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AGENDA ITEMS 9, 10, 11 and 12 (continued)


ADOPTION OF A DECLARATION ON DISARMAMENT

ADOPTION OF A PROGRAMME OF ACTION ON DISARMAMENT

REVIEW OF THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN DISARMAMENT AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL MACHINERY FOR NEGOTIATIONS ON DISARMAMENT, INCLUDING IN PARTICULAR THE QUESTION OF CONVENING A WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): First, I want to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that document A/S-10/AC.1/33 has been distributed under the title: "Letter dated 20 June 1978 from the President of the World Food Council to the Secretary-General". Further, the Committee has also received document A/S-10/AC.1/L.1/Rev.1, the draft resolution presented jointly by Afghanistan and a group of countries.

Third, the final report of Working Group A to the Ad Hoc Committee has been circulated as Conference Room Paper No. 7. The final report of Working Group B, on the programme of action, will be found in Conference Room Paper No. 8.

Several delegations wish to make statements.

Mr. WARNKE (United States of America): It is for me a great personal privilege to speak in this forum today, and it is also a personal pleasure to note that my Government attaches great significance to this unprecedented demonstration that all the members of the family of nations share a common concern about world armament levels, occupied as we are with major arms control negotiations that at this stage must be bilateral, and with others that are, at this stage, of limited participation.
It is important to be reminded of this world-wide concern, and the phenomenon of speakers from 119 countries, including a score of chiefs of State and heads of Government, underscores the fact that arms control and disarmament are recognized as a global imperative. When Vice-President Mondale spoke to the special session four weeks ago, he pledged that the United States would not only speak in this Assembly, but also that it would listen. We have done so and have received, along with all the other participants, a message which is clear and unmistakable. The world is impatient with, and intolerant of, the circumstances in which literally the survival of human society is threatened by the accumulation of more and more weapons with greater and greater destructive power.

Now no one, particularly the United States, could seriously deny that we, and the others which possess the major arsenals of weapons, have a long way to go in order to meet the requirements so eloquently expressed in this forum. But we cannot, of course, move unilaterally or without regard for preservation of the military balance, and we therefore have to move more slowly than we or any of you might wish.

But as I examine the programme of action that has been emerging from the deliberations over these weeks, and from all the months of dedicated work in the Preparatory Committee sessions, it is apparent to me that the arms control negotiations in which my Government is now engaged coincide to a remarkable extent with that programme of action. My agency, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has now been in existence for about 17 years, and at no time in its history has the United States Government been engaged in arms negotiations that have the range and variety that are going on today. Some of these negotiations are approaching a successful conclusion. Others are in mid-course, while still others are in their opening phases. But almost without exception they are making significant progress.
I thought it might be useful for me to review the present status of our arms control negotiations in the context of the programme of action for this special session as it has thus far evolved. Although the consensus document, which we all hope will emerge from this session, is not yet in its final form, we can now see its broad outlines. Indeed, its major points have been clear since the end of the fifth and last session of the Preparatory Committee. I shall begin with the topic to which the programme appropriately gives priority - the area of nuclear weapons and, specifically, immediate and short-term measures to halt and reverse the armaments race.
In that area of nuclear weapons as all Members know we are vigorously pursuing negotiations with the Soviet Union on a SALT II agreement and we are also negotiating with the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom looking towards a comprehensive test ban treaty. It is our expectation that the result of these trilateral negotiations will be considered by the multilateral forum of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD).

There is, of course, not time today for me to go into the details of the SALT negotiations. I should like, however, to emphasize three points. The first is that SALT, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, is and must be a continuing process. In SALT I in May 1972 certain limits were set on strategic ballistic missiles and the destabilizing potential of anti-ballistic missile systems was brought under control. Looking to the future the framework of the over-all SALT II agreement will itself include principles on which we can proceed promptly to a SALT III negotiation.

My second point with regard to the SALT negotiations is that the emerging agreement will provide - as a matter of fact accord has already been reached in principle on these provisions - not only for a cap on the quantitative nuclear arms race but also for significant reductions in the ceilings that were worked out tentatively by the United States and the Soviet Union in Vladivostok in 1971. Moreover, for the first time in these negotiations the SALT II agreement will include qualitative constraints which will begin to close down the technological competition in strategic nuclear weapons.

Then, thirdly, it is agreed by the parties that SALT III, the third stage in our Strategic Arms Limitation Talks - and I hope that this will begin immediately SALT II has been concluded - will aim at even deeper cuts in the numbers and more effective and comprehensive qualitative limitations. In the nuclear area as well, the comprehensive test ban treaty will represent the culmination of efforts, now extending over the past two decades, which have previously produced the limited test-ban Treaty and the threshold test-ban Treaty. That we are now pursuing is the prospect of a complete ban on all nuclear test explosions and the programme of action wisely recognizes this ban as an essential step on the road to the eventual complete elimination of nuclear weapons.
During this special session, after hearing the concerns that were voiced by the non-nuclear-weapon States, the United States has taken a further step to limit the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons and thus a step to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war and to discourage the spread of such weapons.

In President Carter's statement read by Secretary Vance the United States has pledged that it will not use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon State party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or any comparable internationally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear explosive devices, except in the case of an attack on the United States, its territories or armed forces for its allies by such a State allied to a nuclear-weapon State or associated with a nuclear-weapon State in carrying out or sustaining the attack. That undertaking appreciably extends President Carter's previous commitment to the October session of the General Assembly and this expanded commitment shows our determination that nuclear weapons must truly be treated as weapons of last resort.

My country is also pursuing an organized plan of carefully related policies which we believe can ensure the continued peaceful development of nuclear power and the pursuit of nuclear research without contributing to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. A fundamental part of these related policies is to encourage all nations to adhere to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We urge that they do so in their own self interest and in the interest of world peace.

It has at times been argued that the nuclear Powers have not acted promptly enough or strongly enough to discharge their obligations under article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Under that article they pledge to pursue the control and reduction of nuclear arms. Dissatisfaction with the implementation of article VI is even cited at times as casting doubt on the equity of the Treaty or providing a rationale for non-adherence.

