

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TENTH SPECIAL SESSION

*Official Records**



**AD HOC COMMITTEE OF THE
TENTH SPECIAL SESSION**
2nd meeting
held on
Thursday, 1 June 1978
at 10.30 a.m.

New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 2ND MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

CONTENTS

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/S-10/AC.1/PV.2
2 June 1978
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): First, may I extend a warm welcome to all the delegations here. As Chairman, in expressing my gratitude in advance for the co-operation that I am sure I shall receive, I am convinced that we shall be able to work effectively and make a useful contribution to this special session of the General Assembly

In particular, may I welcome the 54 members of the Preparatory Committee; it was as a result of their co-operation and support that I was able to carry out my duties as Chairman of that Committee, which in turn has facilitated the work of the General Assembly.

May I also welcome the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs, Mr. Mikhail D. Sytenko, on whose valuable co-operation we shall be able to rely during this period. In addition, I welcome the Director of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, Mr. Rolf Björnerstedt and the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Alessandro Corradini, as well as Mr. Banarjee and many other colleagues from the Secretariat and advisers from the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, who have worked so efficiently to bring about this special session and to ensure that it shall have the most fruitful results.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): When we held the first meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee and elected its Bureau, I informed the Ad Hoc Committee that I would consult the officers, i.e. the eight Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur. My aim in doing so was to submit to the Ad Hoc Committee a work plan based on a consensus of the officers, which would help us to organize the work of the session and conclude this special session with a final document likely to be approved by all of us.

The proposals that it is my honour to submit to the Ad Hoc Committee as recommendations of the Bureau are listed in Conference Room Paper No. 1, which is now being distributed. It will be noted that on the basis of this document the Bureau of the Ad Hoc Committee recommends the following:

1. In principle, the Ad Hoc Committee should meet three times a week (Monday afternoon, Wednesday afternoon and Friday morning). I say "in principle" because the Ad Hoc Committee should not meet when Heads of State or Government address the Assembly in the general debate, the reason being to allow all representatives to be present in the general debate and listen to what these eminent personalities have to say. In the absence of such statements the Ad Hoc Committee would meet on Mondays and Wednesdays in the afternoon and on Fridays in the morning.
2. Proposals submitted during the general debate by delegations wishing to include them in the final document of the special session should be transmitted to the Secretariat not later than 12 June 1978 at 12 noon. The aim of this proposal is to allow delegations to submit new proposals if necessary. Some of these proposals could be submitted, as has already been done, in statements made in plenary meetings, but they should also be submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee in order to be processed as working documents for consideration and inclusion in the final document. June 9 being the date on which the general debate is scheduled to end, it seems logical to set 12 June at noon as the deadline for the submission of new proposals.

(The Chairman)

3. The Ad Hoc Committee should have no general debate. In accordance with the allocation of items decided on by the President of the General Assembly at the first meeting of the special session, it was decided that the general debate would be held in plenary and that items 9 to 13 of the agenda would be discussed in the Ad Hoc Committee. In order to avoid duplication, it seems unnecessary for this Committee to go over the same ground covered by the general debate in plenary. However, this does not mean that delegations should not be given the opportunity to make statements on proposals contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee in the draft final document, or in respect of new proposals. Every delegation will thus have an opportunity to make such comments or remarks as it may deem appropriate, in connexion with the proposals already contained in the documents I have mentioned or in others that may be submitted.
4. In order to help us in our task it was felt that there should be two working groups of unrestricted membership, in other words open to any delegation desiring to take part. The first working group - Working Group A - will be entrusted with the work on the Introduction, Declaration and Machinery; that is to say, sections I, II and IV of the draft final document. The second group - Working Group B - would deal with matters relating to the programme of action in section III of the draft final document.
5. In order to maintain an appropriate balance in the appointment of the officers of the Ad Hoc Committee and its subsidiary bodies, it is proposed that Working Group A be chaired by a Vice-Chairman belonging to the Western European and Other States Group, and Working Group B by a Vice-Chairman belonging to the Eastern European Group.
6. In exceptional cases, the Chairman of a working group could be replaced by a member of his delegation.

(The Chairman)

7. Whenever possible the regional groups or groups which have submitted proposals should have a restricted number of spokesmen in the working groups. The purpose of this is to facilitate as much as possible the discussion, analysis and drafting of texts, and while every delegation will have the right to state its views in the working groups and, of course, in this Ad Hoc Committee, I should like to appeal to the various groups to appoint spokesmen, when possible, from among the delegations which have submitted proposals either in the Preparatory Committee or during the special session.

8. The two working groups will not have rapporteurs, but the Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Committee will follow the work of both groups and provide whatever co-ordination may be needed.

9. Both working groups would begin their work tomorrow, 2 June. Here we must bear in mind the time factor, since time is a scarce commodity. Between 2 and 28 June we shall have 26 days, including Saturdays and Sundays, and the task that lies ahead is vast and complex. Therefore it has been felt that the working groups should begin their work without loss of time - that is, as I say, tomorrow.

10. Every effort should be made to avoid new discussions on those parts of the draft final document which have no brackets. This does not mean that comments which delegations deem it appropriate to make are barred, but simply that, since the texts without brackets reflect an existing consensus among the delegations representing the various groups in the United Nations membership, it would seem appropriate, as far as possible, not to reopen debate on those matters but rather to focus attention on those unfortunately quite numerous matters which remain between brackets and in respect of which major difficulties subsist.

