

CD/PV.18
13 March 1979
ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE EIGHTEENTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 13 March 1979, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. L.D. THOMSON

(Australia)

GE.79-60504

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

<u>Algeria:</u>	Mr. A. BENSMAIL
<u>Argentina:</u>	Mr. D.C. ORTIZ DE ROZAS Mr. F.J. DÁVILA
<u>Australia:</u>	Mr. L.D. THOMSON Mr. A.J. BEHN
<u>Belgium:</u>	Mr. P. NOTERDAEME Mr. G. VAN DUYSE
<u>Brazil:</u>	Mr. A. CELSO DE OURO PRETO
<u>Bulgaria:</u>	Mr. P. VOUTOV Mr. I. SOTIROV
<u>Burma:</u>	U SAW HLAING
<u>Canada:</u>	Mr. J.T. SIMARD
<u>Cuba:</u>	Mr. L. SOLA VILA Mrs. V.B. JACKIEWICH
<u>Czechoslovakia:</u>	Mr. V. TYLNER Mr. L. STAVINOHÁ
<u>Egypt:</u>	Mr. M. EL-BARADEI
<u>Ethiopia:</u>	Mr. T. TERREFE
<u>France:</u>	Mr. F. DE LA GORCE
<u>German Democratic Republic:</u>	Mr. G. HERDER Mr. S. KAHN Mr. M. GRACZYNSKI
<u>Germany, Federal Republic of:</u>	Mr. J. PÖHLMANN Mr. H. MÜLLER

Hungary:

Mr. M. DOMOKOS

Mr. C. GYORFFY

India:

Mr. S.T. DEVARE

Indonesia:

Mr. A. KAMIL

Mr. M. SIDIK

Mr. I. DAMANIK

Iran:

Mr. M. FARTASH

Mr. D. CHILATY

Italy:

Mr. N. DI BERNARDO

Mr. M. MORENO

Mr. C. FRATESCHI

Japan:

Mr. T. NONOYAMA

Mr. T. IVANAMI

Mr. R. ISHII

Kenya:Mexico:

Mr. A. GARCIA ROBLES

Miss A. CABRERA

Mongolia:

Mr. D. ERDEMBILEG

Mr. L. BAYART

Morocco:

Mr. M. RAHHALI

Netherlands:

Mr. R.H. FEIN

Nigeria:

Mr. O. ADENIJI

Mr. K. AHMED

Mr. T. OLUMOKO

Pakistan:

Mr. H. KHAN

Mr. M. AKRAM

<u>Peru:</u>	Mr. J. AURICH MONTERO
<u>Poland:</u>	Mr. B. SUJKA Mr. H. PAC Mr. B. RUSSIN
<u>Romania:</u>	Mr. C. ENE Mr. V. TUDOR Mr. T. MELESCANU
<u>Sri Lanka:</u>	Mr. B. FONSEKA
<u>Sweden:</u>	Mr. C. LIDGARD Mr. L. NORBERG Mr. S. STROMBACK
<u>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:</u>	Mr. V.L. ISSRAELYAN Mr. Y.K. NAZARKIN Mr. A.M. VAVILOV Mr. Y.V. KOSTENKO Mr. M.G. ANTIUKHIN
<u>United Kingdom:</u>	Mr. N.H. MARSHALL
<u>United States of America:</u>	Mr. A. FISHER Mr. A. AKALOVSKY Mr. M. DALEY Mr. L. TURNBULL Ms. B. KILLIAN Mr. C. BAY Ms. E. ARENSBURGER
<u>Venezuela:</u>	Mr. A.R. TAYLHARDAT Ms. D. SZOKOLOCZI
<u>Yugoslavia:</u>	Mr. D. DJOKIC
<u>Zaire:</u>	Mr. E. MULONGANDUSU

Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria) (translated from Russian): First of all I should like to convey my best wishes to you as Chairman of the Committee on Disarmament for the month of March and express the hope that, under your guidance, we shall in the near future be able to complete our work of drawing up the Committee's agenda and programme of work for 1979 and then proceed to take up substantive disarmament questions requiring immediate attention.

In my statement today I should like to deal with two matters, namely, to make a few preliminary comments on questions connected with the agenda and to present to the Committee some of our views on the initiative taken by seven socialist countries on matters relating to the negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed.