The pace of nuclear arms control has, beyond doubt, been painfully slow. I have tried to explain today some of the reasons why more rapid action is difficult to achieve. I have assured you and assure you now that the United States recognizes that every effort must be made to accelerate the movement towards sound and effective measures to limit nuclear arms. We agree that the existing nuclear-weapon States must recognize and respond to urgings that they
take the action contemplated by article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Certainly the nuclear-weapon States cannot show indifference to the moral questions created by their possession of nuclear weapons. But the world community cannot accept dissatisfaction with the actions thus far taken by the existing nuclear-weapon States as an excuse for other countries to acquire nuclear weapons. Certainly the risk to world peace and to human survival created by the existence of five nuclear-weapon States cannot be diminished if more such weapons are acquired by additional States. Indeed, I would suggest that such proliferation would only reduce the pressures and the incentives and the prospect that the existing nuclear-weapon States will move towards nuclear arms control.

As President Carter stated last fall, the existence of nuclear weapons in the United States and the Soviet Union and in Great Britain, France and China, is something we cannot undo except by the painstaking process of negotiation, but the existence of those weapons does not mean that other nations need to develop their own weapons any more than it provides a reason for those of us who have them to share them with others.

To strengthen global efforts to halt proliferation of nuclear weapons my Government has announced at this special session its intention to enlarge its contribution to the peaceful nuclear programmes of other countries through a number of specific new programmes. While helping other countries to meet their energy needs these programmes are designed to strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty by granting preference to Treaty parties, to enhance the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) role in peaceful nuclear co-operation and to provide incentives to minimize the export of weapons-grade uranium for use in research reactors.

The United States also supports the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones wherever circumstances permit and we have participated in the creation of such a zone in Latin America by adhering to Additional Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Our recent signature of Additional Protocol I constitutes an agreement to apply the demilitarization provision of the Treaty to our territories within the zone and we hope that the few remaining States which have not yet accepted obligations under the Treaty will be encouraged to do so.
The next major subhead in the programme of action concerns other weapons of mass destruction. Here we are actively engaged, as members know, in negotiations with the Soviet Union under the auspices of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to put an end to the production of chemical weapons and to provide for the destruction of existing stockpiles. As can be imagined problems of verification are extremely difficult and complex but we are making significant progress.
We are also at work in this same forum on a treaty on the prohibition of radiological weapons, weapons that would produce lethal radiation without a nuclear explosion.

The field of conventional weapons is also a subject of our currently active arms-control negotiations. Conventional weapons account for by far the major part of the world's annual arms budget. In seeking to restrict conventional-arms transfers we have entered into bilateral talks with the Soviet Union, and although these talks between the two largest suppliers of arms to foreign countries are still in their primary stage the indications are promising. The United States has, as a unilateral action, met the goal we set for ourselves this year to reduce the over-all volume of our arms transfers. It is clear, however, that if we are to succeed in restraining the flow of arms we must involve both other suppliers and the arms recipients in multilateral discussions. Regional conferences may be a particularly useful mechanism for this. The Declaration of Ayacucho represents a promising beginning in the Latin American region, and we are encouraged by current efforts to broaden that agreement.

We attach great importance to the objective of reducing the $400 billion devoted each year to military budgets. An important step in that direction would be standardized universal reporting of military expenditures. Recognizing the special difficulties in finding a common measure for the military budgets of different States, we have responded to the invitation from the Secretary-General and have committed ourselves to providing our own military budget data in a standard format for purposes of comparison. We continue to hope that more States will do the same.

We have been engaged for almost five years in multilateral discussions referred to as "mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe". These discussions, after a long period in which little progress was made, have begun to pick up speed with the recent introduction of a major new initiative by the Western participants and a response in the form of a counter-proposal by the East. And since last year the United States and the Soviet Union have been conducting bilateral talks on Indian Ocean arms limitations. It is our aim to avert an arms build-up in that region by stabilizing the United States-Soviet military presence and then possibly moving on to mutual reductions.
The United States and the Soviet Union have also begun a series of negotiations - actually during this special session - looking towards the control and elimination of anti-satellite capabilities. We regard these negotiations as important because they can protect the peaceful uses of space and reduce the risk that anti-satellite weapons can threaten the viability of arms control agreements since such agreements must in large part rely on national technical means of verification.

It has long been recognized from bitter experience that threats to international security begin with situations of relatively minor conflict, or potential conflict. For that reason we have been especially interested in work on other measures to strengthen international security and to build confidence. So that the possibility of accidental conflict will be lessened, the misperception and uncertainty that contribute to the arms race will be reduced and a firmer basis of trust will be created for the negotiation of limitations and reductions.

As announced by Vice-President Mondale and elaborated by Mr. Newman of our delegation, the United States, drawing upon its own experience in the Middle East, is prepared to consider requests for technical monitoring services such as aircraft photo reconnaissance and ground-sensor detection in situations where such eyes and ears of peace might support disengagement agreements or other regional stabilizing measures.

Lastly, we have recognized the critical relationship between disarmament and development as spelled out in the section of the programme of action dealing with this subject. The United States believes that development assistance is a high-priority objective that deserves serious consideration and the reprogramming of savings which may accrue from disarmament.

This brief catalogue of the on-going activities of the United States in pursuit of our common goal of a peaceful world that no longer bristles with armaments demonstrates, I hope, that the activities we are already engaged in are in close conformity with the structure the Ad Hoc Committee has been developing in the programme of action. I would not, however, want to be understood to suggest that we can rest on our laurels or indeed to argue that our efforts thus far are deserving of any laurel crown. When we contemplate our ultimate objectives - the reduction and elimination of nuclear-weapons stockpiles, an end to the
development and production of nuclear weapons and of nuclear-weapons material, sharp curtailment of the global traffic in conventional arms, the achievement of stability and security both globally and regionally and at greatly reduced levels of armaments, and the redirection to man's social needs of the vast amounts of human energy and material resources now devoted to the instruments of war - when we contemplate these objectives and see how far we must still go to attain them, we can only feel a sense of urgency. But what I would like to say in this forum is that we in the United States have made a beginning; we are eager to carry on our work in closest harmony with other members of this family of nations, a family which, if it is to live at all, must learn to live together.

