

In Mr. Martin's statement of October 13, he explained to the Committee the general principles in the procedure which it envisaged. None of these general principles has been changed in the revised text and therefore there is no need for me to take up the Committee's time in describing them again. I should however like to comment briefly on the four revisions.

The first change, which related only to the title, is self-explanatory. It refers to agenda items 20 and 68, instead of only 20, and spells out the title of this item as well as that of the earlier one.

The second revision concerns paragraph 1(a), which originally read "The regulation, limitation, and major balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments"; and in this there are two changes.

First, the word "balanced" has been omitted, and secondly the word "conventional" has been inserted before "armaments".

As to the omission of the word "balanced", this does not of course represent any change at all in the basic concept which we had in mind. It seems clear however that in this particular context the draft is improved by omitting the adjective, since it could be open to ambiguities and indeed to very divergent interpretations, which were not only not intended but as our debate has shown, have given rise to understandable but wholly needless difficulties on the part of certain delegations.

The consideration which we had in mind originally when we included the phrase "balanced reductions" is not that the reductions should be proportionate - that was an old Soviet proposal which we had always rejected - but that the overall effect of the reductions should be equitable and should not create an imbalance which could threaten any nation's security.

The programme as a whole must of course cover not only forces in all the main areas of the world, but must deal with all services and all types of weapons. This whole programme, to be effective, must clearly be "such that no state would have cause to feel that its security would be endangered". This principle had already been written in to the concluding section of paragraph 1, which naturally refers to each aspect of the paragraph, including those set out in sub-paragraphs a, b, and c. It seems to us therefore that there was not only no necessity to retain the adjective "balanced" in sub-paragraph 1(a) but that there was definite advantage in deleting it. We therefore decided to make this deletion.

It is surely obvious that a satisfactory disarmament programme must be a balanced programme - balanced geographically, and balanced as between various types of force and weapons - so that the overall effect of the programme will be such that it will not upset the security of any part of the world, but will rather increase the real security of all nations, and result in a very substantial reduction in the overall burden of armaments.

Naturally such a reduction will free substantial human resources for more productive purposes, so that they