

**REPORT  
OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE  
FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION  
OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT**

---

**Volume VII**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**  
OFFICIAL RECORDS: TENTH SPECIAL SESSION  
SUPPLEMENT No. 1 (A/S-10/1)



**UNITED NATIONS**

**REPORT  
OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE  
FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION  
OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT**

---

**Volume VII**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**  
OFFICIAL RECORDS: TENTH SPECIAL SESSION  
SUPPLEMENT No. 1 (A/S-10/1)



**UNITED NATIONS**

New York, 1978

#### NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

The report of the Preparatory Committee and its annexes comprise seven volumes. The present volume contains annex II, documents A/AC.187/SR.1-42. Volume I contains the report; volume II, annex I, documents A/32/60, A/32/62 and A/AC.187/1-A/AC.187/29 and Add.1; volume III, annex I, documents A/AC.187/30-A/AC.187/51 and Add.1; volume IV, annex I, documents A/AC.187/52-72; volume V, annex I, documents A/AC.187/73-92; and volume VI, annex I, documents A/AC.187/93/Rev.1-114 and A/AC.187/INF.2-7.

ANNEX II

Summary records of the meetings of the Preparatory Committee

CONTENTS

Page

Organizational session

1st meeting . . . . .	1
<u>Monday, 28 March 1977, at 11.25 a.m.</u>	
Opening of the session	
Statement by the Secretary-General	
Adoption of the agenda	
Election of officers	
Organization of work	
2nd meeting . . . . .	7
<u>Tuesday, 29 March 1977, at 11.10 a.m.</u>	
Organization of work	
3rd meeting . . . . .	10
<u>Wednesday, 30 March 1977, at 11.10 a.m.</u>	
Election of officers	
Organization of work	

Second session

4th meeting . . . . .	15
<u>Monday, 9 May 1977, at 11 a.m.</u>	
Organization of work	
General debate	
5th meeting . . . . .	18
<u>Tuesday, 10 May 1977, at 10.55 a.m.</u>	
Organization of work	
General debate	
6th meeting . . . . .	29
<u>Wednesday, 11 May 1977, at 11.05 a.m.</u>	
General debate	
Organization of work	

CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
7th meeting . . . . .	34
<u>Thursday, 12 May 1977, at 11 a.m.</u>	
General debate	
8th meeting . . . . .	44
<u>Friday, 13 May 1977, at 11.10 a.m.</u>	
Organization of work	
General debate	
9th meeting . . . . .	51
<u>Monday, 16 May 1977, at 11.05 a.m.</u>	
General debate	
10th meeting . . . . .	61
<u>Tuesday, 17 May 1977, at 11.05 a.m.</u>	
General debate	
11th meeting . . . . .	71
<u>Wednesday, 18 May 1977, at 11 a.m.</u>	
General debate	
Organization of work	
12th meeting . . . . .	78
<u>Wednesday, 18 May 1977, at 4.20 p.m.</u>	
Organization of work	
13th meeting . . . . .	79
<u>Thursday, 19 May 1977, at 11 a.m.</u>	
General debate	
Organization of work	
14th meeting . . . . .	87
<u>Friday, 20 May 1977, at 11.05 a.m.</u>	
General debate	

Third session

15th meeting . . . . .	96
<u>Wednesday, 31 August 1977, at 3.35 p.m.</u>	
Adoption of the agenda	
Organization of work	
Provisional agenda of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament	
Organization of work of the special session	
Principal documents of the special session	
Organization of future work of the Committee	
Consideration of the draft report of the Preparatory Committee to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly	
16th meeting . . . . .	102
<u>Thursday, 1 September 1977, at 3.40 p.m.</u>	
Organization of work of the special session	
Organization of work	
17th meeting . . . . .	110
<u>Tuesday, 6 September 1977, at 3.35 p.m.</u>	
Provisional agenda of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament	
Organization of work of the special session	
Principal documents of the special session	
Organization of future work of the Committee	
18th meeting . . . . .	119
<u>Wednesday, 7 September 1977, at 3.40 p.m.</u>	
Organization of work of the special session	
Principal documents of the special session	
Organization of future work of the Committee	
19th meeting . . . . .	130
<u>Thursday, 8 September 1977, at 3.45 p.m.</u>	
Draft progress report	

CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
20th meeting . . . . .	133
<u>Friday, 9 September 1977, at 11.10 a.m.</u>	
Draft progress report	
<u>Fourth session</u>	
21st meeting . . . . .	135
<u>Tuesday, 24 January 1978, at 3.30 p.m.</u>	
Opening of the session	
Adoption of the provisional agenda	
Election of the Rapporteur	
Organization of work	
22nd meeting . . . . .	144
<u>Wednesday, 25 January 1978, at 3.50 p.m.</u>	
Organization of work of the special session	
Principal documents of the special session	
23rd meeting . . . . .	152
<u>Thursday, 26 January 1978, at 3.35 p.m.</u>	
Principal documents of the special session	
Organization of work of the special session	
24th meeting . . . . .	156
<u>Monday, 30 January 1978, at 3.25 p.m.</u>	
Organization of work	
25th meeting . . . . .	160
<u>Wednesday, 1 February 1978, at 4 p.m.</u>	
Organization of work of the special session	
Principal documents of the special session	
26th meeting . . . . .	168
<u>Friday, 3 February 1978, at 11.05 a.m.</u>	
Principal documents of the special session	

CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
27th meeting . . . . .	174
<u>Wednesday, 8 February 1978, at 3.35 p.m.</u>	
Principal documents of the special session	
28th meeting . . . . .	178
<u>Friday, 10 February 1978, at 11.10 a.m.</u>	
Organization of work	
29th meeting . . . . .	179
<u>Monday, 13 February 1978, at 3.45 p.m.</u>	
Organization of work of the special session	
30th meeting . . . . .	181
<u>Wednesday, 15 February 1978, at 3.40 p.m.</u>	
Organization of work	
Programme of work for the special sessions: role of non-governmental organizations	
31st meeting . . . . .	189
<u>Friday, 17 February 1978, at 11.20 a.m.</u>	
Principal documents of the special session	
32nd meeting . . . . .	194
<u>Wednesday, 22 February 1978, at 3.35 p.m.</u>	
Statement by the representative of the Office of Public Information	
Machinery for disarmament negotiations	
33rd meeting . . . . .	203
<u>Friday, 24 February 1978, at 3.40 p.m.</u>	
Principal documents of the special session	
Statement by the representative of the Office of Public Information	
Organization of work of the special session	
Organization of work of the Preparatory Committee at its fifth session	
Closure of the session	



CONTENTS (continued)

Page

Fifth session

34th meeting . . . . .	214
<u>Tuesday, 4 April 1978, at 11.05 a.m.</u>	
Opening of the session	
Adoption of the agenda	
Organization of work	
35th meeting . . . . .	218
<u>Friday, 7 April 1978, at 11.05 a.m.</u>	
Organization of work	
Principal documents of the special session	
36th meeting . . . . .	220
<u>Monday, 10 April 1978, at 3.35 p.m.</u>	
Principal documents of the special session	
37th meeting . . . . .	221
<u>Wednesday, 12 April 1978, at 3.40 p.m.</u>	
Principal documents of the special session	
Final report of the Preparatory Committee to the special session of the General Assembly	
Statement by the representative of the Office of Public Information	
38th meeting . . . . .	228
<u>Friday, 14 April 1978, at 11.10 a.m.</u>	
Final report of the Preparatory Committee to the special session of the General Assembly	
Other business	
39th meeting . . . . .	232
<u>Monday, 17 April 1978, at 3.45 p.m.</u>	
Principal documents of the special session	
Organization of work	

CONTENTS (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
40th meeting . . . . .	238
<u>Wednesday, 19 April 1978, at 3.45 p.m.</u>	
Final report of the Preparatory Committee to the special session of the General Assembly	
Recommendations of the Preparatory Committee	
41st meeting . . . . .	244
<u>Thursday, 20 April 1978, at 3.50 p.m.</u>	
Final report of the Preparatory Committee to the special session of the General Assembly	
42nd meeting . . . . .	247
<u>Friday, 21 April 1978, at 11.25 a.m.</u>	
Principal documents of the special session	
Final report of the Preparatory Committee to the special session of the General Assembly	
Closure of the session	

1st meeting

Monday, 28 March 1977, at 11.25 a.m.

Temporary Chairman: The Secretary-General

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE RCZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.1

OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The ACTING CHAIRMAN declared open the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

2. The SECRETARY-GENERAL said that disarmament was a vital aspect of the primary function of the Organization, the maintenance of international peace and security. Since preparations were now beginning for the special session, which would, in all probability, be the largest, most representative gathering ever convened to consider the question of disarmament in all its aspects, he wished to take the opportunity to make some comments on the tasks ahead and on the role of the United Nations.

3. In order to tackle the question of disarmament in all its ramifications, the underlying problems of international order must be examined. During the three decades which had elapsed since the Second World War, vast transformations had occurred, and that development was continuing. The process of decolonization was nearly completed and had transformed the geopolitical map of the world. All States, regardless of their size and their economic or military potential, were increasingly active in the discussion and solution of major issues.

4. While the important role and responsibilities of the great Powers with respect to peace and security must be fully recognized, the small and medium-sized States, the developing countries and the non-aligned countries were all parties which must be involved in a time and age when the process of scientific and technological advance and democratization was producing a new form of world society. The holding of a special session on disarmament might, therefore, be an important element in the search for a more just and equitable world order. The positive results of that search were, however, constantly threatened by the continuing arms race. In an international environment dominated by the arms race, military and strategic considerations tended to shape the over-all relations between States, affecting all other relations and transactions as well. Unless the arms race was brought to an end and unless a vigorous process of disarmament and, particularly, nuclear disarmament was initiated, there could be no guarantee that relations among States would, in fact, be based on the principles of national independence and sovereignty, non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States, full equality of rights, non-resort to force or to the threat of force, and the right of every people to decide its own destiny.

5. It was, therefore, evident that the United Nations could not be expected to function on the basis of the Charter and international law unless it succeeded in making major progress in the field of disarmament. Only then would it be possible to create a system of world order based on collective responsibility and a climate of international confidence. The vast arsenals already accumulated and the ongoing

race to produce new arms made the peace and security of the world less rather than more stable. Stocks of nuclear weapons in the possession of the nuclear Powers had for many years been sufficient to destroy the world many times over. Still, the number of nuclear warheads had increased fivefold in the past eight years. In addition, those weapons were constantly being diversified and their performance characteristics improved. The development by the major Powers of new generations and types of nuclear weapons smaller in power but more accurate in finding their intended targets could already be observed. That could lead to a gradual erosion of the dividing line between the use of nuclear and conventional weapons. The danger of a further spread of nuclear weapons increased with every year as the art of nuclear technology became more widely known. The so-called conventional weapons were becoming increasingly sophisticated and deadly.

