 States members of the Committee,
(Mr. Garcia Robles, Mexico)

while paragraph 3, without mentioning names, referred to the nuclear States, to which the Assembly accorded the same rights as to States members of the Committee but without indicating that they would be able to become members of the Committee. The very fact that they had been placed in two separate paragraphs was sufficient to indicate that a distinction was being made between those two groups of States. There must be no return to the errors of the twenty-seventh session, at which the situation had been made more complicated despite the warnings voiced by certain delegations, including his own. The Committee must therefore adhere strictly to the provisions of the resolution, in which every comma was there for a reason.

The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that the representative of Mexico would specify the wording he was proposing for the two parts of the list. The Bureau had decided on the term "participant" because it had seemed to apply equally to members of the Committee and to the States upon which paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) conferred a special status and also to observers, who could thus be included in the same list.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that he would like to know which States would be included in the category of observers.

The CHAIRMAN said that Syria had expressed a wish to participate in the work of the Committee as an observer.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) asked whether that meant that the Committee would accede to the same request from any other Member State.

The CHAIRMAN replied that that was indeed the accepted practice in the United Nations.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that he had simply wished to clarify the point. His delegation would have no objection if a large number of States showed their interest in the Committee's work in that way.

With regard to the Chairman's request, he had scarcely had time to prepare a definitive wording but would try to spell out his proposal orally. The list could be drawn up in the following fashion: the first heading would read "Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference". It would be followed by a second heading reading "List of delegations", following the practice of the document issued at sessions of the General Assembly. The first section under that heading
would contain "delegations of States designated as members of the Committee under resolution 3183 (XXVIII)"; and the second section would include "delegations of States invited pursuant to paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII)" or perhaps "delegations of States possessing nuclear weapons". In the latter category, one or two asterisks could be used to indicate whether the delegations concerned could make statements in the same way as the delegations of member States or would not take part in the debates. There would be no point in mentioning delegations which were not present. Finally, a third section would contain the list of observers. That procedure had the advantage of being clear and in strict conformity with the terms of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) and with United Nations practice.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the list of delegations might contain three groups: firstly, delegations of States designated as members of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference; secondly, delegations of Member States invited under paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII), i.e. those possessing nuclear weapons; thirdly, observers.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) drew the attention of the Committee to two points: it would be difficult to draw up a list of invited States if only some of them were mentioned, since all States possessing nuclear weapons had in principle been invited to co-operate or maintain contact with the Committee. Furthermore, before drawing up such a list, it would be necessary to make certain that none of the 40 States members of the Committee possessed nuclear weapons and should therefore change categories.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the problem did not arise if the Mexican representative's proposal was followed. It would be made clear that the delegations of the States in question had been invited under paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII). The reference to that paragraph explained why all the States were not mentioned under the relevant heading and did not imply that the others had not been invited.

Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy) thought that in seeking to be too precise there was a risk of creating difficulties. The representative of Mexico was right to call for strict compliance with resolution 3183 (XXVIII), but his proposal...
(Mr. Migliuolo, Italy)

could be simplified by drawing up the list of delegations under three headings: firstly, delegations accredited pursuant to paragraph 2 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII); secondly, delegations accredited pursuant to paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII); thirdly, delegations accredited as observers. The term "accredited" should be interpreted as meaning that delegations had been accredited by their respective Governments and not by the Secretariat or by the Committee, by which they had been given a particular status.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) thought that the proposal was constructive and would avoid the difficulties stressed by the representative of Tunisia.

The CHAIRMAN said he thought that the Mexican representative's proposal, as amended by the representative of Italy, was acceptable to the Committee as a whole. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee was in favour of presenting the list of delegations in that manner.

It was so decided.

EXAMINATION OF ALL THE VIEWS AND SUGGESTIONS EXPRESSED BY GOVERNMENTS ON THE CONVENING OF A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE AND RELATED PROBLEMS, INCLUDING CONDITIONS FOR THE REALIZATION OF SUCH A CONFERENCE

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up the substance of the work entrusted to it and gave the floor to the representative of Bulgaria.

Mr. Grozdev (Bulgaria) said that he wished to congratulate the Chairman on his election, not having been able to do so at the first session. At that time he had been in Iran, a country with which Bulgaria had excellent relations and had instituted fruitful co-operation. He was aware of Mr. Hoveyda's experience and was certain that the Chairman would bring the work of the Committee to a successful conclusion and could count on the co-operation of all members.

The Committee was beginning its work two days after 22 June, which was the thirtieth anniversary of the German invasion of the Soviet Union. That conflict had given the imperialists a lesson, and the memory of it should stimulate action to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. However, one question had not yet been settled: that of complete disarmament, which was the only means of achieving real security and of solving the urgent problems facing all countries.

/...
Thanks to the policy of the socialist countries, the climate of international relations was improving and there was a trend towards détente. A new era was emerging in which a solution could be foreseen for the conflicts in Viet-Nam, Laos, the Indian subcontinent and the Middle East and, perhaps, an equitable settlement of the problem of the Portuguese colonies. It was now possible, and indeed essential, to take advantage of those favourable circumstances so as to ensure that political détente was followed up by military détente. Several steps had already been taken in that direction, such as the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Soviet-United States agreement on the limitation of anti-ballistic missiles and the provisional measures on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons. In the Soviet-United States joint communiqué of 1973, the two parties had said that they wished to play an active part in the preparation of new measures to limit and halt the arms race, and it was to be hoped that the forthcoming meeting between the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union would result in further achievements along those lines.

However, experience showed that the more efforts were made to solve the problem of disarmament, the more some countries tried, for various reasons, to obtain nuclear weapons; others were saying that they would attempt to do so in the near future, and they would be followed by still others. In those circumstances, it was more urgent than ever to convene a world disarmament conference. Numerous States Members of the United Nations had already stated that they were favourable to the idea, and some very influential non-governmental organizations had called for such a conference. He was firmly convinced that efforts should be redoubled to achieve effective disarmament and that a world disarmament conference would produce positive results in that direction. As Mr. Zhivkov, Chairman of the Council of State of Bulgaria, had stressed, it was the duty of all States, large and small, to support the action undertaken to organize a world disarmament conference and to work constantly to improve the international climate and strengthen peace throughout the world.

The document prepared by the Secretariat provided a good basis for the Committee's work; it showed that a majority of Members of the United Nations were in favour of the conference and made specific proposals concerning it. The
(Mr. Grozej, Bulgaria)

objections to holding a conference were not convincing. The Committee possessed sufficient information on the substance of the question and should draft its report without delay and make proposals to the General Assembly, for world public opinion was virtually unanimous in calling for the conference.

Opinions could, of course, differ regarding the Committee's mandate; some interpreted it narrowly and others more broadly, depending on the goals they had in view. The results achieved were already encouraging: no one was opposed to convening the conference; three nuclear States were already co-operating with the Committee; the USSR was participating in its work with the same rights as the States designated as members of the Committee; the United Kingdom and France were present, and the Committee wished to see them take an active part in the discussions. It was to be regretted that others continued to hold back and were not heeding the opinion of the world and of a majority of Member States.

The positive results already achieved by the Committee would certainly have a favourable impact on discussions in the Assembly, particularly with regard to implementation of the resolutions banning the threat of force in international relations and calling for reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and utilization of part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries.

It would be advisable to set up a working group, as had already been proposed at the first session, so that the Committee could begin drafting its report and its recommendations. The group should have a total of 10 members and be composed of the officers of the Committee and representatives of the political and geographical groups. It would be desirable for the General Assembly to broaden the Committee's mandate in order to facilitate exchanges of views and the convening of the conference.

His delegation would present written proposals aimed at making improvements in the document prepared by the Secretariat. It hoped that the current session would contribute to the success of the proposed conference.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Bulgaria for his kind words concerning Iran and for the proposals he had made.

He pointed out that no member of the Committee had yet asked to speak, and he emphasized the need to draw up a list of speakers at the earliest possible time so as to plan the Committee's work as effectively as possible.

/...
Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) endorsed the Chairman's suggestion and expressed the hope that such a list could be drawn up immediately. He thought that the first thing to do might be to cancel the afternoon meeting, thus enabling members to make the necessary arrangements.

The CHAIRMAN observed that, if the afternoon meeting was cancelled, it would be too late to make the conference room available to another committee. Only one speaker was inscribed on the list for the afternoon meeting.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that his delegation was concerned about the Committee's method of work. What was required was for the Rapporteur or the Chairman, in the light of the compilation prepared by the Secretariat and the consultations which the officers of the Committee had held, to explain the positions of the nuclear weapon Powers, so as to reveal whether there was any common ground between them, and thus to determine what progress could be made. The Committee's task was not to make speeches: it had to pin-point the problem and endeavour to move forward.

The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the contents of paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII). The views of Member States had been assembled in the draft prepared by the Secretariat. It was for delegations to comment on those views.

Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) agreed with the representative of Tunisia that the Committee was not required to make general statements, which had already been made in the General Assembly or in the competent committees. The Committee must work on the preparation of the Disarmament Conference, following the divisions and subdivisions of the draft prepared by the Secretariat: objectives, preparation, agenda and organization of the conference, other questions. In addition, the representative of Bulgaria had suggested the establishment of a 10-member working group to prepare the work of the Committee. The question was whether the Committee should tackle the problems or whether delegations were merely going to repeat what they had already said. What the Committee should do was to study each of the questions in the Secretariat's draft, some of which were questions of form and others of substance. It was only in that way that the Committee could complete its work in three or four days.

/...
The CHAIRMAN said that, as he understood it, the representative of Egypt was suggesting that the Committee should consider the subdivisions of the Secretariat's draft one by one and examine in each case the views expressed by individual Member States.

Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy) felt that further consideration of how the Committee was to proceed with its work was justified in the light of the statements which had just been made. The best method of approach, however, might be for the officers to consult informally with delegations which had spoken or were otherwise concerned. If the Committee was to begin immediately its consideration of the various problems posed by the Disarmament Conference, basing itself on the views of States as summarized in the Secretariat's draft, it might find itself in difficulties because on some issues only a minority of States had expressed views. The problem to which the representative of Tunisia had drawn attention - that of nuclear-weapon States - was a crucial problem. As members of the Committee who had spoken at the first session had observed, States possessing nuclear weapons must be associated in the preparation of the Disarmament Conference. Informal consultations could probably shed a little light on the matter.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the international community as a whole wanted a disarmament conference, particularly since the news of the past few weeks showed that the danger was tending to spread. A major difficulty was caused by the differences of attitude on the part of nuclear-weapon States. The common ground of their positions must therefore be determined. Once that had been done, the direction to be taken would be apparent. The proposal made by the representative of Argentina at the fifth meeting of the Committee - namely, the establishment of a 10-member working group - had been endorsed at the current meeting by the representative of Bulgaria. Such a group would perhaps serve a useful purpose, if it enabled the subject to be better defined. But the first and foremost concern must be the position of the nuclear-weapon countries: China, France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. There could be no disarmament without the participation of those Powers.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that it would be as well to summarize the ideas expressed since the beginning of the meeting. First, while it was...
legitimate to avoid general statements, the Committee should have before it all the information it required. Delegations which had not expressed their views on any of the subject-headings in the Secretariat compilation, or which wished to amplify views already expressed, should be able to do so orally or in writing. Any delegation that wished to comment on the views expressed in the Secretariat compilation should then be able to do so. Lastly, on the basis of the views of Member States and any comments on them, the Committee would draft the report it must submit to the General Assembly. As the representative of Tunisia had observed, it was important to remain in contact with the representatives of the nuclear-weapon States so as to know their views on the progress of the Committee's work.

If the majority of members of the Committee were in favour of establishing a working group, the Committee could begin to discuss the terms of reference of such a group, and the Chairman could begin consultations concerning its membership.

Preparations for the Disarmament Conference had been referred to several times; however, the Ad Hoc Committee was not a preparatory committee for the Conference, but merely a body responsible for analysing the opinions and suggestions of States Members of the United Nations. The Committee should not lose sight of the true nature of its terms of reference.

The CHAIRMAN summarized the ideas put forward: general statements could not be excluded, because some delegations had not yet made such statements; the representatives of the nuclear-weapon States must be given an opportunity to make general statements; the Committee was facing certain problems in the organization of its work, and the establishment of a working group might enable it better to pin-point the matters requiring attention. It would probably be advisable to resolve as soon as possible the questions of the organization of work and the establishment of the working group.

Mr. SCALABRE (France), speaking as the representative of one of the States referred to in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), pointed out that he had asked to speak at the afternoon meeting; but, if the afternoon meeting was cancelled, he would be prepared to speak at the meeting to be held the following morning.

/...
Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that his understanding at the preceding session had been that the working group, when established, would meet during the two months between the second and third sessions. It would prepare a draft report that the Ad Hoc Committee would consider in September. If it was decided to establish a working group, consultations should be held on the subject of its terms of reference. In addition, the Chairman of the Committee should begin consultations concerning the membership of the working group.

The CHAIRMAN said that, if he had understood correctly, the proposed working group would assist the Committee to study the draft prepared by the Secretariat and would then continue its work between the second and third sessions so as to prepare a draft report to the General Assembly. The composition of the working group would depend on the decisions taken by the Committee and would probably take into account geographical distribution.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said that the working group would have two well-defined tasks: to analyse the positions of States, giving priority to the views of the nuclear-weapon States, and to draft the Ad Hoc Committee's report. The idea of establishing a group appeared to have been accepted, but its terms of reference and membership had yet to be determined.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that apparently, in the light of the various statements, the best way to obtain prompt results would be to postpone all discussion until the meeting on the following morning, so as to leave time for reflection. In order to gain a clear idea of the positions of the nuclear-weapon States, the Chairman should hold consultations with the representatives of States which were not represented on the Ad Hoc Committee. The position of the USSR was well known. The position of France would no doubt be known the following day, after the statement by the French representative. It was to be hoped that the United Kingdom position would be stated subsequently, since the United Kingdom was represented on the Committee. There remained the positions of China and the United States, which were not apparent from a reading of the draft prepared by the Secretariat. It was therefore necessary to hold consultations. It would be preferable to cancel the afternoon meeting, so as to be better prepared for the meeting the following morning.
The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to hold its next meeting on the morning of 25 June, when it would hear statements by delegations and consider the establishment, terms of reference and membership of a working group.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.
7th meeting

Chairman: Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran)

EXAMINATION OF ALL THE VIEWS AND SUGGESTIONS EXPRESSED BY GOVERNMENTS ON THE CONVENING OF A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE AND RELATED PROBLEMS, INCLUDING CONDITIONS FOR THE REALIZATION OF SUCH A CONFERENCE (continued)

Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the work of the second session of the Ad Hoc Committee was starting in a favourable climate. The deliberations at the May session had confirmed that the convening of a world disarmament conference continued to be one of the principal tasks of the United Nations. The original idea of convening a world disarmament conference had been put forward by a majority of States Members of the United Nations - the group of non-aligned countries. When the USSR had proposed the item to the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session, it had been guided by a desire to see all countries intensify their efforts to ensure the convening of such a conference.

Since the resumption of work on that question, the international political climate had evolved in the direction of détente, creating new objective possibilities and pre-conditions for further measures aimed at strengthening peace, consolidating and extending the favourable changes, making them irreversible, and spreading them widely over all regions of the world.

Positive results had already been obtained. One might mention the signing in May 1972 of the Treaty between the United States of America and the USSR on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, and the Interim Agreement between the United States of America and the USSR on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Weapons; the conclusion, in June 1973, of an Agreement between the USSR and the United States on the Prevention of Nuclear War; and the signing of an agreement on the Basic Principles of Negotiations on the Further Limitation of Strategic Offensive Weapons. In 1973-1974 there had been negotiations, conferences and forums devoted to disarmament: the Geneva negotiations on the limitation of strategic weapons between the USSR and the United States, and the Vienna discussions on a reciprocal reduction in armed
forces and weapons in central Europe. The work of the Geneva Disarmament Committee was also very significant. In conclusion, mention should be made of the adoption, at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, of the USSR proposal that the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council should be reduced by 10 per cent.

The USSR did not view international détente as a brief phase or a passing phenomenon, but as a possible turning-point in international relations. The reduction of arms and disarmament should become an essential element and factor of further détente.

Speaking on 14 June 1974, L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, had said specifically:

"... We are tirelessly struggling to achieve real progress in the sphere of disarmament. Those who support the arms race argue that it is risky to try to limit arms and even more risky to try to reduce them. But in fact there is an infinitely greater risk involved in continuing to stockpile arms without restraint. For these reasons, we again and again call on all States and all Governments to put an end to the arms race and to begin to move towards the great aim of general and complete disarmament."

There could be no doubt that there was a direct link between the improvement of the political climate in relations between States and the possibility of adopting practical measures to halt the arms race and to solve the questions of disarmament. Détente created favourable pre-conditions for the limitation and ending of the arms race and for disarmament. Moreover, it was clear that the consolidation of political détente would be the most effective way of facilitating practical measures with a view to bringing about military détente also.

Against the background of the general advances of a favourable nature which were influencing the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, a number of other factors should allow the Committee to move forward in its work. First, there had been substantial progress in solving the question of participation in the Conference. In addition, the points of view concerning the duration of such a conference, which should be from one to two months, had drawn closer. It had also been agreed that the provisional agenda should be fairly broad in its conception, in the light of the principal ultimate aim of the Conference, namely, general and complete disarmament.
Agreement seemed close at hand on the idea that the Conference should take place in close co-operation with the United Nations. It was also unanimously agreed that the Conference should be convened only after appropriate preparation. Finally, a very important consideration was that the number of Powers possessing nuclear weapons which attended the deliberations of the Ad Hoc Committee had increased; in that regard, he was gratified by the presence of the representatives of the United Kingdom and France. In the opinion of his delegation, favourable pre-conditions were being created for facilitating co-operation between the Ad Hoc Committee and all the nuclear Powers. Certain organizational difficulties concerning the composition of the Committee had now been overcome. The Soviet Union had never considered those questions to be insoluble and had always advocated that they should be speedily solved. However, the main point was that, even for the countries which had made the solution of those organizational questions a condition of their co-operation with the Committee, those questions could no longer constitute an obstacle to co-operation. In those circumstances, the USSR hoped that other nuclear Powers too would activate their contacts and co-operation with the Ad Hoc Committee. Without being over-optimistic, it might be considered that the Committee was in a position to carry out serious work and reach a consensus on the further practical measures involved in the preparation of the Conference. It could take up its main task forthwith, as defined in General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII).

The mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee, as defined in General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), provided that the Committee should examine all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems. It would obviously be erroneous, in discussing the tasks of the working group which might be entrusted with the preparation of the draft report for the Committee's September session, to try to add the tasks of the working group to the study of the opinions or positions of any one group of States, for instance the nuclear Powers. Such an approach would be in contradiction with the Committee's mandate and would considerably restrict the range of questions which the working group would have to consider. It was obvious that, in defining the tasks of the working group, the terms of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) should be strictly observed; otherwise, the Committee would not be able to perform properly the tasks entrusted to it.

/...
The starting point for the work might be the document drafted by the Secretariat. That commendable document was only a preliminary study and could be supplemented; after suitable revision it could provide a good basis for the preparation of the Committee's report. It reflected the opinions and proposals put forward by 96 countries, the overwhelming majority of the States of the United Nations. The great majority of those countries favoured the holding of a carefully prepared world disarmament conference and felt that the attainment of that very important aim should not be postponed. The realization of such a conference was also called for by a large section of world opinion, expressing itself through the heads of Government of the non-aligned countries, the 1973 World Congress of Peace Forces, the heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, the World Peace Council and other highly influential international organizations. It was therefore the duty of the Ad Hoc Committee not only to study all the views and proposals expressed by the various Governments but also to make appropriate recommendations to the General Assembly, at its twenty-ninth session, so that decisions could be adopted at that session which would facilitate the study of the practical preparations for the Conference.