Mr. KITTANI (Iraq): On behalf of 32 delegations - those of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam and Yemen, and on behalf of my own delegation - I have the honour to introduce to the Ad Hoc Committee the draft resolution in document A/S-10/AC.1/L.1/Rev.1.

The new draft contains four changes made to the draft in document A/S-10/AC.1/L.1, introduced earlier.

The first change is a small one in the second preambular paragraph, which now reads as follows:

"Alarmed by the increasing evidence regarding Israeli attempts to acquire nuclear weapons".

The second change consists of deleting the penultimate preambular paragraph.
The third change is the addition of the following words at the end of the original last preambular paragraph: "and its resolution 32/105 F, entitled 'Military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa'."

The fourth and last change in the draft consists of simply deleting from operative paragraph 1 what is between the first and second commas - that is, "in particular the United States of America".

Draft resolution A/S-10/AC.1/L.1 has been before this Committee for over three weeks. It was submitted, to be precise, on 2 June, as the draft shows; the co-sponsors believe that now that the work of the two Working Groups has ended and that the Ad Hoc Committee has indeed received the final reports of the two Committees, we believe it is time for this Committee to pronounce itself on the draft resolution.

May I add just a few words to show a self-evident fact - namely, that the co-sponsors have gone out of their way to co-operate with the rest of the delegations, and indeed to make the task of this Ad Hoc Committee and your task as Chairman, Sir, as easy as possible.

We were told informally at the beginning of this session that if we, or anyone, submitted a draft resolution, the flood-gates would open and there would be a spate of draft resolutions and proposals submitted. Yet here we are: the deadline for draft resolutions has come and gone, in this Committee anyway. There might be others, but we have not seen any flood of draft resolutions.

We were asked specifically - and this is a very important fact to recall - not to allow our draft resolution to interfere with the earnest efforts by every delegation, including the sponsors, to reach the maximum possible consensus on the main, principal document before the Assembly and before this Ad Hoc Committee. The co-sponsors have gone out of their way in several ways to make sure that this happened. First of all, as we stated when we first introduced it, the draft resolution itself has been submitted under an item - item 9 - different from the three items relating, respectively, to the introduction, the programme of action and the machinery.
We have co-operated, and we shall continue to co-operate, with the rest of the Assembly to make sure that maximum consensus or agreement is indeed reached on the principal document. We have made absolutely sure that our draft resolution does not interfere with that process. But now, on 23 June, four working days from the conclusion of the Assembly session and as I said, after the two Working Groups have finished their work, we believe it is time that this Ad Hoc Committee pronounce itself on the draft.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In reply to what I think was a sort of request for an opinion on the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Afghanistan and others, I wish to explain what, in my view, is the exact situation before this Ad Hoc Committee.

On 23 May, at the beginning of the work of the tenth special session, the General Assembly unanimously adopted the report of the Preparatory Committee for the special session, paragraph 54 of which reads as follows:

"The Preparatory Committee submits to the General Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament, for its consideration, the following draft resolution embodying a draft final document: ...". And then there appears the text of that final document.

Therefore, since the report of the Preparatory Committee was adopted unanimously, the General Assembly thus endorsed the draft resolution which embodies a draft final document and which was the first one brought to the attention of this Ad Hoc Committee.

Later on, the delegation of Iraq, on behalf of the co-sponsors, introduced the draft resolution contained in document A/S-10/AC.1/L.1, and this morning has introduced a revised text of the same draft resolution.

Consequently this Committee has two draft resolutions before it: the first is contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee for the special session, and the second is the one co-sponsored by Afghanistan and other delegations.
(The Chairman)

There is no doubt that the Committee must take a decision on both of these texts. In my view as Chairman, and in keeping with our rules of procedure, the Committee should deal first with the draft resolution embodying a draft final document in its final text, unless the Committee should decide otherwise. Secondly, it would have to decide on the draft resolution contained in document A/S-10/AC.1/L.1/Rev.1.

I thank the delegation of Iraq for its statement concerning the co-operation it has given and will continue to give the Committee as a whole and to the delegations which have consulted it separately. I trust that that co-operation will continue and that the result will be positive and satisfactory to all.

With regard to his references to the possibility of several draft resolutions being submitted - something which has not happened - I would recall that this Committee, without objections by any delegation, decided to set 12 June noon as the deadline for submission of new proposals; consequently, as of that date, in accordance with the decision of the Committee itself, new proposals would not be acceptable, unless the Committee were to decide otherwise.

I trust that these words of clarification satisfy the representative of Iraq.
Mr. KITTANI (Iraq): Mr. Chairman, my delegation is indeed grateful to you for the statement you have just made. I have two comments to make. The first is related to your interpretation that, as I understand you, both draft resolutions relate to the same subject and therefore would come under rule 131 of the rules of procedure, which reads in part:

"If two or more proposals relate to the same question, the Committee shall, unless it decides otherwise" -

I stress the words "unless it decides otherwise", which you were kind enough to use -

"vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted."

Mr. Chairman, we have tremendous respect for you, for Argentina and for the Chair. For the time being we shall accept what you have said, although we could contest it and we could have a very interesting debate on how you reached that conclusion.

My second comment is simply to ask you, Sir, in view of what you have just said, what your intention is with respect to how the Committee is going to proceed, and specifically what timing you have in mind for voting on all the proposals before the Committee and the termination of its work.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The course of action to be followed by this Committee will probably be decided at an informal meeting which I intend to suggest holding at an appropriate time after we have heard the speakers inscribed on the list for this morning. In any event, independently of that decision, the Committee obviously must complete its work next Monday, 26 June, since Tuesday and Wednesday, 27 and 28 June, will be devoted to plenary meetings of the General Assembly. I therefore believe that it will be at its meetings on Monday that this Committee will take decisions on the draft final document to be transmitted to the General Assembly and on the draft resolution submitted by Afghanistan and other States.

Mr. KITTANI (Iraq): I hope that the records of this meeting will be very clear on what I shall now say, because a great deal depends on the language and the exact terminology used. We hope that this will not give rise to any misunderstanding later.
Mr. Chairman, in a final effort to help you and the Ad Hoc Committee to reach the maximum consensus on the principal document for which we all have been working, we would be willing to defer any decision on our draft resolution until Monday, subject to the following, namely, that it is the understanding of the Committee and the Chairman that on Monday the Committee will first take a decision on all proposals before it and - and this is very important - that the Committee will decide in what order to vote on those proposals in accordance with the clear provisions of rule 131 of the rules of procedure.