6. At the same time, scientists were discussing the possibilities of developing new, even more dangerous weapons of mass destruction, which would face mankind with additional innumerable hazards. In that situation there was only one road available that led the world towards a peaceful and prosperous future, and that road was towards disarmament.

7. Progress in disarmament was also needed in order to end the present trend of a massive diversion to military ends of financial resources, manpower, raw materials, technical skills and research and development capability. There was a greater awareness that the world was facing a series of urgent and important problems which would require mobilization of all the world's energies and resources for their solution. Chief among them was the problem of development and the associated task of establishing a new international economic order. There were, consequently, large claims on investment, research and other resources in direct competition with the military demands. The arms race with its economic costs and social and political effects constituted the single most massive obstacle to effective progress in those respects.

8. For a number of years, world military expenditure had been around \$300 billion per year. Every year, the military absorbed resources equivalent to about two-thirds of the aggregate gross national product of the countries which together comprised the poorest half of the world's population.

9. The vast benefits which could result from even trifling reductions in arms expenditures were evident in many fields. For example, the World Health Organization had spent about \$63 million over 10 years to eradicate smallpox in the world. That amount would not even suffice to buy a single modern supersonic bomber. The world health programme, which was seeking to eradicate malaria in the world at an estimated cost of some \$450 million, was dragging because of a lack of funds. Yet, its total cost over the years was only half of what was spent every day for military purposes.

10. In the area of nutrition, half a billion people were severely malnourished. A large proportion of young children in developing countries were blocked in their physical and mental development because of diet deficiencies, with incalculable consequences for the next generation. In recent years, famine had struck entire regions of the world.

11. At the World Food Conference in 1974, it had been estimated that development assistance to agriculture needed to be stepped up to \$5-6 billion annually for the remainder of the decade. While fund commitments for that purpose had risen substantially since then, they were still off the target by \$2-3 billion. A reduction of the military budgets of industrialized countries by a mere 1 per cent would be sufficient to close that gap.

12. In the field of scientific and technological capability, the diversion of resources to military ends was most massive of all. It was estimated that 25 per cent of the world's scientific manpower was engaged in military-related pursuits and that 40 per cent of all research and development spending in the world was devoted to military purposes.

13. It was estimated that, for the world as a whole, a total of 60 million people were engaged in military-related occupations, uniformed or civilian, public or private. That corresponded to the entire labour force in manufacturing in Europe outside the Soviet Union, or to 70 per cent of the total employed in the United States in all branches of activity. The arms race and military expenditures thus created a burden on all peoples and interfered with the economic development of all States. At a time when the international community had accepted the objectives of a new international economic order, that burden should no longer be tolerated.

14. Effective disarmament was therefore needed to release resources for the peaceful development of all, and especially of the developing countries. Disarmament must be a vital part of attempts to restructure the world order politically, economically and socially. The need was today greater than ever.

15. It was obvious that relieving the cold war atmosphere had had an important effect in relaxing the international climate, thus diminishing the risk that peripheral conflicts would escalate into nuclear war. Improvement of international co-operation, as recognized in the Helsinki Declaration on Security and Co-operation in Europe, was a prerequisite for a lessening of tensions. However, détente had not extended to all areas of the world and it had not yet led to a real breakthrough in the process of disarmament.

16. Looking back over the disarmament efforts since World War II, it would be noted that some achievements had been made, albeit modest ones. With the exception of the Convention prohibiting biological weapons, the results had been in the nature of arms limitation rather than disarmament. The emphasis had been on regulating competition in armaments and proscribing certain developments deemed to be particularly destabilizing, costly or otherwise unacceptable, rather than on attempting substantially to reduce important weapons systems.

17. There was a growing realization that in the context of a rapidly innovating arms race such an approach was bound to fail. Technological inventions tended to outstrip the pace of negotiations. The momentum of the arms race made it hurdle the weak barriers that had been built to stop it.

18. Partial and collateral measures could play a role in the cessation and subsequent reversal of the arms race only if they were conceived as part of a broader programme aimed at substantial disarmament in areas of weaponry of central military significance ultimately leading to general and complete disarmament and, in particular, nuclear disarmament under effective international control.
19. What was needed, then, was a comprehensive approach aimed at real disarmament and one that was realistic concerning both the possibilities of disarmament and the dangers of a continued lack of decisive progress.
20. Realizing the need for a new approach, the General Assembly had taken the decisive step of calling for a special session devoted to disarmament. He hoped that that initiative would prove to be a turning point in the search for disarmament and thus move the United Nations closer to attaining the broad objectives for which it had been created. However, there must be a willingness on the part of all to participate actively in what might be a very difficult and long-drawn-out process.
21. There was a need to make the most careful preparations for the special session so that, when it was convened, States would come to it with a readiness to overcome their political differences, to discuss openly and to negotiate in good faith. There should also be an involvement by world public opinion and by the organizations, governmental and non-governmental, that were active in mobilizing that opinion. The General Assembly had repeatedly stressed that absolute priority should be assigned to nuclear disarmament. At that very moment, important negotiations had just resumed in Moscow in an effort to overcome the present difficulties in the strategic talks between the Soviet Union and the United States. He earnestly hoped that the parties would reach agreement on important qualitative limitations and substantial reductions of their strategic nuclear weapons systems. Proposals had also been made, some agreements had been reached and further negotiations were under way on such measures as the discontinuance of nuclear-weapons tests, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. It was his firm belief that only by halting the production of nuclear weapons and liquidating the existing stocks could the danger of their further horizontal proliferation be ultimately eliminated and a nuclear holocaust prevented.
22. Importance should also be attached to the adoption of measures in the field of chemical and biological weapons and incendiary and other conventional weapons, as well as to partial measures of disarmament, the reduction of military expenditures, and other means of military disengagement, leading eventually to general and complete disarmament, which had been proclaimed as the main goal of the United Nations more than a decade earlier.
23. Under the circumstances, it was essential to give the United Nations an enhanced role in the field of disarmament. It had been in that spirit that he had proposed, two years earlier, that the General Assembly should consider a

basic review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament. He had asked what could be done, in practical and realistic terms, to strengthen the role of the United Nations in such a way that the necessary progress could be achieved in that field. He had made some concrete proposals at the time concerning information and study on disarmament, the conduct of relevant discussions and negotiations and also for the follow-up of whatever disarmament agreements were reached. He was pleased with the response of the General Assembly to those proposals. The measures adopted constituted a beginning and should be continued with determination.

24. The special session should be a turning point in the efforts to promote real and substantial measures aimed at achieving the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. He assured the Committee that the Secretariat would spare no effort to contribute to the successful preparations for and conclusion of the special session.

25. The international community was at a crossroads. People expected the United Nations to put an end to the arms race. The task was immense and complex. He urged the Committee to try, through mutual co-operation and understanding, to fulfil the world's high expectations.

#### ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

26. The provisional agenda (A/AC.187/1) was adopted.

#### ELECTION OF OFFICERS

27. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) nominated Mr. Carlos Ortiz de Rozas (Argentina) for the office of Chairman.

28. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) and Mr. VAERNOE (Norway) seconded the nomination on behalf of the socialist countries and the Western European and other countries respectively.

29. Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) was elected Chairman by acclamation.

30. Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina) took the Chair.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that his election was both a token of recognition of Argentina's efforts to promote the cause of disarmament and an honour for him personally, for which he thanked the Committee. He thanked, in particular, the representatives of Peru, the German Democratic Republic and Norway for nominating him and seconding the nomination.

32. On behalf of the Committee, he extended warm thanks to the Secretary-General for opening the session in person, thus sharply emphasizing the importance of the Committee's task and the co-operation which the Secretariat would extend to it. Moreover, the Secretary-General's opening comments would serve to orient the Committee's debates.

33. Without going over the events that had led up to the adoption of General Assembly resolution 31/189 B, he recalled that since that resolution had been unanimously adopted, all Member States shared responsibility for the special session devoted to disarmament. Clearly, since disarmament affected the security and sovereignty of all States, no one could refuse to contribute his views in the search for generally acceptable compromise formulas. In view of the limited time available and the difficulties that lay ahead, he stressed the need for goodwill and determined participation on the part of all delegations. The reward was well worth the effort, for it had been estimated that during the course of 1977 \$350 billion would be spent on armaments.

34. The special session would be the most representative meeting organized specifically for the purpose of moving towards real disarmament. The success of that venture would depend to a large extent upon the intelligence, enthusiasm and determination with which the Committee tackled its programme.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

35. The CHAIRMAN announced that it had been agreed that the Committee should have a total of 10 officers - 1 Chairman, 8 Vice-Chairmen and 1 Rapporteur with two representatives for each regional group. Since consultations were still going on concerning the representatives of one regional group, the election of the remaining officers would be postponed until the following day.

36. Turning to the procedure for adoption decisions, he said that the Committee would be governed by the relevant parts of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. Notwithstanding that fact, it had been generally agreed during the consultations that every effort should be made to ensure that, in so far as possible, decisions on matters of substance were adopted by consensus. He assured the Committee that, whenever it proved necessary, he would make every effort as Chairman to secure such a consensus. He would do so not only to respond to the wishes of the Committee but also because he felt that, in matters as important as those relating to disarmament, decisions adopted by consensus were much more likely to be implemented. Nevertheless, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, he stated that should his efforts to secure a consensus fail, he would duly inform the Committee so that decisions could then be adopted in accordance with the provisions of the rules of procedure. He trusted that that procedure would not be questioned and pointed out that strict adherence to it would be beneficial to all.

37. He announced that the members of the Committee had also agreed to permit representatives of countries that were not members to participate in plenary meetings without voting rights.

38. The general consensus of opinion was that the Committee's meetings at the present session should be devoted entirely to organizational matters and that questions of substance could be discussed at the following session, which was scheduled to start on 9 May.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.



Tuesday, 29 March 1977, at 11.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE RZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.2

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as the representative of Argentina, nominated Mr. Alfarargi (Egypt) for the office of Rapporteur.
2. Mr. Alfarargi (Egypt) was elected Rapporteur by acclamation.
3. Mr. ALFARARGI (Egypt), Rapporteur, said that disarmament was the single most important problem confronting the international community and required prompt action. The fact that the General Assembly was to hold a special session devoted to disarmament testified to the importance of the problem as well as the desire of all States to take part in dealing with it. Every effort should be made to ensure the success of the session, and he would do his utmost in that regard.
4. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) said that his delegation earnestly hoped that the forthcoming special session would, with the co-operation of the great Powers, respond to the aspirations for peace which had prompted the non-aligned countries to call for it.
5. Mr. MURRAY (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the nine members of the European Community, expressed support for the decision to permit delegations which were not members of the Preparatory Committee to take part in its deliberations without the right of vote. The nine members of the European Community also felt that the special session could succeed only if the decisions it adopted had the widest possible support. Decisions made in disregard of the vital interests of States or groups of States would not command the authority necessary to ensure their implementation and could jeopardize a unique opportunity to advance the cause of disarmament. It should therefore be the aim of the members of the Committee and of any sub-committees that might be established to conduct their work so as to be able to reach agreement by consensus.
6. The nine members of the Community had no objection in principle to suggestions which had been made informally regarding the possibility of establishing sub-committees of the Preparatory Committee or intersessional working groups. However, no firm decision should be taken before delegations had had time to consider the views of Governments which, in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 31/189 B, were to be submitted to the Secretary-General by 15 April. It would be premature to decide precisely how the Committee's work should be organized until members were aware of the main preoccupations of Member States regarding the special session. The appropriate time to consider the establishment of subsidiary groups would therefore be at the second session of the Preparatory Committee in May.
7. In view of the diversity of approaches to disarmament, the special session could hardly be expected to produce instant solutions, but it did offer a unique opportunity for the international community to develop a co-operative approach to the problem, and the nine delegations of the European Community pledged themselves to help ensure that that opportunity was used in a constructive and positive manner.