As regards the Committee's agenda, we consider that the experience acquired during the course of the consultations on and the adoption of the Committee's rules of procedure should be used as fully as possible. We hope that all delegations will show maximum realism and adopt a constructive approach to the task of reaching agreement on the Committee's agenda and programme of work. Indeed, priority questions have been reduced to one denominator by the consensus reached on the programme of action set out in the Final Document of the special session.

We feel that one of the difficulties encountered in the course of present consultations is due to the failure to adopt the proposals submitted by the socialist and certain other countries during the consideration of the Committee's rules of procedure on the general agenda, on the one hand, and the annual agenda, on the other, in which could be included problems that are ripe for consideration and on which specific negotiations could be conducted. A number of delegations are now seeking to include in the agenda all questions of primary importance in the field of disarmament despite the fact that the Committee would clearly be unable to consider all of them.

The Bulgarian delegation considers that the draft agenda submitted by the group of socialist countries was drawn up in the light of genuine priority questions and taking into account the positions of other members of the Committee with a view to reaching agreement as rapidly as possible on the agenda and programme of work for the

(Mr. Vcutov, Bulgaria)

present session. Our delegation therefore proposes that the Committee should use this draft as a basis for the consideration and adoption of the final agenda for the 1979 session of the Committee on Disarmament.

We once again call upon members of the Committee to complete work as quickly as possible on the preparation of the agenda and programme of work for the current session, not overlooking the fact that we have already been working for more than six weeks. Although we have already achieved an initial result, namely, the adoption of the rules of procedure, we have not as yet touched upon a single one of the major disarmament problems before the Committee.

Permit me now to turn to the second point I wish to discuss in my statement, namely, the question of ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons and gradually reducing their stockpiles until they have been completely destroyed (CD/4). The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is a sponsor of this new major initiative by the Soviet Union and has high hopes that a new phase is beginning in the search for a radical solution to the problem of nuclear weapons. We are convinced that this initiative will be received favourably by the Committee. It is noteworthy that so far not one delegation has expressed itself against the idea of starting negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

Our delegation notes with particular satisfaction the positive response of the delegations of Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Pakistan and Sweden to the proposal of the socialist countries. We are awaiting with great interest the statements of other delegations in the Committee which promised to study document CD/4 and express their views on it at a later date.

We believe that they will appreciate the strictly balanced nature of the proposal of the socialist countries and the realistic elements it contains, which does not disturb by even a fraction the existing relationship of forces so that, during its implementation, nobody would be the loser. The crux of the problem is to reduce the level of nuclear strength which has become too dangerous and, at the same time, to maintain the balance in this field unchanged.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

I should once again like to draw attention to the constructive nature and the flexibility of our proposal. Particularly telling in this respect was the statement made by Ambassador Issraelyan, the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union, in reply to a series of questions concerning the application and practical implementation of the proposals made by the socialist countries on nuclear disarmament. This is particularly true of the time-frame of the proposed programme and also of the degree of participation by individual nuclear-weapon States in the consultations, negotiations or in the application of the measures proposed.

For these reasons our delegation is counting on the adoption of a positive attitude by all countries members of the Committee to the negotiations on ending the production of all types of nuclear weapons. There is no doubt that the nuclear arms race is fraught with the principal danger of war. As we all know, in the past 10 years alone, stockpiles of nuclear weapons in the world have trebled, to say nothing of the improvement and increase in the number of delivery vehicles for strategic nuclear weapons.

The stockpiling of nuclear means of destruction in itself increases the danger of their proliferation and deployment in new areas, and multiplies the risk of their utilization. But the danger does not stop there. The point is that, as the stockpiling process continues, new and even more dangerous weapons, which are increasingly difficult to limit, are developed. The radical approach to these problems proposed in the initiative of the socialist countries will also place a serious obstacle in the way of the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons. A large number of delegations in our Committee have expressed concern regarding this aspect of the nuclear arms race.

We should like to believe that, side by side with the conclusion of a SALT-II agreement, the United States Government will also make its contribution to the multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. The world remembers President Carter's statement concerning the willingness of the United States to reduce its nuclear capability "by 10, 20, even 50 per cent". In view of the fact that, according to some calculations, the United States of America possess more than 22,000 strategic and tactical nuclear weapons, its attitude to the proposed negotiations acquires special significance.