11. The working groups might set up drafting groups. This, of course, would be left to the working groups to decide. In principle, the officers felt that the working group set up to consider the introduction, the declaration and the mechanism would establish a drafting group on the introduction and the declaration. The membership of the drafting groups should include representatives from delegations which are interested

(The Chairman)

in being members, including those delegations which have submitted proposals or do so in the future, and taking into account equitable geographical distribution in the composition of the drafting groups. As is customary in such cases in the United Nations, those groups will work informally and without interpretation.

12. As a rule, the working groups will not meet at the same time as the Ad Hoc Committee. I emphasize the words "as a rule" because it might happen that at some future stage in our work it would be necessary to have simultaneous meetings of the Committee and the two working groups. I believe that we must be flexible in this respect, but the recommendation of the officers is that in principle we should not meet at the same time in order to make it possible for the smaller delegations to cover both working groups and the Ad Hoc Committee.

13. The Ad Hoc Committee would receive weekly progress reports from the chairmen of the working groups during its meetings on Monday afternoons. Here I must remind the Committee that if, for any of the reasons I have mentioned, such as addresses by Heads of State of Government in the plenary Assembly, the Ad Hoc Committee meeting on a Monday afternoon were cancelled, we would in advance set a subsequent date at which the chairmen of the working groups would make their weekly progress reports.

14. The working groups will work without records. Here the idea is to do our utmost to ensure a fruitful exchange of views which will make it possible to make progress in the drafting of the final document. And, of course, when the atmosphere is informal, without anything being put on record, delegations feel more free to state their views. That is the purpose of this recommendation. Nevertheless, the Secretariat will prepare a brief note at the end of each meeting describing the proceedings and the decisions. That note will be given to the Chairman of the working group concerned so that he will have a complete over-view of all that is discussed and decided.

(The Chairman)

15. The working groups will have available full interpretation and Secretariat services.

Those are the recommendations which, as I said at the beginning of my statement, the Bureau of the Committee agreed upon by consensus. May I emphasize once again the valuable co-operation and substantial contribution of every member of the Bureau. The five regional groups are represented on the Bureau so I should like to think that in principle these recommendations are acceptable to the Ad Hoc Committee. May I take it that these recommendations regarding the organization of our work do not give rise to any difficulties in the Committee?

Mr. LING (China): We have noted the recommendations made by the Bureau of the Ad Hoc Committee of the current special session on the organization of the Committee's work. The Chinese delegation did not participate in the work of the previous sessions of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session Devoted to Disarmament, nor did we take part in the discussion and drafting of various documents. The Chinese delegation has made a preliminary study of the draft final document contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee. We would like to have the opportunity to expound our position and views on relevant questions at the meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee and its working groups, and to put forward our concrete opinions or proposals on the related questions at an appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In this connexion, may I assure the representative of China that, as I said earlier, all delegations, and in particular those which did not participate in the work of the Preparatory Committee, including of course his own, will have every opportunity to state their views both in the Ad Hoc Committee and in the working groups. And of course, in accordance with the recommendations I have submitted, it will be possible until midday on 12 June to submit in writing any proposal which the delegation of China or any other delegation deems appropriate.

Mr. MISTRAL (France) (interpretation from French): Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask you to clarify a small point concerning paragraph 11 of Conference Room Paper No. 1 which was circulated this morning. It has to do with the working methods of the drafting groups. I should like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether it is your intention that the various statements which might be made by delegations in those drafting groups - which will work informally and without interpretation - will be made in the two working languages of the Secretariat. May I take it that that is your intention, Sir?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In reply to the question put by the representative of France, I should like to inform him that there is a limit to the availability of interpretation services. As I said earlier, in principle the Ad Hoc Committee would not meet at the same time as the working groups, but it might happen. Should it do so, interpretation would have to be made available to three concurrent meetings. If not, interpretation would have to be provided for two concurrent meetings of the working groups.

But the working groups, in turn, depending upon the items they are dealing with, may on their own decision set up various drafting groups. It might happen that there would be concurrent meetings of the two working groups and, for example, four or five drafting groups. In which case, there would be five or six or seven groups meeting concurrently. This would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to provide simultaneous interpretation for each and every one of those working groups and drafting groups.

The idea, therefore, was that discussions in the drafting groups be held in a single language. This does not prevent drafting groups, where participants know more than one language, being free to hold their discussions in two languages. But the situation is that there cannot be official United Nations interpretation.

I hope that this is a satisfactory response to the concern expressed by the representative of France.

Mr. NAIK (Pakistan): My delegation would like to convey its appreciation to the Bureau of the Ad Hoc Committee for really presenting us with very clear and precise recommendations which we feel will certainly facilitate the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. But if I have asked to be allowed to speak it is only to seek a few clarifications on one or two points that might be of benefit not only to my delegation but also to some of the other delegations as well.

In the first place, I refer to paragraph 2 of the recommendations which deals with proposals submitted by delegations during the general debate. It is our understanding that this paragraph refers only to the new proposals which have been made during the general debate and that it does not preclude any modifications or amendments of the existing proposals which are already contained in the Preparatory Committee report, and that the submission of such modifications would also be permitted either in the working groups or in the drafting groups so that we might reach a consensus as easily as possible.