Mr. LING (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The draft reports of Working Groups A and B to the Ad Hoc Committee dated 22 June both state:

"The relevant sections reflect the consensus reached on a significant number of formulations. However, on a number of other formulations negotiations were inconclusive and these remain between brackets and in the annex."

Yesterday, the Chinese delegation stated its views on the draft texts at the meetings of the respective Working Groups. In order to save time, we will not repeat those views today but would request that the statements of the Chinese delegation at the meetings of the two Working Groups on 22 June be part of my statement today and be included in the records of this meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to say to the representative of China that the Committee will be pleased to reproduce the texts of those statements if they are submitted as working papers of the Committee, but they cannot appear in the verbatim record unless they are read out. I think that the co-operation offered by the representative of China in the sense of not delaying the work of the Committee by repeating here what he said yesterday in the Working Groups, can best be applied if he submits the texts to us so that they can be distributed to all members of the Committee as working papers. This would meet the concern of the delegation of China, and I am grateful for its collaboration.
Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I should like to refer to the Final Report of Working Group B (Programme of Action), and to the addition submitted by Cyprus to section E, which reads:

"The Secretary-General shall periodically submit reports to the General Assembly on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and its extremely harmful effects on international peace and security." (Conference Room Paper No. 6, p. 25, para. 20)

It is not necessary for me to elaborate on that because we have heard so much about the need to relate disarmament to development, and I think it was quite proper for Working Group B to adopt that paragraph.

Secondly, I should like to refer to the addition to section G, paragraph 2, regarding the continuation of the study of the interrelationship between disarmament and international security and its submission to the thirty-fourth session of the General Assembly, as requested in General Assembly resolution 32/154.
The preliminary study has been submitted in the report of the Secretary-General (A/S 10/7). From this study it is made abundantly obvious that questions of international security and disarmament are interlinked and closely related; and it is generally recognized that in this relationship lies the key to effective progress on disarmament. This relationship is basic to the whole problem of disarmament. International security, therefore, by collective action through the United Nations, is the basic factor which determines the possibility of substantial progress on disarmament.

This, according to the report, is a complex interrelationship having many facets that require more thorough and systematic consideration. Hence, the further continuance of this study. The preliminary study shows that the continuous acquisition of arms on the pretense of ensuring security through a balance of weapons has in itself become a major source of insecurity. The mirrors of new weapons systems, the refinement of old ones and their proliferation throughout the world, while often designed to redress or restore a military balance, in fact lead to military instability, rivalry, tension and apprehension, all of which is expressed in the ever-escalating arms race. Unless there are effective steps to curb and halt the arms race vertically and horizontally, the hazards attendant on the continuous arms build-up, particularly of nuclear weapons, will continue to grow with obviously disastrous effects.

The special session has provided the opportunity to take a look at the whole problem in perspective. A rational and objective approach is needed, not one affected by parochial interests in the arms rivalry for power and domination, which is so maladjusted to our closely interdependent world of the nuclear age.

Looked at in perspective, therefore, the problem, in the last analysis, is that the outdated nineteenth century concept of balance of power – which in the polarized world of our time has become the balance of weapons – has as an inevitable consequence the escalating arms race. And what we have to do if we want to move forwards on disarmament, is to curb and halt this arms race. So long as the arms race continues, there can be no prospect of disarmament proper, that is, of any reduction of armaments, because the concept of phased disarmament – that is, the scaling down of armaments by agreement – requires an extreme degree of inspection and
verification because of the mistrust that is involved in the balance of power. The balance of power does not go along with confidence and trust because each side is looking at the other side and ready to pull the trigger, and therefore there must be continued balance in weapons.

Now, this concept cannot function today. So long, therefore, as the arms race continues, there can be no prospect of disarmament. The only way to stop the acquisition of armaments, which is an ill-conceived means of security, is to provide international security through, as I said, collective action by the United Nations as expressly and in detail provided in the Charter. We have the Charter before us and we look for disarmament, ignoring the Charter. This is anachronistic and, therefore, cannot ensure good results. Through the effective functioning of the Security Council, whose decisions must be given actual effect by the measures contained in Chapter VII of the Charter, we shall have international security as required by the Charter.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I regret having to interrupt the representative of Cyprus, but I would like to remind him that the reports of the Working Groups A and B to which he is referring have not yet been formally submitted by the Chairmen of the Groups. Furthermore, I would like to appeal to the delegation of Cyprus, and to all delegations, not to broach subjects in the statements they make now, when we are nearly at the end of our work, which would be more fitting in a general debate. At this stage we are considering only what our next steps should be. In other words, at this stage we should not embark on statements appropriate for general debate, but should confine our remarks strictly to those items which are now being discussed.

I would, therefore, request the representative of Cyprus to bear in mind this well-meant and friendly appeal.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): As a matter of fact, I was at the end of the last page. I only have to add these few words.
I refer to the fact that an individual State may take actions that can constitute an incentive for regional and global progress on disarmament. In this respect I refer to the proposal of the President of Cyprus regarding the demilitarization of Cyprus. In his statement during the general debate on 24 May, he proposed:

"... total demilitarization and disarmament of the Republic of Cyprus and implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations". [A/S-16/PV.2, p. 56]

Inasmuch as the general work-load of the special session did not allow time to consider particular proposals fully so that a consensus document might be reached, I wish on behalf of my Government to request for the record that this proposal be included in the list of proposals to be kept under consideration, and to be further considered by appropriate organs of the United Nations.

In this respect, I wish to refer also to a relevant statement by the representative of Romania.

Mr. DUSEIBEH (Jordan): The authors and sponsors of the resolution favoured by Afghanistan and others owe it to this Ad Hoc Committee to explain why it has been presented not as part and parcel of the draft resolution embodying a draft final document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The main reason, in my opinion, is that the draft resolution at the special session is designed to be adopted by consensus.