The task of summarizing those views and observations could be entrusted to the working group whose establishment had been proposed by Argentina. His delegation subscribed to the proposal by the Bulgarian representative that the working group should consist of the members of the Bureau of the Committee and other members chosen on the basis of a broad geographical representation, and that its total membership should not exceed 10. The Group could note the gradual rapprochements between the different viewpoints and the progress achieved in the co-operation extended by the nuclear Powers. On that basis, it should draw up a report for the consideration of the Committee.

The final report to be submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session might include a recommendation to enlarge the Committee's mandate and to entrust to it clearly defined tasks to facilitate the convening of the World Disarmament Conference.

Mr. Scaparre (France) said that his delegation had carefully followed the developments at the Committee's first session and had listened with interest to the statements at the beginning of the second and felt that the time had come to explain its position and state its intentions concerning the co-operation it was ready to give to the Committee's work.
France's position on the quest for disarmament had formed the subject of many statements both in the General Assembly and in the First Committee. He would therefore merely quote a communication sent by his Government to the Secretary-General in the context of the inquiry carried out in implementation of General Assembly resolution 2833 (XXVI): "France is desirous of contributing to the study and implementation of any agreement that might be concluded, in so far as the purpose is to seek genuine disarmament measures accompanied by effective international control and dealing in particular with the destruction and prohibition of the production of nuclear weapons."

That principle had dictated France's conduct with regard to the various efforts to achieve disarmament which had merely ended in repeated setbacks, at least so far as actual disarmament was concerned. Those setbacks, which had been unquestionably due to the principles for action which had been adopted and the machinery which had been set up, were also perhaps attributable to lack of will, resistance by certain interests and resignation on the part of public opinion.

Like many States Members of the United Nations, France wanted a new start to be made in a new atmosphere, in order to give the solemn undertaking prescribed by the Charter of the United Nations the inspiration which had previously been lacking, so that the aim would no longer be merely to "disarm the disarmed".

For that reason, his Government, which had been one of the first to propose the convening of a conference of nuclear Powers and, believing that it was the responsibility of the latter to set in motion a genuine effort towards disarmament, had also been one of the first to support the idea launched by the USSR of a world conference bringing together all the countries in the international community and, of course, all those which possessed nuclear weapons.

His Government had also stated on numerous occasions that the preparation of such a conference, or even the preliminary study of views and suggestions by States on its convening, necessitated the presence of all the nuclear Powers in the organs established for that end.

Without dwelling on the difficulties which had made it impossible to allow all of those Powers to participate directly in the work of the Committee, he noted that none of those Powers were included in the list of members appearing in paragraph 2 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII), whilst the third paragraph of the
resolution invited the States possessing nuclear weapons to co-operate or maintain contact with the Ad Hoc Committee. The French Government had deduced that, not being a member, it could not sit on the Committee, but it had replied to the invitation in paragraph 3 by choosing the most direct form of participation - presence - so as to show its desire to co-operate with the Committee.

The French Government would subsequently appreciate it if all the States possessing nuclear weapons would also co-operate with the Committee or at least maintain contact with it in a way they were entitled to choose for themselves, provided that it was effective, since, obviously, without such co-operation or contact no worthwhile work could be accomplished.

The expectations of the French delegation should, however, in no way be interpreted as an abstention. He had just spoken of France's desire to work for disarmament, and its support for the principle of the World Disarmament Conference. The French Government, in its communication of 1972 to the Secretary-General, which he had quoted as the beginning of his statement, had already shown proof of its desire to participate by setting forth in a precise manner its point of view on the conditions in which a world disarmament conference should be held. Members of the Committee could refer to the text on page 23 of document A/8617. He did not wish to make any changes to it, but - in the same constructive spirit and with the firm hope of seeing the work of the Committee progress - he would listen to other views and the discussion of the documents prepared by the Secretariat in order to compare and combine the opinions and suggestions of everyone. Those documents represented a considerable amount of work on which the authors should be congratulated.

As he was addressing the Committee for the first time, he wished to congratulate the Chairman on his election; he was entitled to that post because of his outstanding qualities as a negotiator. Having been able to appreciate the ability with which Mr. Hoveyda had led equally important and difficult meetings, his delegation wished to assure him of its confidence and transmit to him its warmest wishes.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the French representative for having made a positive contribution to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.
Mr. JOB (Yugoslavia) noted that since the May session, nothing had happened that had made the convening of a world disarmament conference less essential, or made the work of the Committee less important. Indeed States, in particular the great Powers who possessed nuclear weapons, were devoting increasingly large sums of money to arms. It had not yet been possible to reach an agreement on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons and on the complete banning of all nuclear tests. Nuclear weapons tests were continuing in the atmosphere and underground. The International Atomic Energy Agency had not fulfilled the expectations of the developing countries regarding the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Some essential provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons had still not been implemented and that was a serious obstacle to making the treaty universal. It would be absurd and dangerous to pursue the arms race whilst reducing political tensions by agreements covering limited areas.

The Yugoslav Government had taken account of that situation, when in its reply of 19 June to the Secretary-General's note of 21 February, it had emphasized that the Fourth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Algiers in September 1973, in which Yugoslavia had participated, had demanded that a world disarmament conference with the participation of all States should be convened as soon as possible. The Yugoslav Government, convinced that a world disarmament conference would greatly contribute to the strengthening of world peace and to promoting disarmament, had declared its determination to promote the convening of that conference.

It was very useful that the paper prepared by the Secretariat described in annex II the positions taken by all the conferences of non-aligned countries, including the most recent one, which had been attended by 76 participant States, 8 observer States and 3 guest States. It had been the non-aligned countries who in 1961 had first launched the idea of a world disarmament conference. They were now demanding that the Conference should be convened as soon as possible, and their demand revealed their very deep concern for the true interests of the international community. As President Tito had recently stated at the Tenth Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, the policy of the non-aligned countries, which had
emerged as a reflection of the struggle for the independence and equality of peoples, was anti-imperialist and anti-hegemonistic and could not be made use of by anybody. The policy of the non-aligned countries was not based on questions of expediency but corresponded to their vital interests. His delegation considered, as it had stated during the May session of the Ad Hoc Committee, that the work of the Committee should reassure everybody that a world disarmament conference would serve the true and legitimate interests of the Members of the United Nations and of the international community as a whole. The Committee should therefore show that it was determined to ensure that the Conference would take into account everybody's concerns and views.

The draft document prepared by the Secretariat contained the views of 96 States. Chapter I showed that 90 of those States, belonging to all regions and groupings, were in favour of convening a world disarmament conference. If the non-aligned countries who had participated in the Algiers Conference were added, the number of countries who were in favour of the Conference would be between 110 and 120.

With regard to the presentation of the draft document prepared by the Secretariat, it would be useful to indicate after each entry the source document symbol and also the date. It was very inconvenient to have to refer constantly to the index in annex I. Furthermore, the first part of chapter V contained some omissions. For example, several non-aligned States, including Yugoslavia, had favoured an early convening of the Conference, and those views appeared in chapter I, but should also be included in chapter V, or there should be cross-references from chapter V to chapter I.

At the previous session of the Ad Hoc Committee, he had expressed the hope that the Committee would receive all the studies and tabulations, by country and by subject, which would make it possible to gain a clear picture of the attitudes and trends of thought of most countries with regard to the objectives, timing, and so forth, of the Conference, and on the conditions for its convening. He had also stated that the report of the Ad Hoc Committee to the General Assembly should contain an evaluation of the views and suggestions of Governments, the trends which emerged from them, and the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee. In the paper which it had prepared, the Secretariat had confined itself to quotations. If the Committee were to make comparisons and formulate conclusions based on the views and suggestions of Governments, it would have to decide how to go about it.
(Mr. Job, Yugoslavia)

The draft document prepared by the Secretariat showed an awareness of the need for appropriate preparations and for the participation of all States, especially the nuclear Powers, at the Conference; there was also a desire that the Conference should be convened as soon as possible and that no obstructions or pre-conditions should be put in its path. The current Conference on the Law of the Sea, the forthcoming World Population Conference and the recent special session of the General Assembly had shown that the holding of world conferences was a recognized and accepted practice. The United Nations was the best forum available for pursuing the action which had been undertaken. The admission of new Members made the Organization even more universal, and also gave it new possibilities and energies.

Mr. Saito (Japan) said that the possible convening of a world disarmament conference and the modalities of convening it were of immense importance and would have a vital bearing on the peace and security, progress and prosperity of mankind. As the Member States, especially the great Powers, were not in agreement on convening such a conference, the General Assembly had been right not to make a hasty decision and to arrange for the views and suggestions of Member States to be studied. Whether a world disarmament conference was convened or not, he was convinced that the work of the Committee, by arousing the attention and provoking the reflections of Member States, and by clarifying the major problems, would eventually contribute to universal disarmament.

In reading the summary prepared by the Secretariat, his delegation found it encouraging that a majority of Governments considered, like his own, that three conditions must be met in order to ensure the success of the World Disarmament Conference. The first was that there must be thorough preparation for the Conference. Once a decision was taken to convene the Conference, it could not be allowed to fail, for failure would raise serious doubts concerning the prospects for further progress. It was obvious that a preparatory committee would be needed to draft the agenda of the Conference, seek out the areas where the chance of reaching an agreement was greatest, prepare background material and determine the site of the Conference. His delegation felt that the preparatory committee should have about 30 members, including the States participating in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, as well as the two Powers which were not taking part in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee.
The second condition was the participation in the Conference of all the nuclear-weapon States. In that connexion, he appreciated the Chairman's efforts to sound out the views of those Powers and to obtain their co-operation. He hoped those efforts would continue and prove fruitful. He also hoped that the five nuclear-weapon Powers would try to reconcile their views in informal meetings at a mutually acceptable time and place. His delegation made that suggestion because the Japanese Government considered that nuclear disarmament was by far the most important topic to be considered at a world disarmament conference. The inclusion of that question in the agenda for the Conference as a matter of priority was the third condition for its success.