My next comment is on paragraph 3, which states that the Ad Hoc Committee should have no general debate, but that this should not preclude delegations from making statements in connexion with proposals contained in the report of the Preparatory Committee or on new proposals. Here, our understanding is that certainly the sponsors or the initiators or those who propose new proposals would certainly be making some statements to elucidate their proposals. But we feel that other delegations also should be given an opportunity to offer their general comments on the new proposals. In other words, what we wish to have confirmed is that on new proposals there would be an opportunity for both the sponsors as well as the other delegations to offer their general comments.

On paragraph 7, the recommendation it contains would certainly facilitate our work, but here again it is our understanding that perhaps delegations which have submitted certain proposals in their own individual capacity also would be given an opportunity to speak in their own name rather than through a nominated spokesman.

(Mr. Naik, Pakistan)

We had some comment on paragraph 10, but in your introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman, you have already indicated that though the common desire is to avoid general discussions on those sections which are free from brackets, there are certain other delegations which have perhaps not participated in the Preparatory Committee, and that an opportunity should be given to them to express their views on those sections as well.

Clarifications on additional questions have already been given in replies to other delegations, and we would certainly be very happy to go along with the recommendations that you have presented and are ready to start our substantive work, as you have indicated, beginning tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In response to the request of the representative of Pakistan for clarification, I should like to state that his interpretation of paragraphs 2, 3 and 7 is correct. That is to say, paragraph 2 does in fact refer to new proposals. In connexion with paragraph 3, of course, every opportunity will be given to any delegation which so desires to make comments either on the new proposals or on existing proposals.

With reference to paragraph 7, here again it goes without saying that delegations which have submitted proposals to the Preparatory Committee, or which submit proposals to this Committee, will be given every opportunity to explain the purport of those proposals either in the Ad Hoc Committee itself or in the working groups.

Mr. VELLODI (India): I should like to seek clarification on one point relating to the records of the Committee and the Working Groups. I take it that, as far as the Ad Hoc Committee is concerned, it will have records and that they will be made available to us speedily. Presumably they will be summary records, not verbatim records. If they are to be summary records, I would observe that it has been our experience that they take longer to reproduce and distribute than verbatim records.

I am raising this point because, while in point 2 it is stated that new proposals should be transmitted to the Secretariat, which means that such proposals will come out as documents or working papers of the Ad Hoc Committee, presumably there may be occasions when those who wish to make new proposals may not actually submit them in writing to the Secretariat for distribution but rescind them or elaborate upon them in the Ad Hoc Committee itself. I therefore hope that the records of the Ad Hoc Committee will be available as speedily as possible.

It is also suggested in point 12 that the Working Groups will normally as a general rule not meet concurrently with the Ad Hoc Committee. At the same time, the Chairman explained that this was a tentative decision and that perhaps the constraint of the time factor might make it necessary for us to have concurrent meetings at a later stage. He then said that the Ad Hoc Committee would at its Monday meeting receive progress reports. I should like some clarification on this, particularly as to what the Committee will do on the other two days, Wednesdays and Fridays, especially after next week, when, presumably, delegations will want to make general statements.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As regards his first question, the Ad Hoc Committee will have verbatim records. However, while some delegations perhaps may wish to make proposals orally, may I emphasize that for the purpose of inclusion of proposals in the final document and an analysis of the proposals by all delegations, they would have to be submitted in writing in addition to being presented orally since that would facilitate our work and that of the Working Groups.

(The Chairman)

As regards point 12, we deliberately left it rather flexible because initially most of the work will be concentrated in the Working Groups. Nevertheless, when it meets in plenary the Ad Hoc Committee may hear statements by delegations having comments or thoughts on the various aspects being discussed in the Working Groups, and they may refer to both Working Groups at the same time and not restrict themselves to individual comments in one or the other Working Group. Apart from that, the Committee would meet to hear other kinds of statements such as general comments on the progress of our work. We have therefore scheduled three weekly meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee. Depending upon how our work progresses, we shall adjust our procedures and our schedules. If we were to note that it would be better for the Committee to meet twice a week rather than three times and thus give the Working Groups more time, we should proceed accordingly. If, on the contrary, we were to find that more plenary meetings would be better, that is how we shall proceed.

Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have a question on point 9. We welcome the recommendations of the Bureau of the Ad Hoc Committee concerning the fact that the Working Groups will be starting their work tomorrow, 2 June. In commenting on this recommendation, the Chairman said that we should begin work quickly because we have only 26 days until the end of the session. That is quite right. But I think 28 June is the date of the ending of the special session. Obviously, the Working Groups should complete their work a few days earlier than 28 June, by which date the Ad Hoc Committee should complete its work so that we should have one or two days for plenary meetings at which the work of the whole session could be summed up.

My point is that we should have deadlines for the completion of the work of the Working Groups and the Ad Hoc Committee. I feel that would allow for the better organization of our work.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the USSR is quite right. When I said that we had 26 days left, I was referring to the completion of all our work, including the plenary meetings. But

(The Chairman)

of course it is obvious that the work of the Working Groups and this Committee must be completed at least a few days before 28 June, which has been set for the closure of this session.

I have not specifically referred to deadlines for the completion of the work of the Working Groups because that is a subject I wish to take up with the Chairmen of the two Working Groups once they have been elected by this Committee and have had an opportunity to draw up with the Rapporteur a tentative work programme including dates. When we have reached agreement with the Chairmen of the Working Groups and the Rapporteur I shall have the pleasure of submitting the time-table to the Committee. But obviously what the representative of the Soviet Union has said is most relevant, and in due course I shall refer to the matters he has raised, and I shall proceed with the consultations I have just mentioned.

Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka): Mr. Chairman, welcome back to the meetings of the special session and those of the Ad Hoc Committee, which I am sure you will lead and guide as competently as you have in the past.

May I also thank the members of the Bureau for the work they have done in preparing Conference Room Paper No. 1.

Much of what has been said here we had learned informally, and I am glad that we have this information set out more clearly in the document before us. The responses to questions raised by some representatives who have spoken before me have given the clarifications which I might otherwise have sought. However, I wish to refer specifically to paragraph 11 on the subject of the drafting groups. I certainly agree that the drafting groups will have to be set up and that they will have to begin their work as early as possible for the reasons which have been given by the representatives who spoke before me, and particularly by the representative of the Soviet Union. I am interested in knowing how soon these drafting groups will be set up. There is reference in the document to the drafting group on Introduction and Declaration. I believe that the genesis of this is that there was an understanding that on the "Introduction and Declaration" the incidence of brackets would not be as great and therefore it might be possible for the drafting group to set about its work a little earlier. The Chairman stated that the drafting group on Introduction and Declaration would start almost right away. I wonder when that is to be, whether it is to be 2 June, which is tomorrow, as mentioned here, and how soon other delegations consider it necessary to set up the other drafting groups to deal with other aspects of the programme of action. I wonder whether we need to decide that now or whether we should have a more thorough exchange and exposé of different points of view on this subject before we decide when the drafting groups are to be set up. I speak on behalf of my delegation and a larger group. We would prefer to wait a little. I trust that the first meetings of the working groups which are scheduled for tomorrow will allow us an opportunity to see how soon the setting up of the drafting groups would be feasible. That it must take place, we know; but the question is how soon.

(Mr. Fonseka, Sri Lanka)

I therefore suggest that at the next scheduled meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee, on Monday afternoon, perhaps we shall be in a position to clarify this question in our minds. Perhaps at the same time we would be able to give an indication with respect to the setting of time-limits. I do recognize that time-limits are necessary and unavoidable if we are to complete our work, as stated by the representative of the Soviet Union, two or three days before 28 June. I share his optimism. Perhaps on Monday we may be able to be somewhat more explicit about the setting of time-limits and about when they are to be set.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In connexion with the statement of the representative of Sri Lanka, I should like to make it clear that paragraph 11 of Conference Room Paper No. 1 is a guideline and not a fixed rule. The composition and number of the drafting groups will be decided by each of the working groups. They also will decide when the drafting groups will begin their work. Each working group will decide what items require the setting up of drafting groups, their composition and when they will begin their work. That is left entirely to each working group. The reference under paragraph 4 (A) to the working group on "Introduction and Declaration" as rightly pointed out by the representative of Sri Lanka was made because that includes the parts of the draft of the final document which in principle appear to be closest to a final formulation. That too, however, will be left to the decision of the working group itself, as will matters related to how and when the drafting groups will be set up. What the Ad Hoc Committee is doing here is laying down guidelines, and very valid and relevant concerns expressed by the representative of Sri Lanka will be resolved within each working group.

May I therefore consider that the recommendations of the Bureau of the Ad Hoc Committee, with the clarifications given this morning, are acceptable to the Ad Hoc Committee? As I hear no objections, it is so decided.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall therefore proceed as indicated in Conference Room Paper No. 1, with all the clarifications that have been given verbally in reply to questions from delegations.

I should now like to place before this Committee the nominations of two candidates to preside respectively over Working Group A and Working Group B. I do so with special satisfaction because these are two personalities who are very well known to members and whose knowledge and competence with respect to the subject, as well as their devotion which I am sure will be displayed in the exercise of their responsibilities, are a guarantee of the proper and efficient discharge of their duties.

(The Chairman)

The Bureau decided by consensus to submit to the Ad Hoc Committee the candidacy of one of its Vice-Chairmen - Ambassador Malcolm Templeton of New Zealand - as Chairman of Working Group A, which will be entrusted with the study of the Introduction, the Declaration and the Machinery; it also decided by consensus to submit the candidacy of Ambassador Henryk Jaroszek of Poland, Vice-Chairman representing the Group of Eastern European States, to act as Chairman of the Working Group B on the Programme of Action.

I do not believe that it is necessary for me to dwell on the qualifications of these two Vice-Chairmen of the Ad Hoc Committee. As I said, they are very well known and highly respected and esteemed by us all and, as Chairman of the Preparatory Committee, I had the opportunity at the first meeting of the Bureau to benefit from their respective points of view.

May I take it that the Committee approves without objection the candidacies which I have just had the privilege of submitting for its consideration?

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to be the first to congratulate Ambassador Malcolm Templeton of New Zealand and Ambassador Henryk Jaroszek of Poland on their unanimous election as Chairman of Working Group A and Working Group B respectively.

I should now like to refer to another matter which was thoroughly analysed in the Preparatory Committee during its meetings and by the Bureau of this Ad Hoc Committee at its first meeting - the participation of non-governmental organizations and of research institutes in the work of the tenth special session. I should like in this respect to recall some precedents.

The Preparatory Committee of the special session decided at its 40th meeting to recommend that two meetings of the Committee of the Whole - that is, this Ad Hoc Committee - or a total of five hours, would be set aside to hear statements of non-governmental organizations and research institutes working on disarmament. Furthermore, it decided to recommend that the day set aside for this purpose would be 12 June, the first day available after the conclusion of the general debate.