Now, in this particular resolution - and I have taken cognizance of the statement of the representative of Iraq that voting would take place on Monday and not today - I think that it might not achieve the consensus that the other declaration would have achieved.

Therefore, it is our duty in preparation for Monday's voting to say what the purpose of the resolution is. I assume that we are all in agreement that we are dealing with a universal problem. We are not dealing with a mental exercise, a moral exercise, a Sermon on the Mount. We are dealing with mundane and practical issues and the configuration that exists today in the world. Even though the declaration is universal and is designed to be universal, the universal is simply a composite of the various regions of the world.
Mr. Museibeh, Jordan

Now, what do we have today in the world? We have North America, we have Western Europe, we have the Warsaw Pact, all of which can cater for themselves. We have China, which is a major Power. We have Latin America which, fortunately, has agreed upon a nuclear-free-zone. Therefore, the only two areas which remain volatile and vulnerable to everything that we have been discussing during the special session are the continent of Africa and the Middle East, where two States, have undeniably been making substantial inroads into the dangerous area of nuclear activities.
In addition, so far as the two volatile areas are concerned, we have not been able to come to an agreement as to a fair and just international order based on law and on the resolutions of the United Nations. That is why this resolution is not quite the same as the one in the general draft final document which will be presented to the General Assembly and which, I am sure, will be adopted by consensus. This is a unique situation. We are all concerned that the entire universe should be covered by an umbrella of protection against the spread or deployment of lethal weapons, particularly nuclear weapons.

Mr. JAIFAL (India): You said earlier, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee had fixed 12 June as the cut-off date for the submission of new draft resolutions for consideration by the Committee. My delegation desires to make clear its intentions and plans in this regard. As we see the situation, all of us here are engaged in an earnest search for a broad consensus, not simply for the sake of reaching a consensus but, rather, to discover the highest common ground of human aspiration and endeavour in the field of disarmament. We shall therefore take a very careful look at the content of the emerging consensus, and if we find that it falls short of the legitimate expectations of the vast majority we shall reserve our right to introduce draft resolutions on those aspects that we regard as overwhelmingly important for peace and human survival. Obviously we cannot decide prematurely whether or not to submit draft resolutions; our decision will depend on the progress that we make towards a satisfactory consensus. In accordance with these views we may submit draft resolutions to the Committee or, if necessary, to the plenary, in the light of any consensus that may emerge.

Mr. CU DINH BA (Viet Nam): Mr. Chairman, allow me to offer my delegation's congratulations to you on your election as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee and to wish you much success. We should like to
like to express our appreciation to the chairmen of Working Groups A and B and to the co-ordinators of the drafting groups for their success in presenting the draft final reports to this Committee. We do not minimize the difficulties that face this special session, but we believe that, with goodwill and a spirit of co-operation, we can agree on a final document which reflects the desire of peoples to live in peace and freedom.

Jointly with the representatives of other non-aligned and socialist countries, my delegation has done its best to contribute to the success of this special session. We are convinced that the case of the struggle for general and complete disarmament, independence, freedom, peace, democracy and the social advancement of the peoples will advance with giant strides.

During the discussions in the working groups and in the drafting groups my delegation put forward some amendments in order to improve the draft final report to the Ad Hoc Committee. In our view the draft Introduction section is, in general, acceptable. However, we find it very difficult to agree with the content of the fourth and fifth sentences of the first paragraph.

In our view, disarmament, as a means of struggling for the maintenance of peace, should be based on the principles of respect for the independence, freedom and sovereignty of peoples. The struggle for peace - the struggle against war and against the arms race - is closely bound up with the struggle for national independence and freedom. In the opinion of the non-aligned countries, intensification of the liberation struggle of peoples against imperialist, colonialist, neo-colonialist and racist oppression, including Zionism, contributes to the strengthening of world peace and security.

My delegation will accordingly submit concrete amendments to the draft Introduction section. We have also proposed some amendments to other sections which we believe will be acceptable to all delegations.

Once again I express my delegation's sincere wish that this special session will have the success for which we all hope.
Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): I should like to raise a point of order, Mr. Chairman. When I was speaking on Conference Room Paper 8 I understood you to say that I was out of order because that paper was not yet officially before this Committee. At the opening of this meeting, however, you said that the paper had been circulated, which presumably means that we can speak on it. If we may not do so now, I would like to know when we may speak on that document.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): My impression was that the representative of Cyprus had already spoken on Conference Room Paper 8. However, for the benefit of representatives who may wish to refer to documents A and B, I should point out that the appropriate time for comments by those who wish to make them will be, first, after they have been formally introduced by the Chairmen of the working groups and, secondly, when the documents in their final form come before this Committee for adoption. I need not remind representatives that, at present, delegations are engaged in intensive consultations with a view to improving the documents produced by the working groups. At the appropriate time, perhaps on Monday, those documents in their final forms will come before the members of this Committee, and they will then be free to comment on them.

I now call on the Chairman of Working Group A and Vice-Chairman of this Committee, Ambassador Templeton, the representative of New Zealand, who will introduce the final report of that Working Group.
Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand, Chairman of Working Group A): I shall begin by reading the introductory paragraphs of the final report of Working Group A, which was adopted yesterday.

1. At its second meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly decided, upon a recommendation of its Bureau ... to establish two open-ended working groups which were entrusted with matters relating to the draft final document of the special session. Working Group A was allocated the sections of the draft final document dealing with the Introduction, Declaration and Machinery. ... /The Permanent Representative of New Zealand was appointed Chairman of the Working Group.

2. During the period 2-22 June, Working Group A held 13 meetings at which organizational and substantive matters were considered. At its first meeting, the Working Group agreed, with respect to its organization of work, to hold a general discussion on the subjects assigned to it in the order in which they appeared in the draft final document, i.e., (a) Introduction, (b) Declaration and (c) Machinery, and to proceed subsequently to set up drafting groups on each of those subjects with a view to formulating an agreed text of the pertinent sections of the draft final document.

3. In addition to the report of the Preparatory Committee, the Working Group had before it the relevant documents of the special session and the Ad Hoc Committee, containing comments, views and proposals of Member States in connexion with the final document.