8. The CHAIRMAN said he agreed that every effort should be made to take substantive decisions by consensus in order to ensure their application, but he felt that other means should be employed when that ideal could not be achieved so as not to paralyse the Committee's work. There also seemed to be general agreement that it was premature to decide on the establishment of working groups and subsidiary bodies before the replies of Governments to the Secretary-General were submitted in April. The consensus therefore seemed to be that such decisions should not be taken before the session which was to begin on 9 May.
9. Mr. CASSELL (Liberia) observed that in the time of the League of Nations many unsuccessful conferences had been held on the question of disarmament but that the world now had a unique opportunity to review a problem which, if ignored, would lead to disaster.
10. Mr. TERADA (Japan) said that his delegation fully supported the idea that a maximum effort should be made to adopt decisions by consensus both in the Preparatory Committee and at the special session. His delegation had no objection to the participation of non-members without the right of vote. There was very little time to prepare for the special session, and realistic means should be sought to ensure its success. His own country would do its utmost to that end.
11. The CHAIRMAN said that the General Assembly, in adopting resolution 31/189 B, had foreseen the need for the preparation by the Secretariat of a number of factual background papers to assist in the preparations for the special session and for use at the session itself. The Secretary-General, in his opening statement to the Committee, had made a firm commitment to assist it with all the means at his disposal. Accordingly, and in view of the limited time that was available for the preparatory work, he felt that the Committee might wish to request the Secretariat to begin the preliminary work on such factual background papers as might be needed. That could, for example, include a presentation of disarmament resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, a paper on existing principles and proposals for the conduct of disarmament negotiations, and a description of existing structures and machinery for disarmament negotiations. Since that was only a preliminary proposal, the Secretariat could be asked to present a more detailed plan to the Committee at the next session in May.
12. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said that it was important to know when the Secretariat would have the essential documentation ready. In particular, he wished to know whether the views of Governments would be collated and analysed by 9 May or merely reproduced.
13. Mr. BJORNERSTEDT (Director, Disarmament Affairs Division) said that in view of the limited time remaining not all replies could be expected by 15 April and that the replies would therefore be reproduced as they were received.
14. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that his suggestion was adopted.
15. It was so decided.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that requests to participate in the special session had been received from non-governmental organizations. According to the Office of Legal Affairs, the sixth and seventh special sessions of the General Assembly provided no precedent for such participation, and the rules of procedure also offered no guidelines. The precedents which had been established in conferences were inapplicable. With respect to the participation of non-governmental organizations in the Preparatory Committee itself, the Preparatory Committee for the seventh special session might offer an applicable precedent, but that Committee was a subsidiary body of the Economic and Social Council. There could be no objection, of course, to the attendance of non-governmental organizations, since the meetings were public, but the problem was what their status should be. Some of the organizations applying for the right to participate in the work of the Preparatory Committee were seriously involved in disarmament matters, but that was not true of all of them. He therefore urged the Committee to give the matter serious thought, since only the Committee in plenary could take a decision.

17. Mr. MOHAJER (Iran) said that non-governmental organizations must be involved in the special session and in the Preparatory Committee because they had an important role to play in achieving the session's primary aims, which were to attract general public interest and to mobilize public opinion. The Preparatory Committee had to decide what the role of the non-governmental organizations should be.

18. Mr. KEMAL (Pakistan), observing that the role to be played by non-governmental organizations was very important, suggested that the Bureau should examine the list of non-governmental organizations and make recommendations to the Preparatory Committee, which would then decide the matter.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that the Preparatory Committee must first decide if it agreed to the participation of non-governmental organizations and then decide on the procedures for such participation and whether it should be broad or restricted. He would welcome informal expressions of views on the matter.

The meeting rose at noon.

Wednesday, 30 March 1977, at 11.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.3\*

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that the representatives of the following countries had been elected Vice-Chairmen of the Preparatory Committee by consensus: Nigeria (African Group), Iran and Japan (Asian Group), Bahamas (Latin American Group), Poland and Yugoslavia (Eastern European Group), Australia and Norway (Group of Western European and other States). He thanked those delegations which had withdrawn their candidacies in order to make a consensus possible.

2. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) expressed his appreciation to the delegations which had withdrawn their candidacies for the post of Vice-Chairman, particularly the delegation of Romania, which in the past had made a significant contribution to the cause of disarmament and arms control.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

3. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) said that the most vital task facing the international community at the present time was to remove the danger of another world war. In the Bucharest Declaration adopted in November 1976, his country, together with the other Warsaw Pact countries, had stated its readiness to co-operate actively with other States to remove that danger. The General Assembly, at its thirty-first session, had adopted a number of important decisions on disarmament and arms control and it was now up to the Preparatory Committee to ensure that efforts to implement those decisions were successful.

4. His country would do all it could to help guarantee the success of the special session of the General Assembly in creating the conditions for fuller and more effective disarmament and arms control. Political détente had made it possible to adopt international agreements on that subject, and those agreements must now be used to prevent further preparations for war, to promote international peace and security, and to free countries from the expenditure involved in participation in the arms race. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of his country had already described his Government's precise position on that issue in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 18 March 1977.

5. Because the problems of arms control and disarmament were extremely complex and directly affected the security of States, the Preparatory Committee must adopt a very realistic approach even in its procedural decisions. In that connexion, his country deeply regretted the fact that the Eastern European group of countries was not adequately represented in the Committee despite the major initiatives which it had taken to promote arms control and disarmament. A temporary solution to that state of affairs had been provided by the decision to permit non-members to participate in the work of the Preparatory Committee, but in his view the membership of the Committee should be reviewed by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session.

---

\*Incorporating the corrections contained in document A/AC.187/SR.1-14/Corrigendum.

6. In the matter of working procedure, the Preparatory Committee should be guided by the experience of other major United Nations bodies. Certain United Nations committees, as well as the sixth and seventh special sessions of the General Assembly, had applied the principle of consensus. It was particularly desirable to apply that principle when discussing the problems of arms limitation and disarmament, which affected the interests of all peoples. Since the constructive co-operation of all States would be required in order to ensure the success of the special session, the Preparatory Committee should set an example by continuing to work on the basis of consensus.
7. The delegation of the German Democratic Republic had serious reservations regarding the participation of non-governmental organizations in the work of the Committee. General Assembly resolution 31/189 B, under which the Committee had been set up, referred only to States. Only States Members of the United Nations were invited to transmit their views regarding the special session to the Secretary-General. Furthermore, the question of the participation of non-governmental organizations in the work of United Nations organs was governed by the Charter. Moreover, there were so many different non-governmental organizations that their participation was virtually impossible.
8. His delegation would do all it could to contribute to the success of the Committee's work so that the Committee could fulfil the hopes placed in it with regard to the special session.
9. Mr. DATCU (Romania) said that his delegation would do all it could to contribute positively and impartially to the success of the Committee's work and to the preparations for the special session.
10. His delegation fully agreed that the rules of procedure proposed by the Chairman would enable all delegations to participate democratically in the work of the Preparatory Committee. Such participation was vital, for the task of disarmament concerned every member of the international community.
11. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America) said that his delegation hoped that the work of the Preparatory Committee would give a positive stimulus to United Nations disarmament activities and was determined to work in a spirit of co-operation with all members of the Committee in order to fulfil that hope. He drew the Committee's attention to the recent statement made by the President of the United States on the occasion of his visit to the United Nations, in which he had underlined the commitment of the United States to work towards real progress in arms control and disarmament.
12. His delegation endorsed the Chairman's remarks concerning the need for decisions to be adopted by consensus both within the Preparatory Committee and at the special session. Disarmament was a highly sensitive issue, and if the special session devoted to disarmament was to lend new impetus to the disarmament process, the decisions of both the Preparatory Committee and the special session must enjoy widespread support, particularly that of the major Powers. The approach adopted by the Chairman would help to promote a spirit of co-operation at the special session.
13. Mr. MUJEZINOVIC (Yugoslavia) pledged his delegation's full co-operation in the work of preparing for the special session devoted to disarmament, which, as the Secretary-General had stated in his opening statement, represented a landmark in the

search for international peace and understanding. In proposing the convening of a special session, the non-aligned countries had believed that they were expressing the general interest of the entire international community in ending the arms race and in involving all Member States in the search for solutions and agreements which would mark the beginning of the end of the arms race and open the way to general and complete disarmament.

14. Like the Chairman, he believed that the preparations for the special session would be successful if all members of the Preparatory Committee were truly concerned to see an end to the threat of a nuclear holocaust. His delegation fully agreed with the Chairman's suggestions concerning the organization and rules of procedure of the Preparatory Committee. In that connexion, he was confident that the Secretariat would be able to start work immediately on compiling the replies submitted by Governments in response to General Assembly resolution 31/189 B, so that all Governments' views could be incorporated into a Secretariat document in time for the May session. His delegation agreed that the Bureau should discuss the question of participation by non-governmental organizations before the Committee took a decision on that subject. With regard to participation by States, all countries with an interest in disarmament should be able to contribute to the preparations for the special session.

15. Mr. MACAULAY (Nigeria) said he was confident that the delegation of Romania would be able to contribute significantly to the work of the Committee, even though it would not be a member of the Bureau. He was also confident that given co-operation, the Committee would be able to fulfil its collective responsibility to guarantee the survival of mankind. The Committee's task was extremely complex, and it would be utopian to expect disarmament to happen overnight. However, that should not prevent the international community from trying to follow up the initiatives proposed by the non-aligned countries, which had now become a collective responsibility.

16. Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria) said that his delegation appreciated the Romanian representative's co-operation in withdrawing his candidacy for the Bureau. It also agreed that the participation of non-governmental organizations should be decided on the basis of recommendations to be submitted by the Bureau.