(The Chairman)

At the same meeting the Committee also considered the list of 18 non-governmental organizations which would make statements at that time; this list had been submitted by the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations with consultative status in the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).

The Preparatory Committee decided to recommend that this question, as well as the list of speakers from non-governmental organizations and research institutes, be decided on by this Ad Hoc Committee at today's meeting, so as to give speakers sufficient time to prepare their statements. In this connexion the Committee took note that the list presented by the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations should be expanded by including non-governmental organizations from developing countries and, likewise, of a representative of Japanese non-governmental organizations and of the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in order to make the list more balanced and representative.

As a result of the observations of the Preparatory Committee, an additional list of four non-governmental organizations was submitted to the Bureau of this Committee for consideration. Thus a list of 22 organizations was drawn up, to which three others of a national character, sponsored by delegations participating in the special session were added. The final list, which comprises 25 organizations in alphabetical order has been distributed to the Committee in Conference Room Paper No. 2.

With regard to the research institutes, it is fitting to recall that the Preparatory Committee at its 40th meeting favourably considered a request from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) to address the Committee of the Whole and decided to recommend that the request be considered by this Committee within the context of similar requests which might be submitted by other research institutes. In fact, to date five additional requests from such institutes have been received. The complete list in alphabetical order also appears in Conference Room Paper No. 2.

I should like here to mention a new development. After the Preparatory Committee adopted the recommendations to which I have referred and also after the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations with consultative status in ECOSOC submitted the list of 22 non-governmental organizations,

(The Chairman)

other requests were received. Some of them were addressed to me personally, others to the President of the General Assembly and still others directly to the Secretariat. These requests from non-governmental organizations reflect a very valid desire to take part in the work of this special session. Regrettably, the requests were - as I said - submitted after the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations had taken a decision. The Preparatory Committee at all times avoided taking any decision on the merits or lack of merits of any of the requests that it received and left such decisions to the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations. That being the case, and as the procedure laid down by the Preparatory Committee had not been followed, the Bureau of the Committee, to its great regret, was not able to consider the applications from these other non-governmental organizations.

(The Chairman)

Time was a factor and, moreover, the non-governmental organizations concerned were not completely familiar with the procedure and time-table laid down by the Preparatory Committee. That is why it was not possible to take any decision. But as I said, it shows a very praiseworthy interest on the part of several non-governmental organizations to participate in our work. I am sure that those organizations, like many other non-governmental organizations, will have an opportunity at another session to state their very valuable points of view. Nevertheless, as Chairman of this Committee, I should like to express our gratitude to those non-governmental organizations for having shown such a keen interest in participating in the work of our special session.

On the basis of what I have said I should like to outline to the Committee the proposal which was adopted by consensus in the Bureau namely, to hear the 25 listed non-governmental organizations on 12 June during the morning and afternoon meetings of this Committee and to reserve the meeting of Monday, 13 June, for the research institutes, bearing in mind the different kind of work done by the organizations and by the institutes. The speakers for the non-governmental organizations and for the institutes would make their statements following the alphabetical order of the list distributed to the Committee.

Mr. MEDANI (Sudan): I have listened with great attention to the Chairman's very valuable explanation. At the outset I want to say that I am not challenging the list which has been distributed to us this morning. The only point I want to raise is that he said that the decision was submitted by the Conference of non-governmental organizations. We have a request which has been submitted by the Sudanese Council for International Peace and Solidarity. It so happens that that particular Council in Sudan did not know beforehand that the request should be submitted to the Chairman, to the

(Mr. Medani, Sudan)

Preparatory Committee or even to the Conference of non-governmental organizations in order that a decision may be taken on who is going to participate by making a statement and who is not going to do so.

I understand from the delegation of the Sudanese Council that the request has already been submitted. But the most important point I want to raise here is that from a quick look at this list I find a fairly regional or zonal distribution although I am afraid to say that the African continent or even the zone of the Middle East is not very well represented here and the Sudanese Council is making its request, taking into account that particular point. I wonder if the Committee here would agree with me. I know that a number of requests have been submitted but if we take one point only, namely, the representation of Africa or the Middle East, for example, we will find that the Sudanese Council for International Peace and Solidarity deserves a place in this particular list. There is only the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization, which is Afro-Asian in its nature. The Sudanese Council could represent the zone of Africa in this respect geographically, or alternatively they could represent the Middle East. I believe therefore that the request of this particular Council deserves the Chairman's personal attention and the attention of the other members of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Regarding the choice of non-governmental organizations, I believe it would be appropriate to repeat, particularly for the benefit of delegations which did not speak in the Preparatory Committee, that from the outset the Committee felt that it was not within its competence to decide on the various non-governmental organizations. I am sure you will readily understand the problem the Committee would have had to face had it had to pronounce judgement on which non-governmental organizations should participate and which should not when there were more than 300 non-governmental organizations which submitted requests to speak. That is why the Preparatory Committee was very careful to leave it to the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations to decide. They held consultations in Geneva and in New York. When an initial list

(The Chairman)

of 18 non-governmental organizations was submitted, the Committee, without making any pronouncement on that list itself, as I said, merely stated that the list should be expanded with non-governmental organizations from developing countries so that the list would be more balanced and representative.

Later, it proposed a representative from the Japanese non-governmental organizations and from the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki on the proposal of a national delegation and bearing in mind obvious circumstances. They were also included and accordingly the list grew from 18 to 22 non-governmental organizations.