(Mr. Voutov, Bulgaria)

My delegation would also like to express the hope that France and the United Kingdom will adopt a positive attitude to the question of ending the production of nuclear weapons and reducing their stockpiles. The solution of a problem as important as that of the complete cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and the reduction of their stockpiles requires the participation of all the nuclear-weapon Powers. So far as is known, that was the position of France, which at the beginning of the 1970s supported the idea of negotiations between the five nuclear-weapon Powers.

As regards China, we all remember the resounding declarations made by its representatives at the special session that it allegedly stands for "the complete prohibition and genuine destruction of nuclear weapons". But unfortunately these are still nothing but words -- a fact which is all too convincingly demonstrated by China's empty place in our Committee. China's armed aggression against socialist Viet Nam has increased still further the concern of the international community regarding China's real position on questions of peace, international co-operation and disarmament.

Nevertheless, the Soviet delegation's willingness not to insist on China's participation in the first stage of the consultations on the preparation of the future negotiations is a further confirmation of the sincerity and businesslike approach of the socialist countries to the search for solutions to this important problem of our times. However, the participation of all the nuclear-weapon Powers without exception in the actual negotiations on nuclear disarmament is a sine qua non.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that we are counting on the co-operation of all delegations on the Committee in the elaboration of the most appropriate forms of consultations aimed at creating a basis for the future negotiations on the basic problems of nuclear disarmament. Our delegation fully supports the idea that these consultations should be conducted within the Committee itself, and considers that nuclear disarmament should be reflected as a top priority item in the Committee's agenda and programme of work for 1979.

Mr. DI BERNARDO (Italy): Mr. Chairman, I would first like to tell you how happy my delegation is to see you as Chairman of this Committee. I am sure that under your wise and able guidance the Committee will this month make the progress that all of us expect.

The Committee on Disarmament has before it for consideration and approval the progress report submitted by the Ad Hoc Group of scientific experts on seismic events at the conclusion of its seventh session.

As everybody realizes, the Ad Hoc Group has been entrusted with a task which is closely related to the problem of the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

In this connexion I should like, at this juncture, to associate myself with previous speakers in reiterating the urgency of a universal and complete nuclear test ban and in expressing the apprehension of my delegation at the continuing delay in the achievement of such an essential goal.

For many years the question of the complete prohibition of nuclear testing in all environments has been one of the priority key issues on the agenda of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

The Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which was adopted by consensus, in paragraph 51 stressed that: "the negotiations now in progress on 'a treaty prohibiting nuclear-weapon tests, and a protocol covering nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, which would be an integral part of the treaty' should be concluded urgently and the result submitted for full consideration by the multilateral negotiating body with a view to the submission of a draft treaty to the General Assembly at the earliest possible date".

Our Committee was again urged by resolution 33/60, adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-third session: "To take up immediately the agreed text resulting from the negotiations [among the three nuclear-weapon States] with a view to the submission as soon as possible of a draft [test-ban] treaty, which will attract the widest possible adherence, to a resumed thirty-third session of the General Assembly".

Against this background of recommendations -- which reflect the increasing concern of the international community on this issue -- we cannot but share the feelings of impatience of a number of other delegations with the current pace of negotiations.

(Mr. di Bernardo, Italy)

My Government had sincerely welcomed the resumption of the trilateral talks between the USSR, the United Kingdom and the United States, acknowledging that the nuclear-weapon States have a special responsibility in this matter. In fact we were confident that the continuation of discussions among the countries most directly concerned would make a positive contribution to the clarification of outstanding difficulties within a reasonable time.

After an interval of several months since the last progress report submitted to the CCD by the distinguished representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the USSR and the United States as well, we however feel that it might be desirable to be provided with more detailed and up-to-date information on recent developments in the tripartite talks; this in order to make a realistic assessment of the progress made and of issues still needing exploration, also in view of the further course of action to be taken at the multilateral level, in pursuance of the United Nations General Assembly resolutions.