Finally, his delegation considered that the holding of a world disarmament conference should not result in any slowing down of efforts to achieve disarmament already under way through existing channels. It trusted that its views would be fully reflected in the report of the Committee to the General Assembly.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain) said that if the Ad Hoc Committee was to work effectively and not to become embroiled in repetition and needless uncertainty, it must follow resolution 3183 (XXVIII), which had been unanimously adopted by the General Assembly and conferred upon it a clear-cut mandate of precisely defined scope and nature. In the view of his delegation, paragraph 1 of the resolution contained three key words: "examine", "conditions" and "consensus".

The Committee's mandate was to examine the views and suggestions expressed by Governments. However, did that mean simply reading the replies from Member States or the oral statements made by certain delegations before United Nations organs and then forwarding them to the General Assembly, a task which seemed to belong more to the Secretariat, or did it on the contrary mean judging or assessing those opinions, in which case the Committee would go beyond its mandate? A happy medium should be found between the role of a mere bureaucratic instrument and that of a judge of others' opinions, and it was to that point that the Ad Hoc Committee and any future working group should direct their attention.

The views which the Committee had to examine related mainly to the conditions to be met if the Conference was to be fruitful and not harmful, as some Member States feared. The first part of the document prepared by the Secretariat set out the opinions of 96 countries, but, since those opinions frequently overlapped, that did
(Mr. Elias, Spain)

not mean that there were 96 different conditions. The following figures could be extracted from a first reading: in the view of 59 countries, universality was the prime condition, some making that principle applicable to non-member States and others to divided countries; 12 stressed the principle of absolute equality of participation; 53 felt that the participation of all the countries possessing nuclear weapons was necessary, and 12 added to that the militarily important countries; 44 declared that there should be adequate preparation, and 9 or 10 referred to special preparatory conditions, while 9 felt, in one way or another, that no specific pre-conditions were required; 12 considered that the Conference should be co-ordinated with the other bodies responsible for studying disarmament problems or be subordinated to those bodies; 12 supported political conditions linked in one way or another to the concept of détente; and 5 felt there was a need for certain specific compromises of a political or military nature.

To sum up, there was no difficulty concerning certain conditions: universality, equality, participation of the nuclear countries, and the adequate co-ordination and preparation of the Conference. All members of the Committee were more or less in agreement on those points, and it would thus be easy to reach a consensus in that regard. Only the demands relating to détente, as the countries concerned interpreted it, and to specific compromises raised real problems which the Committee would have to study in order to arrive at a consensus.

As far as the consensus was concerned, it would not relate to the convening or preparation of the Conference or even to the conditions for it but primarily to the nature of the report to be submitted to the General Assembly. That report could not be a mere summary of views, for that could be more readily prepared by a machine than by the Committee.

Until they were met, the conditions he had mentioned would amount to obstacles, but the Committee could not confine itself to informing the General Assembly that obstacles existed and that the Conference therefore could not take place. For the Ad Hoc Committee to make such a negative statement would be to belittle the unanimous desire for disarmament and to increase the already considerable risk connected with the arms race and the proliferation of nuclear weapons.
(Mr. Elias, Spain)

As Rapporteur, he would, of course, confine himself to recording faithfully all the views expressed. As the representative of Spain, however, he wished to stress that the Committee's mandate not only authorized it, but even placed it under a moral obligation, to submit positive proposals aimed at overcoming the obstacles and facilitating fulfilment of the conditions considered necessary for the Conference by certain countries. He reserved the right to speak on the subject again at a later stage.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Spain for having summarized the Secretariat paper and for having thus complied with the request made the previous day by the representative of Tunisia and the subsequent request made by the representative of the Soviet Union.

Mr. KULAGA (Poland) said the summary prepared by the Secretariat, which set out systematically the views and suggestions of Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference, was a technical document; none the less, it went beyond its formal, technical framework in that it summed up the considerable progress made to date, showed that there was massive support for the conference - and that was the dominant theme which emerged from the document, to which the creation of the conditions required for success was subsidiary - and, finally, set the basic idea of the convening of a conference in full perspective.

It was the usefulness of the Conference which was most readily apparent from the views and suggestions expressed by Governments. Such a conference seemed even more timely today than when the non-aligned countries had introduced the idea in the United Nations and the Soviet Union had formally proposed it; that was so both for reasons of substance connected with the continuation of the nuclear arms race and with recent new developments and for economic reasons, since, as had been pointed out at the sixth special session of the General Assembly, part of the resources now devoted to armaments must be harnessed for economic and social development.

At the same time, the possibility of holding a successful conference was increased by a new political climate: bilateral talks on strategic arms limitation and multilateral regional negotiations on disarmament were in progress, and there was reason to hope that those efforts would be successful. Concrete steps were
(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

being taken to solve long-standing acute political problems. The situation was thus particularly favourable, and, in the view of his delegation, it was essential to take advantage of it and to undertake global disarmament negotiations within the framework of the United Nations. The Ad Hoc Committee should recognize the current positive and objective climate and capitalize on it and universalize it, while at the same time, encouraging and strengthening it at all levels.

In that connexion, he pointed out that, in the document prepared by the Secretariat, many countries were in agreement in emphasizing the usefulness of and need for such a conference. For its part, his Government felt that a conference would accelerate disarmament negotiations and promote the elaboration of international agreements by the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The views contained in the Secretariat paper offered a solid foundation on which the Committee could and should build. He recalled that his delegation had already stated its view of the Committee's task at the first session. It welcomed the participation in the present meeting of three of the nuclear-weapon countries and had noted with great interest the statement by the representative of France. As it had already stated at the first session, his delegation had always believed that all the nuclear Powers should participate in a world disarmament conference, and it hoped that the United States of America and China would decide to co-operate in that regard.

As far as the Committee's substantive work was concerned, he would like to concentrate on the means of carrying it out rather than on its content. He supported the idea advanced the day before by the representative of Argentina to establish a working group, which would be an offspring of the Committee, not a substitute for it. The working group should have the benefit of the views of members of the Committee before starting its work. His delegation had in mind a small group, with perhaps 10 members, as had been suggested several times, and was in favour of including in it the officers of the Committee, as had been proposed by the representative of Bulgaria, and of observing the principle of geographical representation.

As the representative of Egypt had suggested the previous day, the working group should, when it had heard the opinions expressed in the Committee, examine the views of Governments under the headings already agreed upon by the Committee
and used in the Secretariat paper. The working group would submit its analysis to
the Committee at its next session, and the analysis, when approved, would be
incorporated in the report to the General Assembly, together with any conclusions
the Committee might formulate regarding further steps toward the World Disarmament
Conference.

What was involved, therefore, was a basic working document by the Secretariat,
which had already been prepared; a discussion, which the Committee was already
holding; an appraisal of all the pertinent data by the working group; a final
discussion in the Ad Hoc Committee, and the preparation of the report and
conclusions for submission to the General Assembly.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico), speaking with reference to the question of
the working group, said that the representative of Argentina had indicated his
views concerning the group at the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee and had
reminded members the day before of his suggestions concerning the preparation of
the draft report.

As the representative of Poland had just said, the group should be an
offspring of the Committee but should not replace it and its membership should
reflect a broad and equitable geographical distribution. There were two
alternatives: either to request the geographical groups to appoint the members or,
if the working group was to be considered a subsidiary body of the Committee, to
leave it to the Committee itself to appoint them.

His delegation was not looking for an honorary post. However, it did believe
that, if what was wanted was a group that would make tangible progress, account
must be taken of the assistance that could be provided by delegations: it was
unthinkable that the Argentine delegation should remain outside the group, and
the same was true as far as his own delegation was concerned. Although 10 members
would be an appropriate size for the group, consideration might be given, if
necessary, to increasing the number to 15.

No delegation should have the impression that it was being prevented from
making its contribution to the small working group. The best line of approach
would be to appoint a number of delegations which would participate in the group's
work on a regular basis and, at the same time, make the group "open-ended" by
permitting all members of the Committee to be present at its proceedings.

...
Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) welcomed the fact that many delegations wished to express their views on the holding of the Conference. As a result of the fruitful discussion which had just taken place, some ideas were taking more precise form. The comments made by the representative of Spain appeared to be particularly apt. It was clear that the report to the Assembly should not be merely a statistical analysis of the views and suggestions of Governments; indeed an excellent analysis of that kind had already been made by the representative of Spain. Although the Committee was not a preparatory body and its terms of reference did not empower it to consider the views of Governments, it could none the less, in the course of preparing its report, make some positive suggestions that would facilitate the holding of the Conference.

The representative of Mexico had rightly said that the working group should have a balanced membership in order to facilitate the quest for a consensus. The delegations that made up its membership should also be familiar with the special business of writing a report. He had earlier proposed that the number of members should be 10, but that figure was not a rigid one and could without difficulty be raised to 15, as suggested by the representative of Mexico, if that would ensure better geographical representation. His delegation believed, however, that 15 should be the maximum number, it being fully understood that any delegation wishing to do so could attend the discussions of the working group and take part in its work.

As the representative of Poland had said, the working group should not replace the Committee; consequently, it should be assigned specific objectives and its terms of reference should be carefully defined.

One aspect of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) appeared until now to have escaped the attention of members of the Committee. The latter was required to examine the views expressed by Governments on the convening of the Conference and "related problems". Like the Mexican delegation, his delegation had already had occasion, during the consultations which had taken place the previous year, to emphasize that the consideration of those related problems was especially important because it might provide the nuclear Powers with an opportunity to withdraw some of the reservations they had expressed concerning the Conference. The Conference was expected to be of exceptionally wide scope and was to study all aspects of the
disarmament question. It should not be forgotten that although general and complete disarmament was one of the fundamental aims of the Organization, it had apparently failed to arouse any keen interest in the recent past, notwithstanding the fact that the item appeared regularly on the agenda of the First Committee. The time had perhaps come to adopt a more specific approach to it, particularly in the matter of nuclear weapons, which posed the greatest danger. Members of the Committee should not, when considering the related problems, neglect any aspect of the subject. The cause of disarmament had made some progress but in a rather disjointed way: first of all, there had been the negotiations between the two super-Powers, which had been conducted bilaterally without any United Nations participation, and, secondly, there had been the meetings at Geneva of the Committee on Disarmament, an independent body whose relations with the Organization consisted essentially of submitting its annual report to the General Assembly. Such elements were encouraging, however. The Committee could, for its part, examine all the related problems, which were numerous and deserved the closest scrutiny. In addition, it should alert world public opinion and Governments and take advantage of any development propitious to the convening of the Conference.

Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt) said that he had listened with the greatest interest to the previous speakers. He commended the representative of Spain for his detailed analysis of the document prepared by the Secretariat, his equally perceptive analysis of the Committee's terms of reference and his presentation of conclusions which were similar to the ideas he himself had expressed the previous day. The representative of France had stressed the importance of the French delegation's presence at the Committee's meetings, and it was to be hoped that that presence would become active participation.

It had been suggested that the working group should be made up of 10 members only so that it might be able to discharge its functions more effectively. The same concern for equitable geographical representation should be reflected in the composition of the group as had been shown in the appointment of the officers of the Committee. Those members of the Committee who were not members of the working group should, if they wished, be able to attend, and even take part in, its proceedings.
ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN reminded members that he had appealed to them the previous day to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible so as to enable the officers to organize the work effectively. He urged members to respond to that appeal. The discussion of the past two meetings seemed to indicate that the establishment of a working group, which would conduct its activities between the current session and the September session, commanded general support. It remained to be ascertained whether the Secretariat would be able to provide the group with the necessary services, including interpretation.

Mr. BJÖRNERSTEDT (Secretary of the Committee) said the Secretariat had already made a preliminary study of the matter. It would be possible to provide the working group with the necessary conference services if it met during the current week, either after meetings of the Committee or in place of them. In July and August, when no meetings of the Committee were scheduled, the problem would be more difficult to solve. It would be helpful if the Committee indicated the extent and nature of its needs (the number of working languages to be used, etc.) and the Secretariat would try to comply with its request as far as possible. The working group could meet without any difficulty during the week immediately preceding the Committee's September session.

The CHAIRMAN expressed the hope that the various geographical groups would hold preliminary consultations on the membership of the working group, thus facilitating the task of the officers of the Committee and saving the Committee's time.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.
EXAMINATION OF ALL THE VIEWS AND SUGGESTIONS EXPRESSED BY GOVERNMENTS ON THE
CONVENING OF A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE AND RELATED PROBLEMS, INCLUDING
CONDITIONS FOR THE REALIZATION OF SUCH A CONFERENCE (continued)

Mr. SZARKA (Hungary) said that since the General Assembly had first
endorsed the idea of a world disarmament conference in resolution 2833 (XXVI), a
considerable amount of work had been done. The Committee had already begun to
carry out the task assigned to it by the Assembly under resolution 3183 (XXVIII);
the exchange of views which had begun in the May session was continuing and the
atmosphere in the Committee was encouraging.

Hungary's position on the convening of a world disarmament conference was
well known. In his letter of 5 September 1972 addressed to the Secretary-General
(A/8817) the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic had
set out in detail the views of his Government, together with practical suggestions
concerning the preparation and the holding of the conference. The representatives
of Hungary to the General Assembly had repeatedly reaffirmed that position, as he
had done himself a few days before in a letter to the Secretary-General
(Conference Room Paper No. 2, Add.3).

Together with the majority of Member States, Hungary believed that in order to
evaluate the possibilities of disarmament measures, it was necessary to have the
broadest possible exchange of views among all the States of the world. The present
trend towards détente in international relations was favourable to an
intensification of efforts in the sphere of disarmament. The trend towards
political détente should be not only strengthened but made irreversible, and to
that end, it must be accompanied by military détente.

The presence of the representatives of three nuclear Powers at the
Committee's meetings was encouraging, and it was to be hoped that the other two
nuclear Powers would respond to the general desire that they should participate in
the preparations for the Conference.

/...
(Mr. Szarka, Hungary)

The summary prepared by the Secretariat was very comprehensive and would be of great use to the members of the Committee and all those dealing with the convening of the Conference, especially the members of the working group that was to be set up. His delegation supported the setting up of such a group, which would facilitate the work of the Committee and enable it to carry out its mandate, and fully agreed with several other representatives who had suggested that its membership be kept to a minimum in the interests of effectiveness. It was ready to co-operate with the Committee and the working group in order to carry out the Committee's mission successfully.

Mr. PUNTSAGNOROV (Mongolia) commended the Secretariat for its careful summary of the views of some 100 Member States, which would greatly facilitate the Committee's task. Since several delegations had already discussed the document in detail, he would confine himself to pointing out that the great majority of Member States considered a disarmament conference necessary and that some States even wished to see it convened as a matter of urgency. That opinion was shared by many governmental and non-governmental organizations and by world public opinion as a whole, as had been shown at the World Peace Conference held at Moscow in October 1973, at which the numerous participants had called for a disarmament conference. The time had come to resolve the problems of disarmament and thus carry out one of the principal tasks specified in the Charter with regard to maintaining international peace. For that purpose, all States without exception should co-operate in a spirit of compromise in formulating concrete measures to be taken. The question of the Conference had already been studied repeatedly, and present conditions seemed favourable for convening it. There was a manifest desire to halt the arms race: the signing of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, of the Treating Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, and of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction were encouraging signs which seemed to prove that although the problem of disarmament was a complex one, nevertheless it could and should be progressively solved. Another example was the agreement between the USSR and the United States with a view to avoiding an atomic conflict; its particular importance lay in the fact that it had helped not only to improve relations between
the two great Powers but also to strengthen and guarantee international security. Moreover, the countries belonging to the Warsaw Pact or to NATO were also holding consultations concerning the mutual reduction of their forces in Europe. Lastly, an atmosphere of détente now prevailed in relations between States with different social systems. The international situation was therefore more propitious than ever before to solving the problem of general and complete disarmament, which would be all the more desirable because the arms race was a scourge threatening the security of the peoples of the world and jeopardizing their economic and social progress by wasting resources which could be put to better use. Atmospheric tests carried out in violation of the rules of international law and in total disregard of the protests of world opinion were particularly dangerous. Fall-out from such tests not only polluted the atmosphere but also poisoned the political climate. Mongolia had strongly condemned the tests in the atmosphere carried out near its frontiers by China and had called for their termination (A/9650).

The views of his Government on the convening of the Conference were reflected in almost every chapter of the document prepared by the Secretariat. They had been stated repeatedly in many United Nations bodies. His Government had also made known its views concerning the objectives, agenda, place of meeting and time-table of the Conference. It had supported the establishment of a preparatory committee of at most 30 members. Since that committee might be regarded as virtually already in existence in the form of the Ad Hoc Committee itself, it would be convenient to expand the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee and entrust it with the preparations for the Conference.

It was essential that all the nuclear Powers should participate in the preparation and holding of the Conference. One of those Powers, the Soviet Union, was taking an active part in the work of the Committee. His delegation also welcomed the statement of the representative of France and was awaiting with interest the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom. As to the other two nuclear Powers, the Committee should, as in the past, endeavour to maintain contact with them.

His delegation supported the establishment of a small working group to draft a report to the Assembly. The report should emphasize that the great majority of Member States supported the idea of convening the Conference. If the preparations
Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation welcomed the opportunity to co-operate and make contact with the Committee, as the United Kingdom was invited to do in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII).

His delegation had studied with interest the summary of views which had been ably prepared by the Secretariat and listened carefully to the statements made in the Committee. It was in order to hear at first hand the views of Committee members that his delegation had decided to fulfil the request made in paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) by being present at the Committee's meetings, and in doing so it had learned that its own views on the complex question under consideration were similar to those expressed by many representatives. Disarmament had, of course, been a principal topic of discussion in the First Committee of the General Assembly for many years. But during General Assembly sessions, delegations had neither the time nor the staff resources needed for the long exchange of views that would make possible the convening of the Conference. For his delegation, the term "disarmament" applied both to conventional and to nuclear weapons. The holding of a world conference on disarmament could give added impetus to disarmament negotiations. It would also serve as the occasion for reviewing the efforts and composition of existing disarmament bodies and making recommendations for the continuation and extension of their work. At the preceding meeting the representative of Yugoslavia had drawn attention to the large number of recent or forthcoming world conferences devoted to single issues of international importance. Care must be taken not to debase the currency of such conferences. A world conference on disarmament could not be justified simply on grounds of the convenience of delegations for whom disarmament was not the first priority in the General Assembly. What was much more important, if those militarily significant States to which the Conference would primarily look for fulfilment of its aims should participate with no real intention of translating its hopes into reality, the Conference would prove to have been useless and would indeed have served only to widen the gap between the accomplishment of serious disarmament measures and the ritual protestations of goodwill and good behaviour.

It would be clear from what he had said that his delegation's views on the Conference had not changed. His Government favoured the convening of such a
(Mr. Puntsagndorj, Mongolia)

for it were properly made, the Conference would be of great importance and would help to reduce tensions and strengthen mutual trust between States. He therefore hoped that the Committee would be successful in its work.

Mr. BARTOLOME (Philippines) said that there was a universal desire for general and complete disarmament, as evidenced by the draft document prepared by the Secretariat and the statements made in the Ad Hoc Committee, in whose work his delegation was happy to see several nuclear-weapon States participating.

Despite that universal desire, the convening of a world conference on disarmament posed problems which were familiar to all the delegations in the Ad Hoc Committee. The essential problem was to remove any basis for suspecting that any one State was using the important task of the United Nations to suit its own purposes, and that problem should be resolved before the World Disarmament Conference could take place.

His delegation approved the Argentine proposal for the establishment of a working group. The working group should be a small one, with the members of the Bureau participating and the geographical regions appropriately represented; it should be an "offspring" of the Committee, and should not supplement its work.

In the field of disarmament, his delegation believed that it might be best to begin with a total prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons, for those were the weapons that directly threatened human life and the environment. The economic crisis, hunger, disease and poverty, which afflicted two thirds of the peoples of the world, made the need for disarmament even more imperative. All the members of the Committee agreed that States must disarm and that the funds saved through disarmament should be channelled into development to make a decent life for everyone on the globe. That had always been the position of his Government which the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines had reiterated in his statement to the General Assembly at its twenty-eighth session. Since the Disarmament Decade coincided with the Development Decade, the success of the latter could not be too difficult if the former was successful.

