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Corrigendum

Paragraph 14

For the existing text substitute

14. The Committee on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum as referred to by the General Assembly in paragraph 120 of the Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament, includes the five nuclear-weapon States (China, France, USSR, United Kingdom and United States) and 35 other States (Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire). China has participated in the work of the Committee since the beginning of the 1980 session. In the Final Document, the General Assembly also welcomed the agreement that the chairmanship of the Committee would be rotated among all its members on a monthly basis; that the Committee would conduct its work by consensus, submit reports to the General Assembly and make arrangements enabling States not members of the Committee to submit written proposals or working documents, as well as to express views in the Committee when their particular concerns were under discussion. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, following consultations with the Committee on Disarmament, appoints the Secretary of the Committee, who also acts as his personal representative, to assist the Committee and its Chairman. 3/
Paragraph 17

For the existing text substitute

17. The Ad Hoc Working Group established to negotiate with a view to reaching agreement on a convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons has examined the major elements of a draft treaty on such a prohibition, which are a joint initiative by the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as a number of other proposals and views on the subject. Differences in concept regarding approach, priority, definition, verification, and certain other matters have necessitated continued negotiations to elaborate a convention.

Paragraph 59

For the existing text substitute

59. The issue of data concerning the size of respective armed forces in the area was brought into prominence and has been unsolved for several years now, although a series of exchanges of official data and profound technical discussions of military experts took place throughout the negotiations between 1976, when the Western participants suggested an exchange of data, and 1981. In June 1980, upon an Eastern participants' proposal, both sides exchanged the official data, updated as of 1 January 1980. However, the Western side maintained that there were still significant discrepancies in the evaluation of the strength of respective armed forces.

Page 15, line 8

The foot-note indicator should read 16/

Page 15, chapter heading

IV. TRILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS ON A COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN read IV. TRILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS ON A NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Page 15, paragraph 73, line 3

For comprehensive test ban read nuclear test ban

Page 15, paragraph 74, last line

For the comprehensive test ban read a nuclear test ban

/...
Paragraph 75

For the existing text substitute

75. The General Assembly, in resolutions 35/145 A and B, adopted on 12 December 1980, urged the Committee on Disarmament to create an ad hoc working group which should begin multilateral negotiations on a nuclear test-ban treaty. Early in February 1981, the Group of 21, a group of socialist countries and other delegations supported the proposals of the previous year to establish an ad hoc working group. Proposals advanced during the 1981 session for that purpose did not achieve consensus. The United States explained that in the prevailing circumstances it was not in a position to agree to the establishment of such a group, while the United Kingdom reaffirmed its preference for the continuation of the trilateral negotiations. The Soviet Union, the third participant in the negotiations, supported the proposal to set up a working group.