There is wide recognition, I submit, that the prospects for a breakthrough in this crucial area depend, to a large extent, upon the success of the tripartite discussions. This is, however, a problem of vital concern to every nation, and we share the opinion that, pending the completion of trilateral talks, the Committee should not be prevented from giving appropriate consideration to this item, thus offering to old and new member States the opportunity to express their views and to contribute to the achievement of the common goal. In the view of my delegation, parallel to the work of the three nuclear-weapon States participating in the trilateral talks, a complementary activity on specific aspects of the problem could be usefully pursued within the Committee, in a fruitful spirit of co-operation.

We therefore sincerely hope that the delegations concerned will respond affirmatively to the appeal already made by several members of the Committee and provide us very soon with a substantive report, revealing the progress of their efforts.

We are all keenly aware that one of the principal obstacles to the achievement of a CTBT is verification. In this respect it has already been demonstrated, during the extensive discussions which have taken place in the CCD, that effective monitoring of a CTBT could not be confined to so-called national means but should be based on a combination of national verification methods and international machinery and procedures.

(Mr. di Bernardo, Italy)

It is the view of many delegations -- including my own -- that adequate verification of a CTBT must embrace provisions for on-site inspection, to be carried out when a detected seismic event cannot satisfactorily be identified by other means.

At the same time, the Ad Hoc Group of seismic experts established in 1976 has clearly outlined the contribution that seismological methods and capabilities of detection, location and identification of earthquakes and explosions can make to the global monitoring of a CTBT. The Group has done good work in elucidating the possibilities of seismology and has made concrete proposals, advocating the establishment of a global network of seismological stations and of an international data collection and evaluation centre.

The Italian delegation has noted with appreciation the offer by Sweden to establish and to finance a temporary data centre, which could make it possible to plan an experimental exercise of a system of international co-operation in the exchange of data collected on seismic events, for the purpose of verifying a CTBT.

We feel that a decision on the carrying out of such exercise should not be delayed. The operative performance of the seismic identification capabilities should in fact be tested in practice before the entry to force of the treaty, thus permitting such a system of international verification to become immediately operative and to respond fully to its purposes as soon as the treaty takes effect.

Everybody realizes that there are problems of technical, legal, military and political requirements which cannot be easily solved and which need timely and accurate preparation, not only from the theoretical standpoint.

Bearing this in mind, my delegation would like to urge the Group of Experts to expedite its work under its present terms of reference, in order to submit to the Committee as soon as possible a final report which would enable us to adopt appropriate decisions on further steps leading to the establishment of an effective verification system for a CTBT.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Italy for his statement and for his kind remarks addressed ~~personally~~ to the Chair. Would any other delegation like to take the floor at this meeting? As that does not seem to be the case, I would propose to close the meeting but, before doing so, I would like to draw your attention to a draft decision which I wish to submit to you for consideration, and which has been distributed to delegations.

It is a matter of which I think the Committee is aware, on which I have been consulting delegations and it is related to the machinery through which we would undertake the next stage of our work, that is, the drafting of the agenda and programme of work. I hope everybody has had a chance to read the draft decision. It has a small note on the time-table proposed to the effect that we should hold the first meeting of this ad hoc working group, which would be open to the participation of all member States, at the end of today's plenary meeting. Are there any comments on this draft decision?

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): I believe the distinguished delegate of Egypt suggested yesterday that we might use the expression "to assist the Chairman" rather than "exchange views" on questions. We feel that this is perhaps a more precise definition of our work and may help us to go ahead with the job which you have set before us. May I therefore suggest that we use the words "to assist the Chairman on the questions relating to the preparation of the provisional agenda."

Mr. HERDER (German Democratic Republic): I understand the point which was made yesterday by the distinguished representative of Egypt and supported today by my colleague from Pakistan, but the question is whether the Committee has to assist the Chairman. Would it not denigrate the role of the Committee if it were to assist the Chairman? The Chairman has to work under the guidance of the Committee and not to assist the Committee in producing documents or other material; so perhaps we could find another formula which also takes account of the point which was made by the distinguished representatives of Egypt and Pakistan, saying, for example, "to prepare guidelines for the drawing up of the agenda and the programme of work". I think this would be a better approach.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I agree with my distinguished colleague of the German Democratic Republic. I think that his recommendation to prepare guidelines is however a little restrictive in view of chapter VIII