17. Mr. CASSELL (Liberia) said that the Preparatory Committee should appeal to the super-Powers to reach an understanding on disarmament, because they would be providing the guidelines for all work in that area. Success in the talks currently taking place in Moscow would also greatly expedite the Committee's work. His delegation favoured the participation of non-governmental organizations without the right of vote, but only in the case of important, internationally recognized bodies which were seriously involved in disarmament matters. He also wished to thank the Romanian delegate for withdrawing his candidacy.

18. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas) said that his delegation was prepared to support any procedures which would contribute to the attainment of complete disarmament.

19. Mr. TURKMEN (Turkey) said that his delegation would do its utmost to ensure the success of the Preparatory Committee's work and hoped that the special session would lend new impetus to disarmament efforts. The call for a special session reflected the desire of all States to avert the dangers arising from a continuing arms race. Careful preparations were required in order to ensure success, and consensus should be the basis for the adoption of decisions.

20. Useful experience could be provided by non-member States, and his delegation would welcome their participation without the right of vote. Care should be taken not to duplicate the work of the First Committee and other United Nations bodies. His delegation hoped that the work of the Preparatory Committee and of the special session would help to curb the arms race and promote peace and security; it felt that all States had a role to play in achieving those ends.

21. Mr. MULYE (India) said that his delegation fully supported the decision-making procedures which had been adopted by the Preparatory Committee at its 1st meeting.

22. Mr. PALMA (Peru) thanked the representative of Romania for withdrawing his candidacy and expressed his delegation's full support for the decision-making procedures adopted at the 1st meeting. His delegation also favoured the participation of non-members.

23. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said his delegation felt that non-members could make a useful contribution to the Committee's work. Non-governmental organizations also had an essential contribution to make, at least through written submissions if not as participants in the debates, and his delegation would welcome suggestions from the Chairman regarding the mechanical handling of such submissions. He also suggested that if the Committee's work could not be completed at the May session, consultations should be held with the Secretariat regarding the possibility of extending the September session by a few days.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that such an extension would be necessary, especially in view of the time required to produce the progress report, and suggested that the Secretariat should make available in September any days that might have been saved by then.

25. Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria) said that his delegation supported the statement made by the Chairman at the 1st meeting regarding the decision-making procedure and future work of the Preparatory Committee. Non-governmental organizations could make a useful contribution, and his delegation would welcome proposals regarding the procedures for their participation. His delegation also agreed that the September session should be extended.

26. Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden) said that internationally recognized non-governmental organizations could play an important role in enlightening public opinion and could provide valuable input into the deliberations on disarmament. Careful consideration should therefore be given to finding some practical way for them to participate.

If a decision on the matter could not be taken at the current session, the Chairman, in consultation with the Bureau and with members, should propose a solution for consideration at the next session. His delegation agreed that the September session should be extended by a few days.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a number of proposals regarding the participation of non-governmental organizations and that a consensus on how they might contribute seemed to be close at hand. A number of delegations had suggested that the Bureau should deal with the matter, and Sweden had expressed the view that the decision could be postponed. He therefore suggested that the Bureau should consider the matter and submit recommendations for consideration on the first day of the May session.

28. It was so decided.

29. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that replies from Governments would be circulated as they arrived.

30. He requested the five geographical groups to designate one or two persons to act as liaison between the plenary meetings of the groups and the Chairman.

31. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the organizational work of the Preparatory Committee had been concluded.

32. It was so decided.

33. The CHAIRMAN asked the Secretariat to take note of the Preparatory Committee's wish to use the time saved for an extension of the September session.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.



4th meeting

Monday, 9 May 1977, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.4

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, at the previous meeting (A/AC.187/SR.3) on 30 March 1977, the Committee had decided to consider the request made by numerous non-governmental organizations and a number of delegations that the officers of the Committee should meet to determine procedures to govern the participation of non-governmental organizations in the work of the Committee. He could report that the officers had unanimously approved the following proposal:

"(1) A well-informed public opinion, be it at national or international levels, can bring significant contributions towards progress in the field of disarmament.

"The non-governmental organizations, whose dedication and interest in this field is well known and highly appreciated by the members of this Committee, could play a stimulating and constructive role in channelling the public concerns in this matter.

"(2) The officers of this Committee are pleased to realize the NGOs' interest in closely following the development of its work and hope that this association will be further strengthened by the continued presence of its representatives in the usual places in this room.

"(3) Notwithstanding the frequent and useful contacts or exchanges that take place between the NGOs and individual delegations, and in order to facilitate the knowledge of non-governmental contributions, the Secretariat will provide lists of general circulation of the communications received from the NGOs and institutions known to be conducting research in the field of disarmament. The lists will indicate where the communications and any annexed documentations will be available to delegations."

2. Mrs. THORSEN (Sweden) said that her delegation had no objection to the recommendation suggested by the officers. She thanked them for their work and recognized that some progress had been made "towards making it possible for non-governmental organizations working in the field of disarmament to communicate with delegations.

3. Her delegation was particularly gratified that the Secretariat was to provide a list of communications received from non-governmental organizations, since it had always emphasized the importance of well-informed public opinion as a means of achieving positive results in the field of disarmament.

4. She assured other delegations and the non-governmental organizations, whose competence she acknowledged and admired, that her delegation would always be prepared to consider their valuable views on the difficult task before the Committee.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the words of the representative of Sweden echoed the feelings of the officers in making the recommendation, to the effect that non-governmental organizations and institutions working in the field of disarmament were empowered to communicate directly with delegations. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the recommendation.
6. It was so decided.
7. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in order to enable the Committee to carry out its work as efficiently as possible, the first part of each morning meeting should be devoted to general debate and that when the list of speakers had been exhausted, the Committee should proceed to consider any questions that had been raised.
8. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that procedure.
9. It was so decided.
10. The CHAIRMAN asked delegations to keep their statements to a minimum, since Governments had already had an opportunity to express their views on the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in the replies which they had been requested to submit to the Secretary-General not later than 5 April 1977. He suggested that, as far as possible, the length of statements should be limited to 15 minutes.

#### GENERAL DEBATE

11. Mr. PETRIC (Yugoslavia) said that the decision to convene a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament had been well received and approved by the whole international community, which had considered it an indispensable step towards the cessation of the arms race and, ultimately, general and complete disarmament.
12. The results of negotiations held so far had related in general to the control of armaments and not to disarmament itself. Furthermore, the existence of the Treaty banning Nuclear-weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water while underground tests were permitted to continue, and the refusal to conclude a treaty on the complete prohibition of all nuclear tests for military purposes, in spite of obligations embodied in the earlier Treaty, pointed to a lack of political readiness on the part of the nuclear Powers to take effective measures to put a stop to the nuclear arms race.
13. Although Yugoslavia welcomed the efforts exerted by the two leading military Powers and the agreements concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union on the control of strategic armaments, such agreements did not amount to disarmament measures but merely regulated the nuclear arms race, since the conventional weapons race still continued.
14. Although the conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons constituted an attempt to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to new

countries, that action had not met with success, which was hardly surprising in view of the fact that the leading nuclear Powers had continued to improve and augment the quantity of their nuclear weapons, the number of which had increased fivefold.

15. Instead of concentrating on solving major problems, namely, how to prevent qualitative sophistication and territorial spread of nuclear weapons, new tendencies had emerged aimed at limiting the right of all peoples to make use of nuclear energy and technology for the development of their productive forces. In his delegation's view, one of the main tasks of the special session should be to reach political agreement on how to prevent the sophistication and spread of nuclear weapons and how to ensure the free transfer of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes under effective international control. His delegation was fully aware of the difficulties arising out of the delicate and complex character of that matter. It had been precisely those aspects of the disarmament issue that had prompted the non-aligned countries to propose the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The special session should appraise the current status of the problem of disarmament, the results of negotiations, the consequences for and dangers to the process of détente constituted by the continuation of the arms race, and its consequences for the economic and social development of the international community, and should reach agreement on a programme of measures which would effectively solve some basic problems of disarmament and ensure greater and over-all involvement of the United Nations in that field. For that purpose, it was essential to agree on the measures to be implemented jointly, on the measures to be implemented by each State individually, in keeping with their position and responsibility vis-à-vis the international community, and on the negotiating machinery.

16. His Government felt that the agenda of the special session should be conceived in broad terms and include four fundamental items, namely, a general debate, preparation and adoption of a declaration on disarmament, preparation and adoption of a programme of disarmament measures, and the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. The question of convening a world disarmament conference could also be considered within that context.

17. In its reply to the Secretary-General, his Government had enumerated the elements which, in its view, should be incorporated in the declaration on disarmament and in the programme of disarmament measures. His delegation would present those questions during the proceedings of the Preparatory Committee, together with proposals concerning the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the negotiating machinery.

18. With regard to the date of the special session, the organization of further work of the Preparatory Committee and similar questions, his delegation would co-operate closely with the other members of the Preparatory Committee, especially within the Group of non-aligned countries.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.

5th meeting

Tuesday, 10 May 1977, at 10.55 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.5

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that, in accordance with the decision adopted by the Committee at the previous meeting, the Secretariat would circulate document A/AC.187/INF.2, which contained a list of communications concerning disarmament received from non-governmental organizations and research institutions.
2. Under the provisions of the Charter and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, it was customary to invite the specialized agencies to take part in meetings of the Assembly or of its subsidiary organs by sending them a copy of the announcement of the convening of each session, and that was presumably an adequate procedure for inviting the specialized agencies to send observers to take part in the proceedings. Since resolution 31/189 B, in which it was decided to convene the special session devoted to disarmament and to establish the preparatory committee for the session, made no mention of the specialized agencies, he proposed that, if there was no objection, agencies concerned with disarmament should be invited to take part in the work of the committee with observer status.
3. It was so decided.

GENERAL DEBATE

4. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) emphasized the urgent need for the special session devoted to disarmament and her Government's determination to make an active contribution to it. The session should be a starting point for a new phase of joint disarmament efforts aimed at the gradual solution of specific problems within a reasonable time-frame. Sweden had repeatedly stated that the two super-Powers had a special responsibility for the future of the world since their combined armaments amounted to 60 per cent of the world total. Accordingly, substantial early progress in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the United States and the Soviet Union was one of the fundamental ingredients of world disarmament efforts. As in the case of SALT, progress towards a comprehensive nuclear-weapon test-ban agreement and towards the prohibition of chemical weapons depended ultimately on the mobilization of the necessary political will. Disarmament was a matter of serious concern to every nation, and efforts towards that goal must necessarily be multilateral. Sweden had from the very beginning attached the highest importance to the multilateral disarmament negotiations being conducted within the framework of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at Geneva.
5. Early agreement on a draft agenda would facilitate the work of the Preparatory Committee. Her delegation felt that the agenda of the special session should be drafted in broad terms which indicated the type of action that the session was expected to take. The session should not devote too much time to an evaluation of past developments; if there was a real desire to achieve results, it should concentrate on future action. The views of delegations on the events which had led to the present situation could be recorded in a general debate but should not

be the subject of lengthy negotiations. Towards the end of the present session of the Committee, a decision should be taken on the intersessional work that was to be done. It was essential to maintain the momentum created by the General Assembly's decision to convene a special session devoted to disarmament. The preparation of drafts of the final documents should start as soon as possible.