4. After a general discussion in the Working Group, an open-ended Drafting Group on the Introduction was established on 5 June and the Chairman of the delegation of Mexico, Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles, was appointed Co-ordinator. The Drafting Group held four meetings on the subject allocated to it. Informal consultations were also conducted, under the guidance of the Co-ordinator. At the fourth meeting of the Drafting Group, the overwhelming majority of speakers expressed their agreement with the draft Introduction as contained in section 1 below, from which all brackets had been eliminated. Other delegations said that they maintained their reservations on two or three points of the draft. The text was, therefore, transmitted ad referendum to the Working Group.
"5. After a short discussion in the Working Group, another open-ended Drafting Group on the Declaration was established on 7 June and Mr. Walter Krutzsch of the German Democratic Republic was appointed Co-ordinator. The Drafting Group held eight meetings on the subject assigned to it and informal consultations were also conducted, under the guidance of the Co-ordinator. The text of the draft Declaration, as transmitted to the Working Group, is contained in section II below. A number of formulations could not be agreed upon and these remain between brackets.

"6. The Working Group also held a general discussion on Machinery, following which an open-ended Drafting Group on that subject was established on 13 June. Ambassador C. R. Gharekhan (India) was appointed Co-ordinator. The Drafting Group held six meetings and informal negotiations were also conducted with the assistance of the Co-ordinator. Consensus was achieved on certain formulations, but others remained between brackets. The text of the draft on Machinery, as transmitted to the Working Group, is contained in section IV below.

"7. The Working Group submits to the Ad Hoc Committee, for its consideration, those parts of the draft final document which were assigned to it. The relevant sections reflect the consensus reached on a significant number of formulations. However, on a number of other formulations negotiations were inconclusive and these remain between brackets and in the annex."

The text referred to in this Introduction will be found in Conference Room Paper No. 7.

Yesterday, after the adoption of the Final Report of the Working Group, informal consultations continued with a view to arriving at acceptable formulations with respect to paragraphs still containing brackets. In consultations relating to section II, concerning the Declaration, agreement was reached on the following changes to the text of the section on "Principles" contained on Conference Room Paper No. 7 (pp. 9 et seq.)
In the first place, the first sentence of paragraph 2 would read:

"In accordance with the Charter, the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament."

The paragraph would then contain no brackets.

Secondly, in paragraph 3, the sentence in brackets would be deleted.

Thirdly, also in paragraph 3, it was agreed that in the fourth sentence, the words:

"and in negotiations for multilateral disarmament agreements under which they would have obligations",

would be deleted.

Fourthly, in paragraph 6, the brackets would be deleted.

Fifthly, in paragraph 17 the following new sentence would be inserted before the last sentence:

"There are certain negotiations on disarmament underway at different levels, the early and successful completion of which could contribute to limiting the arms race."

Then in section IV, dealing with Machinery (pages 13 et seq.), the word 'ensuring' in the first sentence of paragraph 1 would be deleted, thus leaving no brackets in that sentence.

Secondly, the first sentence in paragraph 2 would be replaced by the following:

"In accordance with the Charter, the United Nations has a central role and primary responsibility in the sphere of disarmament."

I suggest that if these changes are acceptable to the Committee they may be incorporated in the draft document for transmission in due course to the General Assembly.

I wish, once more, to thank the three Co-ordinators for their sterling efforts to produce consensus on the three sections of the document entrusted to Working Group A. I also thank most warmly the members of the Secretariat assigned to the Working Group, who have worked extremely hard to produce the necessary documents and working papers.
If I may, I should now like to add a few personal remarks in my capacity as Chairman of Working Group A. I venture to put these forward as my individual views, not those of the Working Group nor necessarily of the New Zealand delegation.

As I have indicated, although the work of the Working Groups and the Drafting Groups has formally come to an end, informal consultations are still continuing and in respect of the Declaration very good progress has recently been made under the able guidance of the Co-ordinator. Two or three major issues in the "Principles" section remain to be settled, but I hope that a further effort will bring success here also.

With regard to the chapter on Machinery, in spite of our failure to meet the deadline in the negotiations and in spite of the fact that much of the draft remains in brackets, I would stress in the first place that active negotiations are continuing and, secondly, that despite appearances, I do not believe that the various groups are far apart on substance.
I believe that there is a de facto consensus that there should be a body of universal membership to assist the General Assembly in carrying out its deliberative functions. I believe there is also de facto agreement that there should continue to be a negotiating body of limited size which operates on the principle of consensus. An informal exchange of views yesterday afternoon showed that there is not yet consensus as to whether the deliberative body should be the First Committee of the General Assembly, with an agenda confined to disarmament and related questions, or whether the Disarmament Commission should be revived to discuss disarmament questions intersessionally.

In my personal judgement, it should be possible to resolve this issue if agreement could be reached on terms of reference for a reconstituted Disarmament Commission, terms of reference which clearly differentiated its functions from that of the negotiating body. In regard to the negotiating body, I understand that consultations are continuing actively and in a positive atmosphere among certain delegations with a special interest in certain aspects of this question.

At this juncture, I would merely stress the importance of an early conclusion of this phase of the consultations with a view to broadening them, if the necessary consensus is to be achieved in the very few days remaining to us.

On the question of a world disarmament conference, I believe that there is the possibility of consensus on the basis of one of the formulations in the present text, namely the one which has so far attracted the widest measure of agreement. I believe that these are the three most important outstanding issues in the chapter on Machinery, and I believe that if agreement can be reached upon them, the other unresolved matters in the Machinery chapter can be dealt with quite speedily.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Templeton of New Zealand and Chairman of Working Group A for his complete report and for the personal remarks he has made, which may be very helpful to us in our future work.

I shall now call on the Chairman of Working Group B and the Vice-Chairman of this Committee, the representative of Poland, Ambassador Jaroszek, who will introduce the report.

Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland, Chairman of Working Group B): The introduction reads as follows:

1. Working Group B of the Ad Hoc Committee of the Tenth Special Session was established as a result of the decision of the Ad Hoc Committee taken in pursuance of the relevant recommendation of its Bureau at its second meeting on 1 June 1978.

2. At the same meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee unanimously elected Ambassador Jaroszek of Poland as Chairman of Working Group B and assigned to the Working Group the consideration of the draft programme of action, which is contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament, Volume I, Supplement No. 1, pages 25-44.

