

may be used to increase the economic development and productivity of peoples everywhere. But I need hardly expatiate in this forum on this self-evident fact.

The other change in sub-paragraph 1(a) is the insertion of the adjective "conventional" before the word "armaments", so that it reads "the regulations, limitation and major reduction of ...all conventional armaments", instead of merely "all armaments." Here again, there is no change in substance from what we had intended, but I admit that the wording is improved as our earlier draft seems to have been ambiguous. It has, of course, always been our intention that, as part of a comprehensive disarmament programme, all nuclear weapons should be prohibited. This point has, in any case, always been clear from the terms of sub-paragraph 1(b) of the original draft resolution. When in our earlier draft we left out the qualification "conventional" in sub-paragraph 1(a) it was anticipated that "the regulation ... of all armaments" would cover the total prohibition of nuclear weapons, and incidentally also the total prohibition of other weapons of mass destruction, in the bacteriological and chemical field. The word "reduction" would apply to conventional weapons, but "regulation" is of course applicable to all weapons.

But I admit that despite the clear statement of sub-paragraph 1(b) some delegations misconstrued the reference in 1(a) to "all armaments", and my Delegation, together with that of France, the United Kingdom and the United States has, therefore, been happy to accede to Mr. Vyshinsky's suggestion that the reference there should be explicitly to conventional armaments and to conventional armaments alone, leaving sub-paragraph 1(b) to cover our intention to prohibit weapons of mass destruction of every type.

Before I come to the third revision which concerns sub-paragraph 1(c), I should like to make one more observation on sub-paragraph 1(a). It has been suggested that it might be preferable to omit the reference to "regulation and limitation" of armed forces and armaments so that this sub-paragraph would refer only to major reductions. This, as Delegates will remember, is what was done in the Anglo-French memorandum of June 11, 1954. Nevertheless, it has seemed to us desirable to retain the reference not only to reductions but to the regulation and limitation of armed forces and conventional weapons.

The point is, I think, more than academic. Only a day or so ago my distinguished friend the Representative of India expressed his Delegation's concern lest reference to major reductions of all armed forces and all conventional armaments imply that every country, however low its present level of forces may be, should be expected to lower them further. This of course is not necessarily the case. The important point is that the levels of all forces, and all conventional armaments, be subject to international regulation, and to agreed limitations, and that the overall effect of these regulations and limitations will be a major reduction in the present level of world armaments which weighs so heavily on the resources of mankind. The intention is obviously that those countries now most heavily armed should accept major reductions in the levels of their forces and weapons, but we must recognize that some countries may not be armed at all, and some countries may have the minimum required to maintain internal order.