6. Sweden's reply to the note of the Secretary-General (A/AC.187/19) gave an account of her Government's thinking on issues of substance relating to disarmament. It was largely modelled on the structure of the informal paper prepared by a number of non-aligned countries. The reply contained comments on a possible declaration of principles which would provide a new basis for the efforts of the international community in the field of disarmament, a programme of action which would give highest priority to nuclear disarmament, and, finally, organizational measures for the future, particularly with regard to the urgent problem of preventing further proliferation of nuclear weapons. The conventional arms build up in many parts of the world, involving ever more sophisticated weapons, was also cause for concern.

7. At the same time, she wished to stress the weight given in the Swedish reply to the need to clarify, in as concrete terms as possible, certain important aspects of the interrelationship between disarmament efforts and economic and social progress. Sweden proposed that the United Nations should undertake a new study of the subject which would deal in greater detail with certain very complex questions such as the effect of military spending on economic growth, inflation, the balance of trade, the supply of raw materials and other aspects of the economy. The study should also examine methods to be employed for a well-planned, controlled conversion of resources now being used for military production.

8. Her Government felt that the success of the special session could be ensured only through effective follow-up action on the decisions and recommendations adopted at the session. In that connexion, the United Nations Centre for Disarmament should be given an increased opportunity to carry out studies and information activities in the disarmament field. With regard to the possibility of convening a world disarmament conference, her Government had concluded that the prospects for convening such a conference with the participation of all the permanent members of the Security Council were unfortunately not very promising at the present time. The fact that her Government had proposed the convening of another special session devoted to disarmament after a period of three to five years should be viewed in the light of that assessment.

9. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that it was essential to the smooth functioning of the Preparatory Committee and, eventually, of the special session that the Committee should develop a collective theme and agree on a set of generally acceptable objectives for that collective venture.

10. The multitude of replies received so far contained numerous ideas and proposals relating to the objectives of the special session; although they were all important, it would be unrealistic to project all of them as goals for the session. It was imperative to determine by a process of selection those areas where there was a reasonable chance of obtaining results. The main objectives of the special session could best be elaborated by taking account of the following current trends: an unrestrained arms race and the growth of nuclear arsenals to an unbelievable level capable of destroying the whole world many times over had made disarmament more than ever an urgent and truly global problem in which the entire world had a vital stake; multilateral and bilateral treaties and agreements in the field of arms limitation and control had been of marginal value and had not resulted in the elimination of a single nuclear weapon; there was thus a need for a reassessment of the effects of the arms race on the economic development of all nations, especially the non-nuclear countries and those without significant military power.
11. There seemed to be a measure of agreement among most Member States as to the format within which the objectives of the special session could be achieved. In that connexion, the adoption of a declaration of principles and a programme of action was widely regarded as of cardinal importance. The Preparatory Committee should seek to direct its attention as soon as possible to the elaboration of an outline of those two basic documents.
12. The declaration should embody a set of guiding principles and contain, in broadly acceptable, clear terms, the essentials of a new approach to the complicated problem of disarmament. It should reflect current trends and realities and should re-emphasize old but still valid assumptions. It should cite the basic premises which underlay the decision to convene a special session, and it should provide a general framework for the substantive and institutional approaches necessary for action.
13. Although general and complete disarmament was the ultimate goal, short-term and immediate objectives should not be ignored. The necessary attention should be given to controlling the growth of armaments and also to the underlying sources of insecurity and the continuing conflicts and threats which created the demand for weapons. In preparing a declaration of principles, account should be taken of technological and political changes and of new economic realities, thoughts and trends. In a document intended to provide directions for follow-up measures, a broad outline of priorities was an essential element. Of no less importance was reasonable, realistic consideration of the varying degrees of responsibility of different countries on the basis of priorities in the field of disarmament.
14. A programme of action was a logical concomitant of a declaration of principles, and it was in the programme of action that the value of the special session would be determined. The desired aim was obviously not a hasty agreement on abstract priorities or a rigid programme and schedule of action. It was recognized that the implementation of any programme of action in that field was influenced by political and security considerations of the highest order and that an international atmosphere of distrust, in which goodwill and a willingness to co-operate were

lacking, would hardly be conducive to meaningful efforts to achieve disarmament. The programme of action should reflect those realities and offer a reasonable, balanced approach embodying the fundamental interests of the international community.

15. In the identification of particular areas of arms limitation where action was required and in the establishment of priorities for future negotiations, the following considerations seemed to be of particular importance: there seemed to be a measure of general agreement that nuclear arms limitation and reduction should be given the highest priority and should be pursued with the greatest urgency; all areas of nuclear arms control and, in particular, a comprehensive nuclear test ban called for careful attention at the special session; consideration should be given to the possibility of strengthening the non-proliferation régime by re-emphasizing the fundamental elements of the non-proliferation treaty, which included horizontal and vertical proliferation and the vital area of the transfer of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Other matters of concern were the security of non-nuclear-weapon States and progress in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

16. The programme of action should also deal with a number of other important issues, such as other weapons of mass destruction, confidence-building measures, the regulation of conventional armaments and review of disarmament machinery. His delegation would, when appropriate, express detailed and more specific views on those issues.

17. Mr. DATCU (Romania) said that the holding of a General Assembly session on disarmament was of special importance, not only because it was the first time in the history of the Organization that Member States would be considering the question of disarmament at a special session but also because the session would be prepared and held at a time when the whole world was endeavouring to institute a new international economic order.

18. The United Nations was far from having accomplished the mission entrusted to it on the subject of disarmament, although it had been dealing with the problem since its establishment. Negotiations on disarmament had gradually drifted away from the United Nations and those that were still being conducted under its auspices had, in actual fact, lost their original content. Three decades had elapsed since its foundation and the United Nations was still not exercising direct competence in the matter of negotiations on military disengagement and disarmament. Furthermore, Governments had not taken resolute action to reduce or do away with armaments and make mankind safe from another war. The international conventions and treaties concluded thus far had certainly helped to create a climate of greater understanding, but had not succeeded in curbing the armaments race or ensuring the application of effective disarmament measures. In the present circumstances, which were characterized by immobility in disarmament negotiations, the armaments race had intensified, as had the development, diversification and the stockpiling of nuclear and conventional arsenals. While billions of dollars were being spent on armaments, problems of under-development and economic inequality were worsening. It was clear that the strategy, measures, proposals, approaches, rules and procedures applied so far were not yielding the desired results.

19. The time had come to make radical changes in disarmament negotiations and in proposed approaches and measures, as well as in the machinery for the conduct of negotiations. The United Nations certainly had special responsibilities and competence in the matter. The President of Romania, Mr. Ceausescu, had stated that the special United Nations session on disarmament should make it possible to move towards the adoption of concrete disarmament measures and, first and foremost, nuclear disarmament.

20. In a position paper circulated at the thirtieth session of the General Assembly, Romania had submitted its views and specific proposals on a disarmament programme. It had also stated that it was in favour of holding a world disarmament conference.

21. The time had come for disarmament talks to be placed under the auspices of the United Nations, and held in forums open to all States and under the control of world public opinion. In order to discharge its fundamental duty of defending the peace and security of peoples, the United Nations should exert its authority in matters relating to negotiations on disarmament and the adoption of appropriate measures, as well as on the supervision of their implementation. The first General Assembly session on disarmament would have a very important function, since it would be the forum for the adoption of decisions vital to international peace and security. Principles, decisions and measures would be adopted to institute a new era of negotiations, the era of real and concrete disarmament, under strict and effective international control.

22. The special session would need careful preparation, and in that connexion the Committee would have an important part to play, since the guidelines, strategies and documents to be adopted and the future structure of negotiations would largely emerge from its work. It might be said that the special session began with the deliberations of the Committee and, consequently, the Committee had the duty to give the General Assembly the opportunity to adopt clear-cut, specific and constructive documents and to set the disarmament negotiations on the right path. The Committee's activities should be conducted in such a way as to ensure that all interested States could participate in the proceedings and negotiations and that closed groups were avoided.

23. The agenda for the special session should be clear and precise and be strictly linked to the subject-matter, so as to show the dangers of the armaments race and the short-comings in the negotiations held so far on the subject, and an effort should be made to outline measures to be adopted in the future. The agenda should include the following items: consideration of the situation created in the field of nuclear and conventional armaments and the status and results of the negotiations on disarmament; measures to be adopted by the United Nations to ensure that disarmament negotiations could start moving, so that viable agreements could be concluded leading to general and complete disarmament, and especially nuclear disarmament; and the function of the United Nations in the disarmament field.



24. The Declaration should set forth the principles governing disarmament negotiations, their objectives and priorities, the strategy and the tactics for all action relating to disarmament.

25. The Programme of Action, covering various phases, should contain concrete measures to promote confidence and co-operation among States.

26. The Committee would also have to prepare draft decisions and recommendations on the negotiating machinery providing for the establishment of viable structures with full authority that were also flexible and operated in accordance with democratic working rules and procedures, and allowed for the participation of all States interested in disarmament negotiations.

27. In order to discharge its functions the Committee must work at a faster pace. One of its first tasks would be the preparation of the provisional agenda for the special session. However, it would also have to begin to prepare drafts for the Declaration, the Programme of Action and documents on negotiating machinery, since any delay in those tasks could jeopardize both quality and content. The Committee would also have to make the maximum use of the time at its disposal.

28. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) said that the Government of Poland had already stated its well-substantiated position on the preparations and agenda for the special session in document A/AC.187/12, submitted in response to the note from the Secretary-General. That position was based on three inseparable political components: first, that the most important and pressing task of the international community was to put an end to the armaments race and achieve effective disarmament agreements; secondly, that the imperative need for disarmament was necessitated by considerations of strengthening world security and eliminating the threat of a new world war, and that it represented the basic foundation for ensuring irreversibility of the processes of political détente; thirdly, that progress in limiting the armaments race and in disarmament could truly and effectively serve the establishment of a new international economic order. That position derived from the genuine conviction that international relations in the present-day world could only be based on détente and co-operation and that the trends in that direction would continue to develop and take firmer root. It was therefore both feasible and necessary to promote the processes of détente so that they extended to all nations, which implied the elimination of sources of tension and conflict, and so that those processes also extended to new spheres of international endeavour, including, in the first place, the military sphere, which necessarily implied efforts to limit the armaments race and achieve progress in disarmament.

29. Poland was determined to persist in its efforts to promote disarmament on all planes, including the United Nations, which had an important role to play in that field. Nothing should be done to weaken existing disarmament machinery whose establishment had taken three decades.