The Committee had decided to hear 25 non-governmental organizations. Three delegations proposed for the inclusion of national non-governmental organizations from the three countries concerned and those requests were taken into account by the Bureau and included in the list of 25 which has now been submitted.

I have no doubt, and I am sure no member of the Bureau doubts the merits and more than suitable qualifications of the Sudanese Council for International Peace and Solidarity to address the Ad Hoc Committee. The problem we face here is one of selection and the procedure which led to the list of 25. Just as the Sudanese Council for International Peace and Solidarity would like to participate in our debate so also have we had requests from several other non-governmental organizations which have stated their desire to speak. But for the reasons I have given they did not follow the procedure discussed at length in the Preparatory Committee in which all regional groups were represented and since the procedure established by the Preparatory Committee was not observed it was not possible to include those non-governmental organizations in the final list. The requests which were taken into account, apart from the ones I mentioned, were those made by national delegations at the appropriate time.

(The Chairman)

Regrettably, the Preparatory Committee and the Bureau of this Committee had a definite limit of 25 organizations. Our hands were also tied because the Bureau had to follow the procedure determined by the Preparatory Committee. That has meant that several organizations were not included in the list exclusively for those reasons, and for absolutely no other reason. Accordingly, the recommendation of the Bureau, which also took the circumstances into account, was for the 25 organizations which appear in the list that was distributed this morning.

I hope that that clarification will help to console the representative of Sudan, to know that the helpful request of the Sudanese Institute for Peace and Solidarity was not allowed, for the reasons which I have explained.

May I take it that the Committee approves the recommendation of the Bureau? As there is no objection, the recommendation is approved.

It was so decided.

Mr. LING (Interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation is not opposed to the recommendation to invite some non-governmental organizations or other research institutes to address the Committee, but it has noticed that the list recommended by the Bureau includes the World Peace Council and similar organizations.

As is known to all, the leading organs of the World Peace Council and similar organizations have long been reduced to a hired tool of one super-Power. Over a long period, they have been toeing the line of this super-Power on a series of international issues, serving its policies of aggression and war and trumpeting its hoax of sham disarmament and real arms expansion. Therefore, we wish to reiterate the Chinese delegation's serious reservations on inviting the representatives of the World Peace Council and similar organizations to address the Ad Hoc Committee of this special session.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee has duly taken note of the statement of the representative of China, but I believe it is right to reiterate that in submitting this list neither the members of the Bureau nor any member of this Committee expressed any views either for or against any individual non-governmental organization. The list on NGOs was submitted following the procedure that I have described. In approving the list, no delegation present is expressing any value judgement on the orientation, the activities or the ideology of any non-governmental organization. This is simply a list submitted by the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations itself which this Committee has approved. But that does not mean that the Committee endorses any of these non-governmental organizations, nor the views that they may have maintained in the past or those that they may state on 12 June. It is on that understanding that the Committee approves the list.

Similarly, we regret that there are other non-governmental organizations with equally valid title that will not have an opportunity to participate in our work.

Mr. YANKOV (Bulgaria): I should like to say at the very outset, Mr. Chairman, that we agree with your comments and explanation concerning the list of non-governmental organizations. In our view, this list is well balanced and representative; it represents a cross-section of different organizations, both on regional and political grounds, religious youth movements, women's movements, and peace movements on a national or international scale. Of course it has not been possible to satisfy every demand; there are certain limitations, but we agree that this list is well-founded. As the Chairman has said, there may be reservations with regard to one or another organization from different delegations.

As far as the World Peace Council is concerned, I need not defend here or present the case of any specific organization, but since reference has been made to it I should like to state that the record and the activities of the World Peace Council are well known. It is well established in the activities in this field. It enjoys consultative status with the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), and it has taken part in many United Nations gatherings, including the special session on Namibia and other activities. Its name

(Mr. Yankov, Bulgaria)

has been submitted by the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in accordance with the procedure adopted, and we have to consider this list of non-governmental organizations as a whole. Therefore, my delegation suggests that the Committee adopt this list by consensus, as submitted by the Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I point out that the list has already been approved by this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): It is now my special privilege to call on the Under-Secretary of State for Sweden, Mrs. Inga Thorsson, who is Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on Disarmament and Development, to submit the report of that Group.

Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, allow me first of all to congratulate you most sincerely on your new office as Chairman of this Ad Hoc Committee. Having served under your highly skilful chairmanship at the five meetings of the Preparatory Committee for the special session, I should like to thank you for again accepting a similarly arduous task, thus ensuring the important continuity of our work, so necessary for its successful outcome.

I have asked you to call on me to speak today in order to raise a matter in the Ad Hoc Committee which has already been referred to by a number of speakers in the general debate: the relationship between disarmament and development. The Secretary-General, in his introductory address, stressed that it was perhaps the distinctive mark of this generation that we were aware of our capacity for self-destruction. It was, he believed, our awareness that the diversion of the world's human and material resources for arms delays our equitable social and economic development that has brought us together to this session. From that awareness we could derive great hope, the Secretary-General said.

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

In the Preparatory Committee, in September last year, the delegations of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden submitted a proposal for an in-depth United Nations study on the role of military expenditures in the world economy and the conditions for a successful redeployment of resources to civilian purposes. We did so, conscious of the enormous resources devoted to armaments, which would be urgently needed to meet the demands of economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries, and the relationship between disarmament efforts and measures to achieve economic and social progress.