3. Between 2 June, when it discussed procedural and organizational matters, and 22 June when it adopted its final report to the Ad Hoc Committee, Working Group B held eight meetings.

4. The second and third meetings of the Working Group were devoted to a general exchange of views on the draft programme of action.

5. At its fourth meeting on 6 June 1978, the Working Group established two open-ended Drafting Groups. Drafting Group I, under the co-ordination of Ambassador Adeniji (Nigeria), was assigned to consider parts of the draft programme of action dealing with questions related to nuclear disarmament. Drafting Group II, under the co-ordination of Ambassador Hamilton (Sweden), was assigned to consider the remaining parts of the Draft Programme of Action, dealing with questions related to other weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons and other matters.
"6. During the period covered by this report, Drafting Group I held three formal meetings and Drafting Group II held five formal meetings which were devoted to the organization of their work, to the submission of new proposals and to the review of the progress of the Group's work. The substantive work of negotiating and drafting parts of the Programme of Action assigned to them was carried out mainly in informal consultations within the Drafting Groups.

"7. On 9 June, at its fifth meeting, and on 15 June, at its sixth meeting, Working Group B considered the information given to it by the two co-ordinators of the Drafting Groups and considered its progress reports to the Ad Hoc Committee.

"8. At its seventh meeting on 21 June, Working Group B considered the final report of the co-ordinators of the Drafting Groups and the draft texts submitted by them. ...

"9. In both Groups, considerable work has been accomplished with a view to arriving at a general agreement on the Draft Programme of Action. Progress has been achieved on a number of issues which remained unsolved by the Preparatory Committee. Although it has not proved possible to work out a text free from brackets and ripe for an immediate adoption by consensus, a significant number of brackets have been eliminated. At the same time, some new formulations have been added to the text. On several issues, significant differences of opinion continue to exist.

"10. It is pertinent to note that during the negotiating process, important disarmament proposals have been introduced, based both on the statements made in the general debate and in the form of documents submitted in the Ad Hoc Committee. They have been reflected in the deliberations of the Working Group and of the Drafting Groups and constitute a valuable contribution to the work of the special session.

"11. Working Group B and its Drafting Groups had before them the relevant documents of the tenth special session and of the Ad Hoc Committee, as well as the Conference Room Papers submitted in the Drafting Groups. ...
"12. The Working Group submits below to the Ad Hoc Committee for its consideration the draft programme of action which was assigned to it. The relevant sections reflect the consensus reached on a significant number of questions. However, on a number of other questions, negotiations remained inconclusive and therefore the corresponding wording is in square brackets."

I should like to say here that at the meeting of the Working Group yesterday, two delegations, while consenting to the report, expressed reservations about some of the formulations of paragraph 12 of the report.

The Draft Programme of Action that the Working Group is submitting to the Ad Hoc Committee is to be found on pages 3 through 52 of Conference Room Paper No. 8.

Having presented the official report of Working Group B, may I add this personal commentary on the status of implementation of the task entrusted to us by the Ad Hoc Committee on 1 June.

As can be seen from the report, it has not proved possible to work out a text free from brackets and ripe for immediate adoption by consensus. If one realizes, however, the political complexity, the magnitude of problems and, in particular, the fundamental security interests of States, involved in our task, one cannot but conclude that some progress has indeed been achieved. Quite a number of bracket have disappeared. On the other hand, new formulations, including new brackets, have been added to the text. Yet, all that happened in both the Working Group and the Drafting Groups remained within the confines of the risks of a negotiating process.
I am happy to mention here that informal consultations conducted since the report of the Group was adopted have brought further progress. I understand that the co-ordinators may wish to elaborate on this later in the course of this meeting.

Aware as I am of the imperfections of the final product of Working Group B, I should like to stress two factors which could not have been brought about except in a negotiating process like ours.

First, what we did in the past three weeks was the indispensable spade work. It was a vivisectional operation, regrettable as that may be but unavoidable in the negotiating environment of this Organization. Now that we have gone through it, the road to our final destination may perhaps not be simpler but it is certainly shorter.

Secondly, we all came to realize very strongly that any meaningful progress in what we are doing here must rest on a broad basis of general agreement among all the parties involved. For the price of that realization alone it was worth spending three weeks on a "debracketing venture".

Mindful of the complexity of the situation the Working Group's report has been transmitted to the Ad Hoc Committee in the hope that our joint efforts so far and further consultations in the next few days will result in a final agreement based on a sound and mutually acceptable consensus, short of which - I am sorry to say - there can be only different shades of failure. And pressure tactics can change that reality.

I should like to take this opportunity to put on record my appreciation of the dedicated and conscientious work of the two co-ordinators of the drafting groups in Working Group B, Ambassador Olu Adeniji of Nigeria and Ambassador Gustav Hamilton of Sweden, and to express to them my thanks for the important contribution they have made to the functioning of their respective drafting groups and Working Group B.

Finally, I wish to convey my thanks to you, Sir, for your invaluable advice, guidance and co-operation in my conduct of the business of Working Group B.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the Permanent Representative of Poland, Chairman of Working Group B, Mr. Jaroszek, for the comments which he addressed to us in the final part of his statement.

The next speaker is the co-ordinator of Drafting Group I which considered parts of the Draft Programme of Action dealing with questions related to nuclear disarmament, Mr. Adeniji of Nigeria. I understand that Mr. Adeniji has some information to transmit to the Committee on the progress made yesterday. If my understanding is correct, it gives me pleasure to call on him.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria, Co-ordinator of Drafting Group I): Yes, there was some progress made yesterday during the informal contacts which continued on some of the aspects of the programme of action assigned to us. But apart from mentioning generally that there was progress I am not in a position now to be specific. The contacts are still continuing. Some delegations have yet to receive firm instructions on formulations which they had accepted ad referendum, and I think we should give them the opportunity to receive those instructions before we announce the kind of agreements that have been reached.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I think that the view just expressed by Mr. Adeniji of Nigeria is the appropriate one, namely that it is preferable to await the results of consultations before announcing the progress made yesterday in the field for which he was co-ordinating.