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

of the rules of procedure, which refers to the agenda and programme of work, giving this responsibility to the Chairman. Now we all recognize that this year is not an ordinary year for the Committee on Disarmament, and one can hardly expect the Chairman, during a recess, to have prepared a series of draft agendas based on the rules of procedure which had not yet been adopted. So, recognizing the fact that this is a different year, it would occur to me that we could handle this problem by saying: "to exchange views on questions relating to the preparation of the provisional agenda and programme of work of the Committee for the purpose of assisting the Chairman in carrying out his functions in accordance with chapter VIII of the rules of procedure". There is no doubt that the Chairman has indicated that he would like to hear what we have in mind, and the purpose of our exchanging views is to give him some ideas, so that his work as referred to in chapter VIII will reflect as closely as possible the consensus.

Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria): I think that I share the concern of the distinguished representative of the German Democratic Republic on the possibility of setting up an ad hoc working group to assist the Chairman on the problem of the agenda. Perhaps not so much because I think this might denigrate the Committee but because it might, when linked specifically with the agenda, be in conflict with chapter VIII of the rules of procedure, where rule 29 says that the provisional agenda and the programme of work shall be drawn up by the Chairman of the Committee with the assistance of the Secretary. In other words, the physical assistance is to be provided by the Secretary of the Committee and not by an ad hoc working group. I also believe that to set up an ad hoc working group merely to exchange views does not suffice as a task for the ad hoc working group. The suggestion of the distinguished representative of the United States may of course provide the possibility of exchanging views with the prospect of doing something else. On the other hand, perhaps we might also consider setting up an ad hoc working group to consider questions relating to the preparation of the provisional agenda. That is to say, the setting up of a working group which would then have the task of considering questions relating to the preparation of the provisional agenda, without it necessarily impinging on the prerogative of the Chairman, whose prerogative it is to provide the basic text. In considering the questions relating to the preparation of the agenda, suggestions would be made which would guide the Chairman or assist him, without the ad hoc working group actually assuming the task itself.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): In view of the intervention of my predecessor, the distinguished representative of Nigeria, I would like to limit myself to supporting his suggestion.

Mr. DOMOKOS (Hungary): In my view the simple "exchange of views" on this question does not justify the creation of an ad hoc working group. A forum for the exchange of views could probably be offered by the unofficial plenary meetings of the Committee. Therefore, I would like to propose a very simple change in your paper, Mr. Chairman, which might help to harmonize different views, and which, I think, leaves the mandate of Chairman intact while justifying the creation of an ad hoc working group. I would like to propose the deletion of some words in the fourth line of your proposal, Mr. Chairman, that is, the words "exchange views on questions relating to" and their replacement by the following: "facilitate, in 1979". The text would thus read "to facilitate, in 1979, the preparation of the provisional agenda and programme of work of the Committee".

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States suggested some changes in language, but upon hearing those of our distinguished Nigerian colleague -- and this comes to me with a great deal of personal pain -- I am prepared to admit that his suggestion is better than mine. I therefore withdraw the United States proposal, and support the one made by our distinguished colleague, Ambassador Adeniji.

Mr. HARKER (Pakistan): The original idea of our delegation was to bring more precision into the task ahead of us, and I think the suggestion made by the distinguished Ambassador of Nigeria does that admirably, so we would also support his views.

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): I feel somewhat responsible for this exchange of views, because at yesterday's informal meeting it was my delegation that brought up this point, which was subsequently very appropriately commented on by the delegation of Egypt. We have now embarked on an exchange of ideas and drafting proposals which would have been more appropriate at an informal meeting than a formal meeting. This, however, probably offers obvious and tangible proof that the Committee on Disarmament is adopting a new approach, and that many of these things have been said so that they could be included in the records. In order to make my delegation's position