30. The Government of Poland had supported the idea of holding a special General Assembly session devoted to disarmament, because it was an incentive for mobilizing the efforts of Governments towards more meaningful disarmament measures. In that connexion there was a direct relationship between the special session and the world disarmament conference, the idea of which had originated with the non-aligned countries and had subsequently been proposed in the General Assembly by the Soviet Union. In view of those considerations the agenda for the special session should include: (1) a general debate on disarmament; (2) preparations for the holding of a world disarmament conference; (3) the function of United Nations in the field of disarmament; and (4) the adoption of the final document or documents.

31. In fact, Poland's position coincided with that of the non-aligned countries regarding other aspects of the special session and of disarmament. For example, it was important that the special session should discuss the military, political, economic and social consequences of the armaments race and define the relationship between disarmament, development and the restructuring of international economic relations, especially since the armaments race was increasingly obstructing mankind's progress. In the Soviet memorandum of 28 September 1976, a comprehensive programme of action had been submitted which took account of the world situation and the ideas put forward in the Colombo Political Declaration which could be useful for the work of the Committee.

32. It was to be hoped that at the special session consideration would be given to a wide range of issues in the field of nuclear disarmament, and to measures to put an end to the armaments race and limit armed forces and conventional armaments. The special session should take account at the same time of the basic security requirements of all States. In the view of the Polish Government, progress could only be made if the approach to disarmament was based on realistic premises, namely on the principles of undiminished security of every State, respect for inadmissibility of unilateral military advantages, universality of disarmament, effective limitation and reduction of military potentials, strict adherence to and full implementation of accepted obligations, refraining from actions detrimental to disarmament efforts and the adoption of global and regional measures to promote further strengthening of détente and growth of international confidence.

33. Given those conditions, one could envisage the possibility of viable agreements for prohibiting the use and production of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, reducing their number and finally eliminating them. Those objectives would be furthered by agreements on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the banning and destruction of chemical weapons, the establishment of zones of peace and nuclear-free zones, and effective action to consolidate the non-proliferation régime.

34. One prerequisite for meaningful progress in that regard was the universality of disarmament processes. Without underestimating the role, capacities and

obligations of the nuclear-weapon States, it must be borne in mind that disarmament was an historic necessity, incumbent upon all States without exception, and that States large and small, developed and developing alike should make their contribution to disarmament. It was therefore essential that all States should participate not only at the discussion stage but also in the implementation of disarmament measures.

35. If it was to prove effective, the disarmament process must not only be comprehensive in scope and universal in character but also reflect an agreed, common approach to disarmament on the part of participants. Decision-making by consensus and the equitable participation of all groups of States in the preparatory process were therefore pre-conditions for success. He observed that, because of the mechanical application of a formula which might have been valid in other bodies, the socialist States were seriously underrepresented in the composition of the Preparatory Committee. In disarmament efforts, a proper reflection of the existing world relationship of forces was a consideration that could not be ignored. His delegation therefore hoped that the current imbalance in the Committee would be duly rectified.

36. His delegation felt that the preparations for the special session and the session itself represented an important step in the over-all disarmament effort. The United Nations had made an outstanding contribution to that effort, and the agendas of successive sessions of the General Assembly had seen dozens of disarmament initiatives submitted by Member States. With a view to profiting from what had been achieved to date, his delegation proposed that, for the next session of the Preparatory Committee, the Secretariat should compile a document listing disarmament proposals officially submitted to the United Nations. The list should present the substance of the proposal, the date and country of submission, and the status of its follow-up. He was convinced that such a document would be very useful both to the Committee and to the special session of the General Assembly. In accordance with its traditional position, his delegation stood ready to participate in the preparations for the special session with a view to ensuring the latter's success.

37. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka), speaking on behalf of the members of the Preparatory Committee belonging to the Group of Non-Aligned Countries, submitted a draft agenda for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. He recalled that the idea of holding such a session had first arisen at Belgrade in 1961 during the First Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries. The Fifth Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Colombo in 1976, had revived that proposal because of its deep dissatisfaction and disillusionment at the failure of the various negotiations on disarmament and its conviction that one of the factors contributing to that failure was that such negotiations took place in an exclusive forum. For those reasons, the Conference had felt that it was appropriate to urge the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and had welcomed with great satisfaction the adoption by consensus of General Assembly resolution 31/189 B.

38. The first item on the agenda proposed by the Group of Non-Aligned Countries called for review and appraisal of the present international situation in the light of the lack of progress in the field of disarmament, since the non-aligned countries believed that that situation was seriously affecting international conditions in general. In that connexion, emphasis should be placed on the close link between economic development and disarmament, which the non-aligned countries regarded as extremely important. It was no secret that the inflation currently afflicting the world was the result of the huge sums spent on armaments. Although the non-aligned countries did not believe that the resources released by a reduction in arms expenditure should necessarily be used to promote economic development through assistance to the developing countries, they felt that doing so would benefit both the developed and the developing countries.

39. If the entire international community was to participate in discussion of the disarmament problem, it was essential to reach an agreement on the principles which were to govern the matter. The non-aligned countries therefore gave high priority to the adoption of a declaration of principles on disarmament and to its logical corollary, a programme of action which would make those principles effective. Experience showed that the United Nations as a whole did not play an important role in discussions of disarmament, and the non-aligned countries believed that that situation should be brought to an end.

40. In proposing the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Colombo, had referred to three main subjects which should be dealt with at that session, namely, the problem of disarmament, the drawing up of a set of priorities and recommendations, and the convening of a world disarmament conference as part of the international machinery of negotiations on that subject. In conclusion, he stated that the Group of Non-Aligned Countries was always prepared to hold consultations with other States or groups of States belonging to the Committee and hoped that through such consultations it would be possible to reach a consensus on the agenda with a view to avoiding lengthy debates which would take up the limited time available to the Committee.

41. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) recalled that, in accordance with a suggestion made by the Chairman at the second meeting of the Preparatory Committee, held on 29 March 1977 (A/AC.187/SR.2), the Committee had decided to request the Secretariat to begin the preliminary work on such factual background papers on disarmament as might be needed for the Committee's work, including a presentation of all disarmament resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, a paper on the existing principles and proposals for the conduct of disarmament negotiations and a description of existing structures and machinery for disarmament negotiations. He inquired whether those factual background papers were already available and if not, when they would be made available.

42. In accordance with the invitation issued by the General Assembly in operative paragraph 3 of its resolution 31/189 B, some Member States had communicated their views on the agenda and all other relevant questions relating to the special

session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. His delegation felt it would be desirable, as on a previous occasion, for the Secretariat to prepare a document in which, under appropriate headings, it would classify and summarize the replies received from Member States, setting forth the gist of their views and including quotations from them. The reply from the Government of Mexico (A/AC.187/34) mentioned 10 subjects on which, in that Government's opinion, working papers should be prepared. His delegation felt that such papers would be very useful both to the Preparatory Committee and to the special session itself.

43. The CHAIRMAN observed that the representative of Mexico had made three suggestions: the first involved a question to the Secretariat concerning the stage reached in the preparation of the background documents mentioned at the second meeting.

44. Mr. ALEM (Secretary of the Committee) recalled that at the second meeting of the current session of the Preparatory Committee three documents had been mentioned: a presentation of disarmament resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, a paper on existing principles and proposals for the conduct of disarmament negotiations and a description of the existing structures and machinery for disarmament negotiations.

45. The Centre for Disarmament had made great efforts to complete the papers but had encountered some difficulties. Many documents dated back to 1946 and were very difficult to obtain, while others were not United Nations documents and were not available in all languages. The paper on existing principles and proposals for the conduct of disarmament negotiations and the description of existing structures and machinery for such negotiations were provisionally expected to be available at the end of the current week. The presentation of disarmament resolutions adopted by the General Assembly could also be made available at the end of the current week, if the Committee wished to have it in English.

46. The CHAIRMAN requested the Secretariat to circulate the English text of the presentation of resolutions as soon as possible, without prejudice to the ongoing task of translating the text into the other languages.

47. With regard to the second suggestion by the representative of Mexico, the Secretariat would certainly wish to study it quietly and evaluate it before providing a detailed reply concerning the method of preparing a paper comparing the replies received. With regard to the third proposal of the representative of Mexico, in connexion with which mention had been made of the 10 documents referred to in the reply of the Government of Mexico, he wished to point out that all the comments and proposals made in the Preparatory Committee would serve to guide and orient its work, and he regarded as most constructive the proposals of Mexico and the draft agenda submitted by Sri Lanka, which contained interesting elements that would enable the Committee to have a fruitful exchange of ideas.

48. Mr. BORDEN (Canada) said it would be desirable for the Secretariat to prepare an informal paper listing the items regularly included in the agenda of General

Assembly sessions, such as the minute of silent prayer or meditation, examination of credentials, and so on. It would also be desirable to set up a system whereby the Fifth Committee would consider draft resolutions or decisions that might have financial implications.

49. The CHAIRMAN said the Secretariat had informed him that it would prepare an informal list as requested by the representative of Canada.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

6th meeting

Wednesday, 11 May 1977, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.6

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. SCHLAICH (Federal Republic of Germany) recalled that his country had co-sponsored the draft resolution whereby it had been decided to hold the special session devoted to disarmament, because it considered that what had so far been achieved in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was only a beginning. The multilateral negotiations concerning disarmament and arms control on a world-wide basis were concentrated in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. That organ was responsible for negotiating draft treaties on the subject, and it was to be hoped that progress would be achieved in Geneva in important areas before the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The objectives of the special session should be viewed against the background of those ongoing efforts. His delegation believed that the special session devoted to disarmament should be held in an atmosphere of co-operation and mutual trust, in order to demonstrate the credibility of world-wide endeavours towards disarmament and arms control. Starting from those premises, the special session should assess the results achieved so far with regard to disarmament and arms control and provide an effective impetus for further discussion, particularly where development tended to be stagnant. The Federal Republic of Germany would therefore be pleased if a consensus could be reached at the special session on the basic elements of the disarmament question and if some guidelines could be given concerning future priorities.
2. With regard to the issues to be discussed, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany believed that the problems of nuclear and conventional disarmament should receive equal treatment. In addition to the priority subjects of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, the discussion might also centre on the whole range of issues connected with a non-proliferation policy, the reduction of armament burdens, regional aspects of disarmament and problems arising from the interrelation between disarmament and economic and social development in the world.
3. It was important that the special session should help to make international disarmament negotiations more effective, particularly in order to achieve the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. In that connexion, the special session could provide a positive impetus for the achievement of international stability and security through balanced measures of disarmament and arms control.
4. With regard to the immediate purpose of the Preparatory Committee's meetings, efforts should be concentrated on reaching a consensus on the agenda for the special session devoted to disarmament. The proposal submitted at the preceding meeting (A/AC.187/43) provided an excellent basis for discussion. His delegation would prefer a committee of the whole to be established in order to draft a final political declaration reflecting the consensus of the international community on the future course of international disarmament efforts and negotiations. In its

view, that committee of the whole would also be the most appropriate body of the special session to discuss possible improvements in the structure of disarmament institutions and their mechanisms, taking into consideration the need to maintain the negotiating capacity of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. If necessary, the committee of the whole could establish ad hoc groups to consider special problems.