I now call on Mr. Hamilton of Sweden, Co-ordinator of Drafting Group II, which considered the parts of the Draft Programme of Action dealing with questions related to other weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons and other matters.

Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden, Co-ordinator of Drafting Group II): After Working Group B adopted its report yesterday I continued informal consultations with a group of delegations and I am happy to report that we have made progress in the section dealing with conventional weapons, which begins on page 17 of Conference Room Paper No. 8.
I will read out the changes in wording which have been made and which result in our having three paragraphs without brackets.

The first paragraph as it stands in Conference Room Paper No. 8, has brackets around the second sentence. There is also an alternative to that sentence. The wording in brackets should be deleted and replaced by the following:

"States with the largest military arsenals have a special responsibility in pursuing the process of conventional armaments reductions."

Secondly, the texts of both paragraph 2 in the same section and the alternative to paragraph 2 should be deleted and replaced by new wording which reads:

"In particular the achievement of a more stable situation in Europe at a lower level of military potential on the basis of approximate equality and parity, as well as on the basis of undiminished security of all States with full respect for security interests and independence of States outside military alliances, by agreement on appropriate mutual reductions and limitations would contribute to the strengthening of security in Europe and constitute a significant step towards enhancing international peace and security. Current efforts to this end should be continued most energetically."

Finally, there has also been agreement to delete in the third paragraph in the same section the wording in brackets. That will mean that the words "in other regions of the world as well as appropriate" will be deleted.

Before concluding, I wish to inform the Committee that I will continue consultations and hope to make more progress in my part of the programme of action.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Hamilton of Sweden, the Co-ordinator for conventional weapons and other weapons in the programme of action, not only for his continuous efforts yesterday but also for the report he has just given us on the progress made.

We have just heard the formal introductions of the final reports of Working Groups A and B. As members are aware, Working Group A was in charge of the first, second and fourth sections of the draft final document - that is, the Introduction, the Declaration and Machinery - and Working Group B was in charge of section III, which concerns the programme of action. I wish warmly to thank the Chairman of the Working Groups, Ambassadors Templeton and Jaroszek respectively, for their very wise leadership in striving to achieve consensus texts for the various sections of the documents entrusted to them. It was indeed no easy task, and it required of the ambassadors total dedication, competence and knowledge of the subjects being discussed. I also wish to extend thanks to the co-ordinators of Working Group A, Ambassador Alfonso García Robles, who at an early stage of our discussions succeeded in submitting to us the only paper totally free of brackets, and Mr. Walter Krutzsch, of the German Democratic Republic, who was in charge of co-ordinating work on the Declaration and who has also succeeded in achieving substantial progress if not, as yet, total success. However, considerable progress has been made on that part of the document. Finally, I would thank Ambassador Gharekhan of India, who had the difficult task of co-ordinating work on section IV of the draft final document, on Machinery. As for Working Group B, I wish to express thanks to Ambassador Adeniji of Nigeria, who has worked tirelessly to achieve consensus on very difficult aspects of nuclear disarmament, and Ambassador Hamilton of Sweden, who was in charge of the rest of the programme of action as co-ordinator. The statement made just now by Ambassador Hamilton provided proof that not only are there possibilities of making progress but that he continued his endeavours to achieve progress even after the drafting groups and the Working Group had finished their work.

As we see it, the present situation can in some measure be termed encouraging. In the final stages of the discussions in the working groups, and certainly in this Ad Hoc Committee, progress has been made in drafting, and I
would like to think that further progress will be possible in the few hours remaining.

However, despite our efforts some parts of the draft of the final document, especially sections III and IV, contain many brackets, indicating that there are areas in which consensus has not yet been reached. At this stage it would seem that on some basic questions agreement may elude us, but on some other equally important aspects I am thoroughly convinced that after some additional efforts in the next few hours compromise solutions can be reached given the necessary flexibility and goodwill on the part of the main parties involved. Active individual and collective consultations have been held and are continuing among delegations in some cases and in other cases with the participation, as we have seen this morning, of the co-ordinators, of the Chairmen of the Working Groups and myself. Whatever we do in the next few days before the conclusion of the Committee's work may be decisive in terms of making important progress on those sections of the document still containing brackets.

I have thanked those who have been mainly responsible for the conduct of our work, but I also wish as Chairman - and I think I speak for the whole Committee - to express appreciation to all delegations that have made their best endeavours to try to arrive at compromise solutions.

I believe that at the present stage of our work it would be appropriate to suspend this formal meeting and to proceed to an informal meeting, a closed, unrecorded meeting that would be restricted to delegations, at which conditions would be favourable to discussion and we could exchange views as to the best course of action to follow in the immediate future in terms of negotiating the texts that still present difficulties and deciding upon the best way in which to proceed on the texts which despite our efforts may not finally be adopted by consensus by this Committee. I therefore formally propose that we now suspend this meeting in order to hold such an exchange of views. The formal meeting would resume after we had concluded an informal exchange of views. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee adopts this proposal.

It was so decided.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): This meeting of the Committee will, then, be suspended and members will immediately meet informally to take advantage of the few minutes remaining. If it is necessary to continue it, we shall resume our informal meeting this afternoon and then proceed to meet formally to agree on whatever decisions have been put forward.
The meeting was suspended at 12.40 p.m. and resumed at 1.45 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to announce that as a result of the views exchanged in the informal meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee has decided to make efforts in the next few days to reach a consensus on some of the texts on which agreement still has to be negotiated. To that end it has been agreed to ask the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Alfonso García Robles, who co-ordinated the work on the Introduction section of the final document, in co-operation with the other four co-ordinators, and in close and constant liaison with the Chairman, to undertake the task of seeking acceptable solutions on the questions referred to. Those negotiations would begin immediately and could extend over the weekend.

We trust that this Committee will be able to meet on Monday morning and will then be in a position to announce the results achieved in the negotiations.

Mr. MIBRA (India): We are in full agreement with the proposals and the decision which we are going to take, but we would like to make it clear that other informal negotiations and consultations are not excluded by this decision.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of India for his timely comment. Yes, in effect any informal consultations which may take place simultaneously and which could be conducive to the same end would be most useful and would be a valuable contribution to our work.

The Committee will meet on Monday at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.