(Mr. Ortiz de Rozas, Argentina)

clear, I should like to say that, when I made this suggestion yesterday, I was very much aware of the provisions of rule 29 under which the Chairman, with the assistance of the Secretary, is assigned particular responsibility for the preparation of the provisional agenda, which must then be submitted to the Committee for consideration and adoption. The rules of procedure do not say how the Chairman is to proceed, leaving him some latitude in the matter, which is logical, since the Chairman changes from month to month. There will be chairmen who, on their own initiative, will want to submit a draft provisional agenda. There will be others who will want to hold informal consultations between various delegations. There will also be chairmen who might want to set up a working group so that they can have the benefit of delegations' opinions on the contents of the agenda. This means that there is no formal limitation on the manner in which the Chairman is to proceed in preparing the provisional agenda with the Secretary's assistance which, of course, he will always have. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the proposal you submitted to the Committee was perfectly in order, since it reflects your criterion for proceeding with preparation of the agenda. The only suggestion I made at that time was that the words "exchange of views" should be replaced, because I considered that in setting up a working group, we should give it a slightly more responsible and formal task than that of simply exchanging points of view. Having said this, I feel that the formula suggested by the distinguished representative of Nigeria allays the concern felt by my delegation when it made its suggestion at the informal meeting yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of Argentina. I may say his analysis, based on vast experience, strikes me as very relevant. I think that I would be right in saying that there is no real difference between any of us on this point and, in putting forward the language we did, I really had in mind the whole process of preparation that would go on until such time as I was able to lay before the Committee, in formal plenary session, a provisional agenda and programme of work. It does, however, seem to me as if this conception has not adequately been formulated by the Chair, as can perhaps be seen from the very useful suggestion made by our distinguished colleague from Hungary. I wonder if the easiest way out has not been provided by the suggestion of the distinguished representative of Nigeria, which I understood to be the deletion of the phrase "exchange of views on" and replacing it by the words "to consider questions, etc.". Am I right in this?

Mr. DOMOKOS (Hungary): After checking the exact text of the proposal made by my distinguished colleague and friend, Ambassador Adeniji, I will also support it with great pleasure.

Mr. ENE (Romania): I certainly do not have any difficulty in accepting the change which was proposed by the distinguished representative of Nigeria and supported by others. I agree that this is what we have to do in this working group. My problem is that, at this particular moment, we are establishing a kind of precedent for the future as to the manner in which the agenda is to be prepared at the beginning of each annual session. My basic concern is that we should always keep very strictly in mind rule 29 of the rules of procedure, which allocates to the Chairman the task of drawing up the provisional agenda with the assistance of the Secretary. Now, of course, the distinguished representative of Argentina was very right in pointing out that it will be for each Chairman to suggest to the Committee a way of assisting him in this task. Whatever formula we are to establish should not depart from rule 29.

Therefore my suggestion would be that the first sentence in the decision that we are to make should contain some reference to the fact that rule 29 is to be taken into account in the preparation of the agenda. While accepting the idea that the working group should conceive the preparation of the provisional agenda and the programme of work for the Committee, which is now in the text, I would then suggest adding the words "in accordance with rule 29".

Mr. CASTILLO (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): I agree with what has been said by the representative of the United States to the effect that, at this stage, the Committee cannot be too demanding and exacting concerning the application of the rules of procedure. Paragraph 27 states that the Committee shall adopt its agenda; paragraph 29 states that the agenda shall be drawn up by the Chairman with the assistance of the Secretary. It cannot be denied that, in this initial stage, the Committee has a special interest in the preparation of the agenda because it is the first agenda to be examined by the Committee. This is proved by the existence of three draft agendas which have been specially circulated, despite the fact that nowhere do the rules of procedure speak of members of the Committee having to submit draft agendas. This fact, as I said, is the clearest proof of special interest in the matter. Now, I in fact consider that, as some

(Mr. Castillo, Venezuela)

delegations have already said, the task of the working group at this stage cannot be simply to exchange views; rather, its task must be the slightly more important one of co-operating in some way during the preparation of this first agenda. I therefore feel that, of the proposals that have been made, the one submitted by the representative of Nigeria could serve as a basis for a formula for preparing the decision. I should now like to refer more particularly to what was said by the representative of Romania, and it occurs to me that, somewhat on the lines of the decision adopted on the establishment of the working group which prepared the draft rules of procedure, a sentence of the following nature could be added to the draft decision that has been submitted: "For this purpose, the Ad Hoc Working Group shall take into account, in addition to the provisions of rule 29 of the rules of procedure, the various drafts circulated informally as well as the opinions of various delegations". This is more or less the language of the decision establishing the Working Group on the rules of procedure, and it might be appropriate to include wording of this kind in this decision as well.

Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria) (translated from French): I wonder whether I am not going to complicate matters somewhat.