5. In connexion with the suggestions made concerning the organization of the special session, it should be borne in mind that the problems of disarmament were so closely interrelated, and even the consideration of structural problems was so closely linked with the task of defining priorities, that it was difficult to see how co-ordinated work could be done in several committees which lacked the cohesion of one single body.

6. The United Nations Disarmament Centre should be used as rationally as possible to prepare the necessary background material for the next round of meetings of the Committee. That would also assist the preparation of the report which the Committee was to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session. No priority areas had yet been developed on which the Secretariat should concentrate, apart from a general assessment of the results so far achieved in disarmament and arms control, and efforts currently being made in that regard. It might also be useful to take into account the references to the relevant subjects made in the replies of States to the Secretary-General and in the statements of delegations in the Preparatory Committee.

7. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet Union supported the idea of a special session devoted to disarmament because it believed that, if suitably prepared, the session could contribute substantially to the solution of disarmament problems. It was necessary to end the absurd competition regarding armaments, and the Soviet Union for its part was prepared to take all necessary measures to that end, provided that the other parties to the negotiations were also prepared to make their contribution.

8. Disarmament problems had been discussed at various multilateral and bilateral meetings. In a number of important areas, notable success had been achieved in the reduction of the arms race and effective agreements had been concluded. In general, however, there was no slowing down in the arms race, involving increasingly sophisticated weapons, and the number of States participating in that process was still growing. The special session of the General Assembly should provide a useful international forum for consideration of the existing situation with regard to disarmament. Views could be exchanged and the principal trends could be outlined, and the session could conclude with the adoption of a final political declaration setting out agreed views on the question of disarmament. The adoption of such a document would undoubtedly be an important contribution to the task of disarmament.



9. In their replies, many States proposed that the special session should formulate broad basic principles to guide disarmament negotiations. His delegation would not be opposed to seeing the special session discuss and perhaps draft a number of declarations of principles. In particular, it would be useful to reaffirm that the main purpose of all disarmament efforts should be the achievement of general and complete disarmament and to emphasize the need for participation in negotiations by all States, particularly the nuclear Powers, and for the enunciation of basic principles such as the principle that no one should seek to obtain unilateral advantage or threaten the security of any State.

10. At the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union had submitted a memorandum on questions of ending the arms race and disarmament in which it had made specific proposals calling, inter alia, for nuclear disarmament, the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, consolidation of the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the destruction of chemical weapons, prohibition of the development of new types of weapons of mass destruction and the reduction of military budgets. His delegation was pleased to note that most of the replies from States drew attention to the need for a prompt solution to all those problems. However, it would be unrealistic to expect complex, deep-seated problems like the ending of the arms race and the achievement of general and complete disarmament to be solved overnight. Experience had shown that the road to disarmament was difficult and complicated and that it called for painstaking negotiations through various channels and in various forums. The existing channels had demonstrated their effectiveness. Complex negotiating machinery had been created in which practical measures for bringing about disarmament and curbing the arms race were discussed and adopted. However, those were complex, many-sided problems; in some cases they called for a bilateral approach, while in others a regional, multilateral approach was required. The bilateral Soviet-United States negotiations should play an important role in containing the arms race as in the case of the limitation of strategic arms. Regional negotiations aimed at the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe were being conducted at Vienna, and fruitful negotiations were taking place at Geneva in the Committee on Disarmament. Disarmament problems were discussed every year in the First Committee of the General Assembly. All those different approaches complemented each other and contributed to the over-all work being done in the field of disarmament.

11. Effective solutions to disarmament problems could be worked out only in a universal forum with the necessary machinery for adopting practical viable decisions that took the interests of all States into account. That could be accomplished within the framework of a world disarmament conference. At every session since 1971, the General Assembly had called for the convening of such a conference, and the idea had won active support at various meetings of the non-aligned countries. In August 1976, the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned Countries in Colombo had proposed that the agenda of the special session devoted to disarmament should include an item on the convening of a world disarmament conference. His delegation was pleased to note that the convening of such a conference was receiving support in the replies submitted by States to the Secretary-General. Among the countries which had taken that position were Algeria, Poland, Venezuela, Spain, the German Democratic Republic, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Syria, Finland and

Mexico. The question of convening a world disarmament conference had thus become universal in nature, and one of the main tasks of the special session was to decide on measures for preparing and holding the conference, which should be the next, decisive stage in the solution of disarmament problems.

12. His delegation wished to draw attention to the question of the composition of the Preparatory Committee which should reflect the specific tasks to be performed by the Committee and the role played by various States in disarmament negotiations. Unfortunately, the socialist countries, whose efforts and experience in disarmament talks were well known, had been discriminated against in setting up the Preparatory Committee. The system used in distributing seats was that known as the "Economic and Social Council formula", which was not appropriate when it was a question of discussing disarmament problems. The effective efforts made by the Group of Socialist States in dealing with those problems was reflected in the structure of other bodies concerned with disarmament questions. His delegation had therefore reserved the right to propose that at its thirty-second session the General Assembly should assign additional seats to the Socialist group. The Committee should include that recommendation in its report to the thirty-second session of the Assembly.

13. His delegation was prepared to play a constructive part in the work of the Committee.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

14. Mr. ELLIOT (Belgium) expressed appreciation to the delegation of Sri Lanka for submitting at the previous meeting a draft agenda for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (A/AC.187/43) which would enable the Committee to initiate a more concrete phase of its work. He was also grateful to the delegation of Sri Lanka for having been willing to hold consultations with a number of representatives of other regional groups.

15. His delegation supported the draft agenda, and that support should be viewed in the light of the oral explanations provided at the previous meeting by Ambassador Amerasinghe. It should be noted that the draft set out only the main topics. It should be regarded for the moment as merely a rough outline and might well be amended in the course of the Committee's work. Formal proposals would probably be made with a view to improving the draft agenda so as to facilitate a consensus, which seemed essential to the success of the special session devoted to disarmament.

16. His delegation felt that the draft agenda could also provide the basis for the preparation of an annotated agenda which would set out in detail the various aspects of each item in the present draft. The draft could also serve as the basis for establishing several working groups, which should be limited in number so that all delegations could participate in them. His delegation would be able to support, when the matter arose, the proposal by the Federal Republic of Germany that the Preparatory Committee should hold informal meetings.

17. Mr. BJORNERSTEDT (Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament), replying to a question by the representative of Mexico concerning documentation, said that it would be possible to proceed at once with the task of analysing the replies submitted by Member States pursuant to General Assembly resolution 31/189 B and arranging their contents under various headings; however, communications were still being received and, if 11 or 12 May was set as the deadline, addenda to the document would have to be issued. The list of 8 or 10 main headings, probably with subheadings, could be submitted at the next meeting of the Committee, in which case the document would be ready by the beginning of the following week and the necessary addenda would be issued later.

18. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that the preparation of the document should begin that same day so that it could be circulated the following Monday at the latest. The list of headings did not need to be exhaustive, but, if there was no time for a more detailed analysis, the replies from Governments should at least be classified under the following subject headings:

1. The objectives of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament;
2. The main documents which the General Assembly should adopt at its special session devoted to disarmament and their content:
  - (a) Declaration of Principles on Disarmament;
  - (b) Programme of Action on Disarmament;
3. The agenda of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament;
4. The role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico.

20. It was so decided.

21. Mr. BJORNERSTEDT (Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament), replying to a question by the representative of Iran concerning the possibility of including in the document the contents of the statements made by various delegations at the present session regarding the topics referred to, which would be classified according to the same criteria as the replies from Member States, said that, although that procedure had been followed on past occasions, it would be necessary for practical reasons to issue the document in question after the present session ended.

22. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, if there was no objection, the meeting should rise and the Committee should continue its proceedings informally in order to facilitate communications between delegations.

23. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.

7th meeting

Thursday, 12 May 1977, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.7

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. JANKOWITSCH, (Austria) recalled that, in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization in 1975, the Secretary-General of the United Nations had deplored the fact that it had not proved possible to halt or limit the arms race in a world increasingly preoccupied with the problems of social justice, hunger, poverty, development and an equitable sharing of resources. Today, that assessment was even more valid. The policy of détente, of which the Austrian Government was a firm advocate, would have credibility only if it produced tangible results in the field of disarmament. It was with those considerations in mind that the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, had expressed Austria's full support for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

2. The Austrian Government was aware that genuine disarmament could be achieved only through the political will of States, which in turn depended on the existence of a climate of mutual confidence and understanding between States and on the active concern of world public opinion. It hoped that the special session would make a real contribution to building up such confidence and would ensure that the problems of disarmament were seen in the proper perspective of the over-all political, social and economic situation. The problems of development and disarmament were closely related, and the two tasks must therefore succeed together or fail together.

3. The difficulties impeding progress in disarmament, which stemmed from the intricate problems involved, would not disappear by themselves. Accordingly, a thorough and sincere examination of the causes underlying the current stagnation of disarmament negotiations was as necessary as was discussion of the possibility of a new and comprehensive approach to disarmament negotiations leading to the adoption of a balanced programme of action which would ensure the co-ordination of activities carried out on different levels and in different forums in order to obtain an accelerated solution of priority problems. Another topic of the discussions should be the institutional and organizational measures which would allow the United Nations to carry out more effectively its predominant role in the field of disarmament.

4. The Austrian Government attached special importance to a speedy solution of the various problems posed by the arms race in both the nuclear and the conventional fields. Nuclear disarmament continued to be the most urgent of those problems, and the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, besides being of vital importance to mankind, would facilitate disarmament in other fields. The credibility of measures to prevent the horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons hinged in particular upon the willingness of the two leading nuclear-weapon States to agree on effective measures of nuclear disarmament. In that context, the fragile basis of the non-proliferation régime, as demonstrated by the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, could not be overlooked. National and international actions

prior to the second Conference would be a determining factor for the future of non-proliferation treaties. A related problem was that posed by the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and especially by the peaceful use of nuclear explosive devices. The special session should elaborate recommendations on the subject, and the resources of the International Atomic Energy Agency should also be strengthened.

5. The increasing build-up of arsenals of so-called conventional weapons in many parts of the world in recent years was also a cause of great concern to the international community, particularly because it accounted for the greatest proportion of world military expenditures. The solution to that problem called for an exhaustive examination of the political, social and economic reasons underlying it.

6. The problem of the demilitarization of outer space, which had not yet been completely solved, was a third dimension of disarmament. Although it did not completely eliminate the use of outer space for military purposes, the 1967 Treaty provided that States Parties to the Treaty would use the Moon and other celestial bodies only for peaceful purposes. It was to be hoped that in the future it would be possible to reach agreement on the total demilitarization of outer space. In that connexion, mention must be made of proposals such as that concerning an agreement prohibiting weapons which could destroy the other side's observation satellites and thereby prevent the verification of compliance with arms limits.