His delegation associated itself with the others that had called for an end to the arms race. Its views were summarized in the background paper prepared by the Secretariat, and he assured everyone that his delegation would do its part in carrying out the task of the Ad Hoc Committee.

/...
conference provided that it would really be one in which all the major military Powers, including the five nuclear-weapon States, took part. It would need most careful preparation, and the timing would be of the greatest importance. As many speakers had pointed out, the Committee would have to adhere closely to its mandate in preparing its report and must not lose sight of the objective. To attempt to convert the Committee into a preparatory committee would not be likely to dispel the fears of those who doubted the usefulness of such a conference. His delegation would study with careful attention the draft which the working group would prepare.

In conclusion, he paid tribute to the Chairman for his great ability and commended the Rapporteur for his pertinent comments concerning the document prepared by the Secretariat.

Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt) recalled that Egypt had consistently advocated the convening of a world disarmament conference and that it had taken that stance both in the United Nations and in several international forums like the conferences of non-aligned countries. However, it believed that such an undertaking needed serious work and that certain requirements must be fulfilled if successful results were to be obtained. The World Disarmament Conference must have the support of all Powers, and above all the nuclear Powers. Without their participation, the Conference was doomed to failure. Adequate preparation was another prerequisite.

Some speakers had already mentioned the favourable conditions which now prevailed on the international scene: the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union was entering a new era, détente was becoming a feature of international politics, agreement had been reached in different areas, and steps had been taken to abate the arms race. Within the United Nations, the General Assembly had instructed the Ad Hoc Committee to examine all the views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and to submit a report to it. The Committee now had before it the draft document prepared by the Secretariat, which would be very helpful to the working group, since it revealed the views of Governments and areas of consensus and emphasis.

The examination which the Committee was to undertake should be a broad one; in other words, it should fulfil the ultimate goal. His delegation agreed with the explanations given at the preceding meeting by the representative of Spain /...
and considered that an open-ended working group would be more likely to gain world-wide support.

In his Government's view, the functioning of the collective security system as devised in the Charter of the United Nations depended on disarmament. Through limitation of armaments and the effective organization of collective security, one would find a hopeful answer to the problems of world order. Disarmament would also make it possible to allocate more funds and more human resources to economic and social development.

The statements delivered by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom were a good omen of more involvement in the Committee's work on the part of the nuclear Powers. However, he would remind the Committee that there were still some areas of the world which were struggling for their right to self-determination and independence against colonialism, racism and foreign occupation. If disarmament was a matter of universal concern and should be considered by a world conference, the liberation movements should be seated at the conference and their voice should be heard.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) felt that, after useful analysis of the Secretariat's summary by the representative of Spain and the statements by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom, which reflected a laudable spirit of co-operation, the time had come to consider the question of setting up the working group so that the Ad Hoc Committee might carry out its real task, as there was almost unanimous agreement on the desirability of a world disarmament conference. He would like the Chairman to ask the Committee to take up that question.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Committee was already considering the question. Following the informal consultations he had had, there would appear to be unanimity on many points. First, the working group should be a small group, but should not be closed to other members of the Ad Hoc Committee. Secondly, its task would be to prepare a draft report, with conclusions and recommendations, which would be examined by the Committee and submitted by it to the General Assembly. Thirdly, the geographical groups should decide who was to represent them in the working group. Several of them had already indicated that they had consulted on that point. Finally, the general view was that the working group might have about 10 members.
Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said he believed that 10 members would be a good number for the working group, as there were five officers of the Committee who would be members and the geographical groups, each of which would have one representative, also numbered five. If the geographical groups wished to be represented by more than one member, there might be some difficulty. The working group would be an open-ended group. If there was no objection to that arrangement, the group could be established immediately.

The CHAIRMAN felt that it should be left to the geographical groups to decide whether or not they wanted their representatives who were officers of the Committee to be members of the working group, since the officers were not responsible for drafting the report whereas the working group would be. The geographical groups could be asked to appoint two representatives. Naturally, any member of the Committee could participate in the work of the working group.

Mr. van der KLAAUW (Netherlands) said that his geographical group favoured the ideas expressed by the Chairman. For the sake of efficiency, the working group would have not more than 10 members. Each geographical group would appoint two representatives.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) agreed with the idea of a 10-member working group, provided that the five officers of the Committee were members. If the working group was composed in any other way, it might be difficult to achieve proportional representation of the geographical groups.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the idea was to establish not a sub-committee but a working group and that the rule of proportional representation of the geographical groups had never been applied in the past in such cases. In expressing the belief that it was for the geographical groups to decide, he had taken into account the comments made by the representative of Mexico and also the fact that some of the officers might not wish to serve on the working group or might be unable to participate in its work in July and August. However, as the purpose was to prepare a preliminary draft report, perhaps the Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee should serve on, or even preside over, the working group. The geographical groups should consider those various points.
Mr. van der KLAUW (Netherlands) said that, in the view of his geographical group, the Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee should be a member of the working group.

Mr. CHRISTIANI (Austria) said that the discussions of the last few days had clarified the matter and had been useful as to both substance and procedure. His delegation had already spoken on the substance of the matter at the first session of the Ad Hoc Committee. With regard to procedure, the Secretariat document would serve as a basis for the Committee's work, but it was still only a summary of the views of some 100 countries.

According to General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), paragraph 1, the Ad Hoc Committee must "examine" the views and suggestions expressed by Governments and therefore must formulate conclusions which would be submitted to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session. That being so, it seemed desirable, as the representative of Argentina had proposed, to establish a small working group with precise terms of reference. His delegation was in favour of a 10-member group as proposed by the representative of Bulgaria - namely, the five officers of the Committee and five members appointed by the geographical groups - although, in order to ensure better geographical distribution, the number could be increased to 15 as proposed by the representative of Egypt, on the understanding that any other members of the Committee would be able to participate in the work of the group if they wished to do so.

The question of the terms of reference of the working group was complicated, but all delegations agreed that the report to be submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee and subsequently to the General Assembly should be drafted by the group. In order to ensure that the draft report was not merely a summary, the working group could consider the views of Governments under the headings suggested by the Secretariat, concentrate on the areas of agreement which would be the heart of the draft report and from which the Ad Hoc Committee would draw its conclusions and, finally, identify differences of opinion with a view to reconciling them.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the proposal by the representative of Bulgaria raised a technical problem. Officers of the Committee who were elected to membership of the working group in an individual capacity would, of course, have to attend. However, some of the officers, including himself, would not be able to
(The Chairman)

take part in the group's meetings owing to other engagements; officers of the Committee would therefore have to be appointed as representatives of countries or of geographical groups.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) proposed a compromise, under which the working group would have 10 members, including five officers of the Committee and five members appointed by the geographical groups, but if an officer of the Committee was unable to take part in the working group he would be replaced by another member of his geographical group. Thus, the representatives of Argentina, Mexico and Spain—the latter perhaps as chairman of the working group—would be able to take part in its work.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said he considered it desirable, as the Chairman had suggested, for officers of the Committee to participate in the working group as representatives of their countries and not as individuals. He found the idea of having the election of officers of the Committee ratified by the geographical groups very sensible, since some of the officers might not wish to participate in the working group. As the representative of Tunisia had said, the Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee should be a member, and perhaps chairman of the working group, since he would be responsible for introducing the draft report of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. ELIAS (Spain), Rapporteur, stated that, without taking any position, he was prepared to agree to participate in the working group as rapporteur, as chairman as the representative of Spain.

Mr. ABDEL MEYGUI (Egypt) said that it would be useful to know whether the other officers of the Committee, the representatives of Burundi, Peru and Poland, were willing to participate in the working group. In addition, a representative of Iran should be chosen to replace the Chairman in the working group.

So far as the other five members of the working group were concerned, the African group had not yet held consultations. He understood that the European group had discussed the matter, and he wondered whether it had already made its choice. It seemed to him that the question could be settled at once, so that the Committee could proceed to consider the working group's terms of reference.

/...
The CHAIRMAN confirmed that one geographical group had made its choice.

Mr. SINARINZI (Burundi), Mr. LUDWICZAK (Poland) and Mr. STUBBS (Peru) said that they were prepared, as officers of the Committee, to participate in the working group.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the working group already had five members. The geographical groups should hold discussions with regard to the remaining five members, it being understood that any member of the Committee wishing to participate in the group's work would be welcome. He hoped that the names of the members appointed by the regional groups and of the countries wishing to participate in the working group would be available by the following morning so that the group could perhaps, after consultation with the Secretariat, make use of the conference services not required by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. CORREA (Mexico) said his delegation hoped, as it had said at the preceding meeting, that the working group would be open-ended, and welcomed the fact that Peru would be a member of the group. His own delegation had already said that it also wished to participate in the group's work, and if the group was open-ended it would attend all the meetings.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) noted that five members, or one for each geographical group, still were to be elected. The Latin American countries would be holding consultations later in the day, but they were prepared to appoint the representative of Mexico as a second member from their region, in view of the great contribution he had made to the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee.

The representative of Mexico had suggested at the preceding meeting that the Argentine delegation should be the one to participate in the working group, since it had proposed the establishment of the group. However, he believed that Latin America would be well represented by Peru and Mexico, with his own country perhaps reserving its right to attend the working group's meetings.