I believe that the problem will be solved if we adopt the proposal made by the representative of Nigeria and say "The Committee decides to establish an ad hoc working group, open to the participation of any member State of the Committee, to consider questions relating to the preparation of the Committee's provisional agenda and programme of work" and if, at the end, we add "so as to enable the Chairman to draw up the draft agenda in accordance with rule 29 of the rules of procedure".

Perhaps if this phrase were added at the end, the objections of the representative of Romania would be met.

Mr. ENE (Romania): I fully agree with the proposal just made by the distinguished representative of Algeria.

The CHAIRMAN: We now have several suggestions before the Committee. I must apologise for the inadequacies of my draft which has prompted the plenary meeting to turn itself into a drafting group. It is perhaps a salutary experience for any Chairman.

(The Chairman)

I think I did discern a slight difficulty with one point made by the distinguished representative of Venezuela, in the sense that he wanted to refer to drafts that were before the Committee. These drafts are really very informal and whether one should actually refer to them in the decision setting up the Committee is a matter for consideration. I wonder whether the latest suggestion that we have just heard from the distinguished representative of Algeria would not provide satisfaction to the Committee? We have already accepted the amendment made by the distinguished representative of Nigeria and we now have an addition to the text following the words "agenda and programme of work of the Committee," which would read "in order to enable the Chairman to set up, or draw up, the draft agenda in conformity with rule 29 of the rules of procedure."

Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): I would agree, since I have no difficulty with the formula proposed by the distinguished representative of Algeria. As you very rightly said, I think that we should try to simplify this matter. As I understand it, everyone agrees with the idea suggested by the distinguished representative of Nigeria to the effect that the words "to exchange views on" should be replaced by the words "to consider". Thus, only one point remains to be settled, namely, the concern expressed by the distinguished representative of Romania. What the distinguished representative of Algeria said -- and, I repeat, I have no difficulty in accepting it -- may meet... this point: when I asked for the floor I was considering another formula with the same objective, but I think that we must all accept what the distinguished representative of Algeria has proposed and pass to other matters. If anyone has any difficulty, what I had in mind was that we should say "the Committee", in the second line, "without prejudice to the provisions of rule 29 of its rules of procedure, decides to establish, etc.". But, I repeat, I have no difficulty with the other formula proposed to the same end by the distinguished representative of Algeria.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further observations? I wonder whether in the light of the flexibility which our Mexican colleague has shown, we could perhaps agree, having adopted the Nigerian amendment, to accept the Algerian amendment as well. If there is no objection to this we will, of course, need to have the

(The Chairman)

text redrafted, but for our own purposes at the moment I shall perhaps read it out to you. The text would now read:

"In the light of informal consultations among its members, the Committee decides to establish an Ad Hoc Working Group, open to the participation of all member States of the Committee, to consider questions relating to the preparation of the provisional agenda and programme of work of the Committee, in order to enable the Chairman to draw up the agenda in conformity with rule 29 of the rules of procedure.

"The Ad Hoc Working Group shall hold its first meeting at the end of today's plenary meeting".

Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): I think it would be more appropriate in the first part, which reads "to consider questions relating to the preparation of the agenda", to delete the word "provisional" and include it in the second part of the text proposed by Algeria, "in order to enable the Chairman to draft the provisional agenda", because rule 29 speaks of the preparation of the "provisional" agenda by the Chairman. In short, delete the word "provisional" from the first paragraph referred to and include it in the second part.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): I note that in rule 29 the reference is not only to the provisional agenda but also to the programme of work, and I wondered whether the elimination of the programme of work was conscious or was not. I do not have strong feelings on this matter one way or the other, but rule 29 does apply to both and we have all recognized that while, theoretically, they should be completely sequential, in fact they will not be. I am therefore wondering whether perhaps we could insert "programme of work," along the lines of the suggestion made by our distinguished and experienced colleague from Argentina.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the distinguished representative of the United States. I think his suggestion is indeed an improvement and would be in line with the thinking of the Chair. I apologise for not having picked up the point earlier.

Could I take it then that this decision is acceptable to the whole Committee? That seems to be the case.

It was so decided.

I would now simply wish to state that the next plenary meeting of the Committee will be held on Thursday, 15 March, at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.