By resolution 32/88 A of 12 December 1977, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendation made by the Preparatory Committee that an in-depth study on the relationship between disarmament and development should be initiated and that the terms of reference of the study should be determined by the Assembly itself at the present special session. The Secretary-General was requested to appoint an Ad Hoc Group of governmental experts to elaborate a possible framework and terms of reference for this study, and to transmit to Member States the report of the Ad Hoc Group not later than one month before the opening of the special session. Pursuant to that resolution, the Secretary-General appointed the Ad Hoc Group on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, which was given a balanced composition. The report of the Group was transmitted to Member States on 5 April 1978 in document A/S-10/9.

In my capacity as Chairman of the Group, I now wish to make some comments with regard to the contents of that report.

The Group was at work between 13 and 21 March this year, in New York. The report represents the outcome of very thorough and constructive discussions and I wish to extend my warmest thanks to the members of the Group for their keen co-operation. Among the many distinguished experts in the Group was Professor Dolgu, President of the Academy of Economic Studies in Bucharest, who had himself led the work of the Expert Group on the Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures which submitted its report last September. Thanks to the presence of Professor Dolgu, we were able to draw on the experience gathered by that group of experts and to base our proposals on foundations already laid in their report.

We were, of course, most grateful for the valuable assistance provided us by tireless members of the Secretariat, in particular the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, as represented by Mr. Rolf Björnerstedt and Mr. Saad Alfarargi, and by Mr. Ronald Huisken of the Australian National University, Canberra, who served as our consultant. Moreover, we had the pleasure of listening to Professor Leontieff, that eminent economist, who informed us of the supplementary work being carried out on his model for the world economy in the year 2000, including also aspects of military costs.

The results of our joint efforts have, then, been presented to you in the form of general guidelines and terms of reference for an in-depth study on the relationship between disarmament and development, and tentative recommendations for the organization of the work relating to such a study.

The general guidelines underline the importance of a study being made in the context of how disarmament can contribute to the establishment of a new international economic order. The study, it is said, should be forward-looking and policy-oriented and place special emphasis on both the desirability of a reallocation of resources, particularly for the benefit of the developing countries, and the feasibility of such a reallocation. It should serve as a basis for decisions on concrete action by Governments, following disarmament measures, to release real resources now used for military purposes. The construction of a comprehensive and reliable data base will be a prerequisite for the more forward-looking aspects of the study.

To quote the report of September 1977, to which I just referred and which was submitted by the Expert Group on the Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures:

"This question of the relationship between armament and disarmament, on the one hand, and other aspects of social, economic and political development, on the other, has received all too little attention in the past. This report has attempted to indicate these interrelations, but an adequate analysis would require much deeper study." (A/32/88, p. 72)

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

Much of the importance of the proposed study on disarmament and development lies in the possibilities it will offer to gather in-depth knowledge of a number of aspects on the relationship between disarmament and development which are so far insufficiently known when it comes to serving as a basis for decision-making. It will offer an important opportunity for informing the public on such aspects.

Bearing in mind these guidelines, the study should investigate three main areas:

First, the present-day utilization of real resources, such as labour, research and development capacity, production facilities and raw materials, for military purposes, examining in particular the opportunity costs of present-day resource allocation.

Secondly, the effects of a continuing arms race on the supply of and demand for those resources, and the effects of the implementation of disarmament measures on economic and social development, for instance in terms of the supply of and demand for research and development capacity and on employment and production in general.

Thirdly, the problems associated with the reallocation of real resources released through disarmament measures to purposes that can be seen to be related directly to economic and social development, including practical methods for the transfer of resources to the developing countries. Here, immediate problems, such as employment, come into the picture, as well as questions relating to resource requirements which would, in the longer term replace military demands. With regard to the actual transfer, time factors are particularly important in the readjustment process.

There are serious lacunae in our knowledge with regard to all three chapters of the study. Outside experts disagree, for instance, on the effects of a continuing armaments process on the civil production of a country, and on world economic development. Such matters as these must, of course, be thoroughly clarified before proposals are submitted for concrete readjustment measures. On the other hand, it is imperative that we utilize to the utmost extent the time and resources set aside for the study. For that reason, the Group had a feeling that work in all three areas should be carried on more or less simultaneously. This would be feasible if the

(Mrs. Thorsson, Sweden)

study group collects and utilizes as much as possible of existing data and expert advice from the very start of its work. It will then become clear what supplementing investigations will be required. The object of the study being to serve as a basis for concrete decisions, the main emphasis of the work would be on the phase of studying and arriving at conclusions and practical recommendations to national Governments concerning the task of actual conversion of real resources to constructive development purposes.

Those are some of the ideas behind the tentative recommendations for the organization of work that conclude the report of the Ad Hoc Group. It will now be for the special session to take the final decisions on the organizational framework and terms of reference of the study to provide it with the resources so badly required to proceed efficiently.

Speaking now, in conclusion, for the Swedish delegation, I would like to quote from the Swedish Prime Minister's address to the Assembly last week. On this subject, he said that:

"The immense volume of resources consumed for armaments stands out as particularly alarming when seen in the light of the world's urgent development needs; in a world where each day one fourth of mankind is exposed to hunger and destitution. Resources now set aside for armaments must be transferred to more constructive purposes in all States. That would facilitate the efforts of the international community to provide the developing countries with substantial resources for their economic and social development. In this way the glaring inequalities between peoples in various parts of the world and within States could also be more speedily eliminated. The lack of real progress in disarmament must obviously not be used as an excuse for inadequate efforts to promote development. Both disarmament and development are essential, each in its own right." (A/S-10/PV.2, p. 84-85)

The overriding importance of the work of the study ahead need not be further emphasized.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of Sweden, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development for the presentation of its report.