The CHAIRMAN, summing up, said that the proposed working group would have 10 members, of whom 5 would be officers of the Committee and the other 5 would be announced at the following day's meeting. However, the group would be open-ended and any delegations could participate in its work if they so desired.
(The Chairman)

The group could be presided over by the Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee, and if the Committee was not meeting in plenary session the working group could use the conference services, which would enable it to organize its work and establish a time-table. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed with those suggestions.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the representatives of Austria, Egypt and Tunisia had already spoken on the working group's terms of reference, and asked whether any delegation had further comments on that matter.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) stated that the working group's terms of reference were easily definable: the purposes of the group should be to analyse the document prepared by the Secretariat and to draft a report for consideration by the Ad Hoc Committee and subsequent submission to the General Assembly. It might be better to leave it to the working group to decide how it would organize its work.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) said that the remarks of the representative of Austria had been very useful and that it was indeed necessary to reconcile the existing differences of opinion. He also wished to draw attention to a point which he considered important: if the working group was open-ended, it could be hoped that the nuclear-weapon States would send representatives to it. If not, the officers of the Committee should maintain contact with those countries in order to save time when the Ad Hoc Committee came to consider the draft report and in the hope of reaching the required consensus as early as possible.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, under the terms of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), paragraph 3, the States possessing nuclear weapons enjoyed the same rights as the members of the Ad Hoc Committee, which meant that they could participate in the work of the working group if they so desired. At present three countries possessing nuclear weapons were participating in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, but the views of all countries, without exception, possessing such weapons should be sought. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the proposal of the representative of Argentina.

It was so decided.
Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) asked how much time the working group would have to prepare the draft report for the Ad Hoc Committee.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the third session of the Ad Hoc Committee would open on 9 September. The draft report would therefore have to be circulated to members of the Committee, in all the working languages, at least 10 days before the opening of that session. That was why he had asked delegations, if there was no afternoon plenary meeting of the Committee on the following day or the day after that, to allow the working group to meet in order to organize its work and agree on a time-table. He requested delegations to inform him on the following morning of the names of the five members of the working group still to be appointed.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.
EXAMINATION OF ALL THE VIEWS AND SUGGESTIONS EXPRESSED BY GOVERNMENTS ON THE
CONVENING OF A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE AND RELATED PROBLEMS, INCLUDING
CONDITIONS FOR THE REALIZATION OF SUCH A CONFERENCE (concluded)

The CHAIRMAN announced that the geographical groups had designated the
five remaining members of the Working Group. Hungary would represent the countries
of Eastern Europe, Italy the countries of Western Europe, Mexico the Latin American
countries, India the Asian countries, and Egypt the African countries.

If the Ad Hoc Committee completed its work at the current meeting, the
conference room would be made available to the Working Group in the afternoon.

Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia) observed that the Committee's deliberations
indicated that the preparations for, and the convening of, a world disarmament
conference were becoming a pressing objective urged by the overwhelming majority of
the States Members of the United Nations. The Committee's first session had
brought it considerably nearer to the fulfilment of its task, and the summary
prepared by the Secretariat could serve as a basis for the elaboration of the
Committee's report to the General Assembly. The summary, reflecting the views of
96 Member States, might also serve as a guideline for the Working Group. His
delegation had endorsed the Bulgarian proposal on the basis of which the Working
Group would be composed of the officers of the Committee and five other members,
one from each geographical group. The activities of the Working Group should
consist in preparing a draft report - a task which would require a further analysis
of the positions and proposals of States concerning the preparations for a world
disarmament conference. The Working Group should concentrate in the first instance
on seeking common points in the views of States in order to show that there already
existed a consensus on certain important aspects of the preparations for the
conference. If the Working Group was to carry out its work effectively, it must
maintain contact with the members of the Committee, and his delegation therefore viewed as reasonable the decision that the Group should remain open to all members.

His delegation agreed with the majority of other delegations that the nuclear Powers should participate in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. It therefore welcomed the fact that, apart from the Soviet Union, two nuclear Powers - France and the United Kingdom - were attending the Committee's meetings. It was to be hoped that the two remaining nuclear Powers - China and the United States - would reassess their positions and would also support the Committee's efforts.

Co-operation among States possessing nuclear weapons was an important prerequisite for the convening of a world disarmament conference. Czechoslovakia welcomed the normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and the signing of important agreements relating to the curbing of the arms race. The results of previous efforts, as well as the current negotiations, played a significant role in the process of détente and helped to improve the international atmosphere. A disarmament conference might accelerate that development and provide a fresh impetus in resolving the issues of disarmament and a whole range of grave international problems. While expenditure on armaments was increasing and weapons were being perfected - a trend which endangered human life - the progress of mankind was also being affected by other problems, such as pollution of the environment and the securing of sources of energy and raw materials. Resolving those issues would require huge financial resources and large numbers of scientific and technological personnel, and the drain of such personnel into the military sphere must therefore be halted. The majority of States, as proved by the sixth special session of the General Assembly, expected that the deliberations on disarmament would make it possible to secure more means for peaceful economic development.

Only patient efforts and an open attitude on the part of the advocates of a world disarmament conference could foster the conditions under which all States might become aware of the essential need for their participation in the preparations for the conference and in the conference itself. His delegation would spare no effort to assist in fulfilling the tasks that the Committee faced.
Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan) welcomed the draft document prepared by the Secretariat, which met the Committee's needs. He also considered that the exchange of views at the current session had been very useful.

The Bulgarian delegation had referred to the danger of more and more States' seeking to obtain nuclear weapons and to conduct nuclear tests. His country's concern over the nuclear explosion carried out in India had been made known in various forums. That development lent urgency to the question of nuclear disarmament. Pakistan took the view that the situation which had arisen as a result of the Indian explosion called for prompt and effective action and that its consideration could not await the convening of a world disarmament conference. A review of the question of the security of non-nuclear-weapon States and of the application of international safeguards to peaceful nuclear research and development had become urgent. In that connexion, the Fifth Conference of the Islamic Foreign Ministers, currently meeting in Kuala Lumpur, had just adopted a resolution stating that it considered it imperative for the international community to devise measures to assure the security of non-nuclear countries, to strengthen the existing security assurances, and to provide a solemn undertaking not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States.

The Indian nuclear explosion also raised a question with regard to the world disarmament conference, namely, the question of the status of a State participating in the conference which had conducted nuclear explosions. Would such a State be treated as a nuclear-weapon Power, or would it belong to a new category of nuclear Powers? If it was sought to create such a new category, that must be done by bringing such a country's nuclear facilities under international inspection and safeguards.

His delegation was glad that the Ad Hoc Committee had adopted the proposal for the establishment of a Working Group. It understood, however, that initially the examination of the views of Governments would take place in the Committee and that it was only after such an examination that the Working Group would draft a report.
The figure of 10 agreed upon for the membership of the Working Group was reasonable and practical and would enable the Group to discharge its function efficiently and speedily. When the draft report was ready, the Ad Hoc Committee could meet briefly in order to examine it and approve it for submission to the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session.

The Working Group must be enjoined to adhere to the provisions of General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII), since it would not be in accord with those provisions to create the impression that the Ad Hoc Committee was a preparatory body for the World Disarmament Conference. If that was kept in mind, it would be possible to avoid the difficulties that had constantly arisen over the past two years.

The representative of Tunisia had stressed the need to give prominence to the views of the five nuclear-weapon States. His delegation agreed that those views were crucial for the success or failure of the current effort. Accordingly, the Working Group's report should reflect fully and faithfully the views of all the nuclear-weapon States. His delegation hoped that the Group would make contact with those nuclear-weapon States that were not present in the Ad Hoc Committee. Finally, if the report drafted by the Working Group was to have any meaning, it should clearly outline the divergence of opinion that existed regarding the convening of a world disarmament conference; only then could the General Assembly attempt to reconcile the differences and determine the future course of action.

Mr. ABDULDJALIL (Indonesia) said that the summary prepared by the Secretariat and the earlier replies of Member States to the Secretary-General had given his delegation not only a better understanding of the issues involved but also an awareness of the magnitude of the problems relating to the convening of a world disarmament conference. The very lucid analysis by the representative of Spain had also greatly helped to clarify issues and place them in the proper perspective.

The replies to the Secretary-General revealed the interest of many countries in the idea of convening a disarmament conference. The document prepared by the Secretariat reflected the fact that current international efforts were being directed mainly at engaging all countries in a discussion on disarmament. There was general agreement on a number of issues: the convening of a conference.
(Mr. Abdaljalil, Indonesia)

(although there was a difference of opinion regarding its timing); the agenda, which should cover all aspects of disarmament but should accord priority to certain issues; the necessity of adequate preparation and of participation by all the major military Powers. A number of delegations had stressed the need to make continued use of existing forums, such as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, in order to translate the recommendations of the Conference into specific draft agreements. In addition, most Member States believed that the Conference should be held under the aegis of the United Nations.

His delegation also subscribed to the idea of a world disarmament conference open to all States, in which the five nuclear Powers would participate. Priority should be accorded to the consideration of nuclear disarmament, but simultaneous consideration of conventional disarmament was also important in order to make progress towards general and complete disarmament.

A stumbling-block was the opposition of some countries, which considered it inopportune to convene a world disarmament conference at the present time. As it was essential to the success of the Conference that all the great Powers, without exception, should participate, the Ad Hoc Committee should devote whatever time was necessary to the reconciliation of conflicting points of view. The problem was further complicated by the stalemate between the nuclear Powers themselves concerning some fundamental questions of disarmament. His delegation welcomed the positive statements in that regard made by the representatives of France and the United Kingdom, who were participating in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee, and it hoped that the remaining nuclear Powers would decide to follow their example.

It was in that context that the Committee should decide whether there now existed the requisite conditions for the holding of a conference. If the Committee succeeded in providing the General Assembly with a basis for a decision on the procedures for preparing the Conference, it would have more than fulfilled its mandate. It was his delegation's view that an analysis of the Secretariat paper and the various opinions expressed during the discussion should provide the basis for recommending, in principle, the convening of the Conference.

His delegation endorsed the composition of the Working Group on the understanding that the Group would be open-ended and that other members of the Committee would be free to participate in its discussions. The Group's terms of reference should include an analysis of the paper prepared by the Secretariat,
a definition of the areas of possible agreement with, as suggested by the representative of Austria, an indication of the areas of disagreement, and a statement of the positions of the great Powers, especially those which had not committed themselves to the idea of the Conference, specifying how they could co-operate fully. The draft report should incorporate the main views expressed in the course of the Ad Hoc Committee's deliberations. That approach should also result in the formulation of suggestions and conclusions which would considerably facilitate the Committee's task in reporting to the General Assembly.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) recalled that atmospheric nuclear tests had been vigorously condemned by the representative of Mongolia the previous day. His own delegation's position concerning a discriminatory approach to nuclear tests depending on whether they were conducted in a certain environment, in a certain region of the world or by a certain Power was well known, and he would not repeat what had been said the previous year in the statements made on that point in the First Committee.

Under its terms of reference, the Committee was expected to concentrate on the consideration of views and suggestions of Governments regarding the holding of a world disarmament conference. The purpose of such a conference should be precisely that of preventing discrimination, ending nuclear monopolies and achieving true disarmament. The consensus required for the accomplishment of the Committee's task, and for the convening of the Conference itself, could not be brought about by engaging in polemics regarding certain nuclear tests. Allusions of the kind made the previous day were certainly not calculated to promote co-operation with the Committee by all the nuclear Powers, and yet such co-operation was recognized as essential by all concerned.

The statement by the representative of Pakistan prompted him to observe once again that the only satisfactory solution to all the problems posed by nuclear weapons was their destruction, without which, no matter how great the efforts made, it was difficult to prevent their proliferation. He hoped that the proposed conference would be the starting point for a genuine effort towards that goal.
Mr. LAHIRI (India) said that the statement by the representative of Pakistan implied that India was equipping itself with nuclear weapons. That was not true; his country had already explained repeatedly that it was conducting nuclear tests for peaceful purposes only. Such tests did not place India in an equivocal position, since General Assembly resolution 3183 (XXVIII) spoke of "non-nuclear-weapon States" and "States possessing nuclear weapons". A distinction must be made between countries which conducted nuclear tests for peaceful purposes and those which possessed nuclear weapons. India had no intention of acquiring such weapons but maintained its right to exploit every peaceful use of nuclear energy. India continued to support fully the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control and was convinced that a world disarmament conference would promote that cause provided that it was held after adequate preparation and with the participation of all States.

The representative of Pakistan had also referred to the question of international safeguards. Although he considered it inappropriate to discuss this question in the present forum, he wished to reiterate his delegation's position on the question. The first step should be the cessation of all nuclear weapon tests in all environments. After that, an international system of observation or regulation of peaceful nuclear explosions under appropriate international safeguards could be separately agreed upon. India had advocated the application of appropriate safeguards, provided they were functional, non-discriminatory and applied universally to all countries.

The CHAIRMAN reminded delegations that the terms of reference of the Ad Hoc Committee were clearly defined in paragraph 1 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII) and suggested that they should endeavour to abide by them.

Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan) said that he had raised the question of the Indian nuclear tests not in substantive terms but merely by way of supporting the Bulgarian representative's statement regarding recent events which made the holding of a world disarmament conference particularly necessary. He agreed with the representative of France that all nuclear weapons should be destroyed, but he also believed that every weapon, of whatever kind, should be destroyed in order to bring about a truly peaceful world, which was the goal of the United Nations.

He did not believe that he had introduced ambiguity into the discussion when
referring to the Indian nuclear tests, but it did seem to him that in order to
distinguish, as advocated by the representative of India, between countries which
possessed nuclear weapons and those which were merely conducting nuclear tests, it
would be necessary to establish criteria that were based on something more than the
intentions of the countries concerned.

Those problems affected all countries, and the Islamic conference of Ministers
for Foreign Affairs had just adopted, at Kuala Lumpur, a resolution which reflected
a desire to ensure the security of the non-nuclear States. The point at issue was
not therefore a quarrel between India and Pakistan but a problem which called for
reflection, discussion and action.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) suggested that the Working Group which had just been
established might meet following the present exchange of views, thus taking
advantage of the services which had been provided for the Ad Hoc Committee.

The CHAIRMAN welcomed that suggestion. The Committee had held an
interesting exchange of views, and it had progressed in its work by setting up a
Working Group which, although small, was open to all who wished to participate in
it. The Working Group could use the time – three meetings – remaining to the
Ad Hoc Committee in order to organize and perhaps begin its work.

Mr. ELIAS (Rapporteur) observed that the Working Group had been given
sufficiently explicit terms of reference; he would conduct its proceedings to the
best of his ability. He understood that the Group could meet for the first time in
the afternoon and would be provided with interpretation services.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the Working Group was scheduled to meet and that
all members of the Committee could participate in its work if they wished.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) said he took it that the current meeting was the last
meeting of the plenary body at the current session.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the next meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee would
be held on 9 September and that in the meantime the Working Group would meet to
complete its work.

/...
Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) expressed regret that he had been unable to be present for the previous day's meeting and most of the current meeting, which he understood was to be the last of the session. The Working Group would now draft the Committee's report, which, according to paragraph 1 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII), was to be prepared "on the basis of consensus". In that connexion, he wished to repeat what he had said in the First Committee when he had introduced, on behalf of its sponsors, the draft resolution which had been adopted as resolution 3183 (XXVIII): in the view of the representatives who had participated in the laborious negotiations which had led to the unanimous adoption of that resolution, the word "consensus" also applied to States which possessed nuclear arms and which were invited to co-operate with the Committee under the terms of paragraph 3 of the resolution. That was an important point which the Working Group would have to take into account.

He also suggested that the Committee should request the Secretary-General to remind all Member States that they were invited, under paragraph 1 of the resolution, to communicate to him their views and suggestions. It was to be hoped that many States would reply; when the same invitation had been addressed to them under paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 2833 (XXVI), there had been only 33 replies.

He was pleased that the Latin American Group had nominated him as a member of the Working Group. However, he personally would not be in New York for most of the summer, since he had to attend the meetings of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva and preside over the Mexican delegation at the preparatory conference for review of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In his absence the Mexican delegation could, of course, make a constructive contribution to the work of the Group; however, it did not feel that it could accept its nomination to that body. His delegation thought it inconceivable that the delegation which had proposed the establishment of the Working Group, i.e. that of Argentina, should not be a member of the Group, whose work it wished to have the maximum effectiveness. That was why it had proposed that the Group should be composed of 15 rather than 10 members. If, as often happened in the summer, one delegation was unable to be represented or could not be represented at a sufficiently high level, it could be replaced by another delegation from the same group. His
delegation therefore requested permission to withdraw from the Group; its place should unquestionably be taken by Argentina.

The CHAIRMAN said he was certain that the Mexican delegation would make a positive contribution to the work of the Group. Since the Argentine delegation had also made it known that it would take an active part in the deliberations of the Group, there was no reason to change the latter's membership.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) recalled the decisive role played by the representative of Mexico in the adoption of resolution 3183 (XXVIII), under which the Committee had been established. It was true that the agreement of the five nuclear Powers was essential to any genuine consensus, and it was for that reason that he had suggested the previous day that the Working Group should maintain contact with those Powers, as provided for in paragraph 3 of the resolution. No one was better qualified than the representative of Mexico to maintain the desired contacts. As for Argentina, it went without saying that his delegation would contribute to the work of the Group to the best of its ability.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that there was no provision for two delegations from the same regional group to take turns in occupying the seat assigned to their group, but since the representative of Argentina had stated that his delegation would participate in the deliberations of the Working Group as often as possible, which it was entitled to do on a footing of absolute equality, he felt that the two delegations could reach an agreement whereby the Latin American Group would in practice always be represented at a sufficiently high level. Under those conditions, his delegation could accept its nomination as a member of the Working Group.

The CHAIRMAN welcomed the fact that the composition of the Working Group remained unchanged. He drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that, under paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII), the States possessing nuclear weapons were "invited" to co-operate or maintain contact with the Committee; entrusting the Rapporteur with the task of maintaining contact with those States might appear to contradict that provision. In fact, however, that contradiction was only apparent, and there had always been a flow of dialogue between the nuclear Powers and the
(The Chairman)

Committee. It was also possible to ask the Secretary-General to request the views of those Powers, as the representative of Mexico had suggested.

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico), speaking on a point of order, pointed out that he had expressed the wish that the Secretary-General should request the views of the States referred to in paragraph 4, and not paragraph 3, of the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN said he was certain that the Committee would have no objection to that suggestion.

Mr. NIGLIOLO (Italy) recalled that at the last session he had expressed the view that the Secretariat would be in a position to prepare an accurate and objective summary of the views and suggestions of States. He congratulated the Secretariat on the excellence of its work, which was so comprehensive that there was no need for him to reiterate the views of his Government before the Committee. Those views were faithfully reflected in the document in question and had not changed. He recalled that Italy had always emphasized the absolute necessity for careful preparation of the World Disarmament Conference. Since it should deal with disarmament questions as a whole, priority consideration should be given to the problems of nuclear disarmament, and that view had been confirmed by recent events. It was therefore essential that the nuclear Powers should be associated with all the work relating to the Conference from its earliest phase.

His delegation was grateful to the Western countries, which were members of the Ad Hoc Committee or were participating in its work in accordance with paragraph 3 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII), for having shown their confidence in it by requesting it to represent them on the Working Group, to which it was determined to make a constructive and objective contribution. It felt that the decision to keep the Working Group small was a wise one and would, inter alia, ensure that the Group would not supplant the Committee, as had unfortunately happened in the case of other bodies. The joint participation proposed by Argentina and Mexico was not without precedent: the Working Group that had been responsible for preparing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security had considered that it should maintain a certain flexibility of membership, and it had adopted a principle of rotation, making it possible to call on delegations possessing a special
competence one by one, which had proved to be a very useful procedure. Resolution 3183 (XXVIII) provided for efforts to achieve consensus, and it was obvious that that provision also applied to the Working Group. His delegation had noted the remarks made in that connexion by the representative of Mexico. Apart from any legal consideration, a realistic approach must be taken if positive results were to be achieved and the support of all the nuclear Powers ensured.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) agreed that the Secretary-General should be requested to remind all States of the provisions of paragraph 4 of resolution 3183 (XXVIII). If it had been a question of the States referred to in paragraph 3, he would have thought it preferable that that task should be left to the Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. SCALABRE (France) said that, since it had been decided that the Working Group should maintain contact with the nuclear Powers, his delegation, for its part, would keep abreast of the Group's work through the Rapporteur or the Italian delegation.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.