I now have pleasure in calling on the Permanent Representative of Iran, Ambassador Fereydown Hoveyda, who will present the special report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference in his capacity as Chairman of that Committee.

Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran): First of all, Mr. Chairman, allow me to address you as the representative of my country in order to tell you how delighted we are to see you in the Chair of such an important Committee. It is indeed a pleasure and an honour for me to serve under your chairmanship as one of the Vice-Chairmen, and I do not need to elaborate on your high qualities, which are known to all of us.

Now, as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, it is my privilege to present for the consideration of this Committee the special report in document A/S-10/3. This report has been prepared in fulfilment of the mandate entrusted to the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference in resolution 32/89 of 12 December 1977, by which the General Assembly requested the Ad Hoc Committee, inter alia, to submit to the Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament a special report on the state of its work and deliberations.

In accordance with its mandate, the Committee met initially on 13 and 14 March 1978 and, after a brief exchange of views, decided to entrust its open-ended Working Group, established in 1974, with the task of formulating a draft of the special report requested in the resolution of 12 December 1977.

The Working Group accordingly initiated its work on 28 March 1978 and met eight times between that date and 3 May under the very able chairmanship of the Committee's Rapporteur, Mr. Ignacio Lopez-Chicheri of Spain. As a result of dedicated work on the part of the members of the Working Group and of the negotiations I conducted in fulfilment of my responsibility as Chairman with the representatives of the nuclear-weapon States, the Ad Hoc Committee was able

(Mr. Hoveyda, Iran)

to adopt the special report at its third and final meeting of the session on 8 May 1978. I therefore take more than customary delight in congratulating Mr. Lopez-Chicheri and his colleagues on a task so ably performed.

Following past practice concerning the adoption of its reports, the Ad Hoc Committee adopted the special report by consensus. As in previous years, of the five nuclear Powers - which enjoy the same rights as the designated Committee members - France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland participated in the Committee's work, while China and the United States of America maintained contact with it through its Chairman.

Turning now to the content as well as the format of the report, it will be noticed that the document under consideration has been divided into two volumes. Volume I consists of the substantive part of the report, whereas volume II is an annex containing a comprehensive review of the positions of States as presented to the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference and to other bodies since 1974.

As far as the main body of the report in volume I is concerned, it will be observed that there are five chapters.

The introductory chapter sketches a brief historical outline of the origin, evolution and development of the idea of convening a world disarmament conference.

Chapter II presents a review of the Committee's work as well as its methods of work, and notes that since its establishment the Ad Hoc Committee has been mainly concerned with the examination of all views and suggestions expressed by Governments on the convening of a world disarmament conference and related problems, including conditions for the holding of such a conference. It is further pointed out that an important aspect of the Committee's work has been the adoption of decisions on the basis of consensus, a fact which has been essential to the involvement of all five nuclear-weapon States in the work of the Committee. It is stated that this practice has constituted a unique feature of the work of the Committee, since no other body dealing exclusively with problems related to disarmament has formally established similar contacts with all five nuclear-weapon States.

(Mr. Hoveyda, Iran)

The third chapter sets forth summaries of the positions of Governments on various aspects of a world disarmament conference, and these are quoted verbatim from the successive reports of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference.

Chapter IV of the special report contains conclusions reached and observations and recommendations made from 1975 to 1977 by the Ad Hoc Committee, including those relating to its mandate.

The fifth and final chapter of volume I contains the conclusions of the special report, in which the Ad Hoc Committee reiterates that the idea of a world disarmament conference has received wide support from the membership of the United Nations, with, however, varying degrees of emphasis and differences on conditions and certain aspects related to the question of its convening; and that no consensus with respect to the convening of a world disarmament conference in present conditions has yet been reached among the nuclear-weapon States, whose participation in a world disarmament conference has been deemed essential by most Members of the Organization. Furthermore, the Ad Hoc Committee considers that the General Assembly, at its special session devoted to disarmament, might wish to draw its conclusions on the subject in the light of this special report and taking into account the relevant sections of the report of its Preparatory Committee (document A/S-10/1).

Before concluding this brief presentation, I should like to emphasize that in preparing this special report the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference was at all times acutely conscious of the need to be guided in its work by a realistic and balanced approach. The fact that the Committee was able to conclude its work in such an expeditious and harmonious manner speaks eloquently for the co-operative spirit displayed by all parties concerned in attaining that objective.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the Permanent Representative of Iran, Ambassador Hoveyda, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference for his introduction of the report, and for his cordial words addressed to me.

The special report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference has been published as volume 2 (A/S-10/2); it consists of two volumes containing annexes I and II of the report I have mentioned.

With the introduction of the two reports and the announcement of the special report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, we have concluded our business for this morning. On Friday and on Monday addresses will be made by Heads of State and Government in plenary meetings of the General Assembly and, as has been agreed to in the organization of our work, this Committee will accordingly not meet again until Wednesday, 7 June at 3 p.m.

The conference rooms and the times of the meetings for working groups A and B will be announced in the Journal.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.