7. All States should adopt co-operative measures to put an end to the arms race and to redirect the resources currently being used for it towards social and economic development activities. That also applied to the large percentage of the world's intellectual resources which was diverted to military purposes. That aspect should be a topic for the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development scheduled for 1979.

8. As to the further conduct of the preparatory work for the special session, his delegation considered that the Committee should adopt an agenda which ought to be defined in broad terms in order to be generally acceptable. In that connexion, it was prepared to support the draft agenda submitted by the delegation of Sri Lanka. Agreement on the agenda would make it possible to reach an understanding on the format and character of the final documents of the special session. As its next step, the Committee should try to agree on the broad outlines of the contents of the final documents, perhaps in the form of an annotated agenda, which could then be submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session. During that work, the Committee should make optimum use of the services of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament and should request the Secretariat to provide it with the background information it would need to carry out its task. The expertise of non-governmental organizations and internationally recognized research organizations could also contribute to an understanding of the problems facing the Committee.

9. His delegation also supported the establishment of an intersessional working group to prepare the work to be done at the September session of the Committee.

It would, however, be necessary carefully to define the terms of reference of the group, which should be open-ended, and to agree on a generally acceptable structure for its work, including the period of time for which it would be convened.

10. The Marqués de VILLAFRANCA DE EBRO (Spain) said all countries were agreed that the agenda should include a general debate, during which the progress made in disarmament would be assessed, the adoption of a declaration of principles on disarmament, the adoption of a programme of action on the subject, and a study of the machinery that could be used in the context of the United Nations in order to achieve progress in all aspects of disarmament. His delegation, like many others, considered that the work of the special session must not be allowed to become merely a repetition of the work of the First Committee; attention should therefore be concentrated on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. In that respect, it must be acknowledged that the progress made by the United Nations in the field of disarmament related almost exclusively to side issues.

11. Obviously, the first point the Committee must settle was the content of the agenda of the special session. In that connexion, the document submitted by the delegation of Sri Lanka on behalf of the group of non-aligned countries constituted an excellent basis for negotiation, since it reflected the views of a large number of Member States. The list of items should not, however, be exhaustive, since Member States were probably interested in dealing with other aspects of disarmament. As his delegation had indicated in document A/AC.187/9, it might be important to have an agenda item providing an opportunity for careful consideration and possible recommendation of drafts prepared by United Nations negotiating bodies which were ready for adoption.

12. His delegation felt that the adoption of a general political declaration would be very useful and that, among the principles which should be reflected in such a document, stress should be placed on the relationship between disarmament and international security at the global and regional levels. The declaration should also take into account a just apportionment of obligations among countries in matters of nuclear and conventional disarmament. There was no doubt that greater obligations devolved upon those States which possessed nuclear arms and whose enormous arsenals constituted a major threat to world peace. Another basic principle which should be reflected was the effects of the immense costs of an unrestrained armaments race on the economic development of the entire international community.

13. The principle of equality of States and the right of all to participate in the measures which would be adopted for the eventual achievement of general and complete disarmament should also be taken into account. The agenda should also give priority to the horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear arms and to effective measures to deal with the problem, without, however, affecting the access of non-nuclear-weapon countries to the technology and raw materials needed for peaceful nuclear activities under an effective system of international safeguards. The establishment of zones of peace and denuclearized zones should

also be studied, as well as the possibility of extending such zones to other geographical regions.

14. The special session was an excellent opportunity to study the United Nations negotiating machinery on disarmament and to consider possibilities for restructuring it. The United Nations had a guiding role to play in that field. The links should therefore be strengthened between the United Nations and certain organs such as CCD, whose work was extremely useful but which was not in a position adequately to bring together the views of all the members of the international community. Finally, consideration should be given to the possibility of the General Assembly's holding further special sessions so as to continue to serve as an effective instrument in the cause of disarmament.

15. The CHAIRMAN said that, in accordance with the arrangements allowing States Members of the United Nations which were not members of the Preparatory Committee to participate without the right to vote in the work of the Committee, he would give the floor to the representative of Finland.

16. Mr. BLOMBERG (Finland) said that two simple principles should be kept constantly in mind. Firstly, as an essential element of détente, arms control and disarmament were imperative for the security of nations. Secondly, disarmament was imperative for the realization of the goals of a new international economic order. The Members of the United Nations had pledged themselves to the creation of that new international economic order. A number of causes of underdevelopment had been identified and agreement had been reached on the structuring of a more equitable world. However, the continued diversion of scarce human and material resources to military ends was seriously threatening the attainment of the goals of development. The special session should reflect an awareness of the organic link between disarmament and security and the necessity of disarmament for development.

17. The question of convening a World Disarmament Conference had been raised in most considerations related to the special session on disarmament. His Government thought that there was ample reason for it; both would aim at focusing the attention of the world community on the problem of disarmament in its entirety. The Finnish Government, like the majority of the Members of the United Nations, was committed to the idea of a world conference on disarmament. Therefore, it was logical to expect that that would be reflected in the proceedings of the special session.

18. In the view of his delegation, the preparatory work for the special session should be seen in the context of the ongoing process of negotiations towards arms control and disarmament agreements. The atmosphere and the possibilities of a successful outcome of the session would be greatly enhanced if progress in the negotiations could be achieved before the special session. On the other hand, the agenda should be flexible enough that the work of the special session could be accommodated to results achieved in those negotiations.

19. His delegation found it self-evident that the special session would discuss

all crucial arms control and disarmament issues. Thus, it should deal with the serious and urgent problem posed by nuclear weapons, including the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests and the reduction of the existing nuclear-weapon arsenals. The risk of the proliferation of nuclear weapons was perhaps the most serious facet of the problem: the session should consider action for the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime. The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones was another viable approach to check the spread of those weapons. The limitation and elimination of other weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons and new types of weapons, should also be included in the work of the session. It was also important that the session should tackle other major issues, such as the trade in and transfer of conventional arms. His delegation welcomed the Swedish Government's proposal for a study of the interrelationships between disarmament efforts and economic and social progress, and offered its full co-operation in that undertaking.

20. The relatively slow progress in disarmament negotiations was mainly due to the inherent complexity of the problem rather than to the lack of adequate machinery and procedures either within the framework of the United Nations or outside it. At the same time, improvements should be made in the existing mechanisms and procedures so as to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

21. Mr. HOLLAI (Hungary) said that Hungary's support for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was not a matter of subjective decision, but followed from its social system. In every international forum, Hungary had supported attempts aimed at enhancing the cause of disarmament.

22. Hungary was convinced that the elimination of the arms race required the common effort of all States, and considered that the best framework for that was a World Disarmament Conference. Some maintained that the holding of that Conference would not be a realistic solution because of the opposition of certain Powers. Recent history had provided many examples of the achievement of goals which seemed unrealistic a few years earlier. When a number of countries proposed holding a European Conference on Security and Co-operation, for some the proposal had also seemed to be unrealistic; later, however, it had been possible to hold the Conference. It should be pointed out that the political climate in Europe had improved considerably in recent times and that any progress achieved in the field of disarmament would surely accelerate the process of détente. The World Disarmament Conference would be a new approach in international disarmament negotiations, and Hungary considered it very important that the special session should devote due attention to it and include it as a separate item in the agenda.

23. With respect to the agenda of the special session, it was evident that a general debate on disarmament was needed, as well as a realistic appraisal of the present situation, so as to draw correct conclusions for the future. While reviewing the role of the United Nations and that of the existing machinery in the field of disarmament, one should keep in mind the proven usefulness and the so far unused capacities of that machinery.

24. In that connexion, it should be stressed that the main task of the special session should be not to replace the existing machinery or forums but to exert a favourable influence on them, since the slow progress in the field of disarmament was not due to "imperfect" machinery but rather to the lack of adequate political



will. His delegation hoped that the special session would contribute to the improvement of the political climate, which would in turn be reflected in greater progress in the existing disarmament forums.

25. The need for achieving concrete results in the field of disarmament was unquestionable, but they could be achieved only if the basic document respected certain principles, such as the need for States to take into account each other's security interests, the exclusion of unilateral military advantages for any State or group of States, and the universality of disarmament both in the geographical sense and in the sense of types of weapons.

26. The sequence of items on the agenda should be formulated in a logical way, which meant that the adoption of the final document or documents must be the outcome of the whole work of the session.

27. Finally, his delegation considered the preparations for the special session a continuous process and was certain that the General Assembly would renew the mandate of the Preparatory Committee. It trusted that at that time it would be possible to enlarge the Committee in order to accommodate those socialist countries which played an important role in disarmament questions as members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. He requested that the observations of his delegation and the delegations of other socialist countries on that point should be reflected in the report of the Preparatory Committee to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.

28. Mr. ZEA (Colombia) said it must be remembered that the forthcoming special session devoted to disarmament had been the solution found by the General Assembly to try to remedy the resounding failure of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and the failure of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which had not yet produced any positive results that might benefit mankind. His delegation was concerned that too much emphasis might be placed on declarations or appraisals of the world disarmament situation and that the participants in the special session might become involved in philosophical discussions that would use up the short time available to them without offering the world any panacea.

29. With regard to the draft agenda submitted by the delegation of Sri Lanka on behalf of the non-aligned group in the Preparatory Committee, while it might be useful to carry out a review and appraisal of the present international disarmament situation and to adopt a declaration of principles on disarmament - something which the General Assembly had already done on countless occasions - his delegation felt that item 3 of the draft agenda, namely the adoption of a programme of action on disarmament, was most important and should be the core of the work of the special session. Nothing could be gained from a rhetorical declaration of principles if it was not accompanied by a programme of well-conceived measures for arms limitation. Such measures should be aimed at ending the proliferation of nuclear weapons, limiting conventional weapons, and eliminating incendiary and chemical weapons and weapons of mass destruction. Nevertheless, a mere announcement of such measures would not be sufficient; it would be necessary to prepare background documents on each one and to formulate practical suggestions on them.

30. In discussions of practical measures, the need to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to eliminate nuclear stockpiles was constantly stressed. But there were other more urgent matters, since the horrible consequences of such weapons made it very unlikely that they would ever be used. On the other hand, the existing traffic and trade in conventional weapons kindled conflicts for profit. Nearly \$20 billion were currently being invested in that trade. For example, on the Latin American continent, where large masses of the population were afflicted by the tragedy of underdevelopment, \$570 million had been spent on arms in 1975.

31. No matter how hard the General Assembly tried to achieve positive results in the field of disarmament, its efforts would be futile unless the countries responsible for the tragedy of the arms race throughout the world showed a will to co-operate.

32. In its letter addressed to the Secretary-General pursuant to General Assembly resolution 31/189 B, the Government of Colombia stated that disarmament was in no way dependent on the will of the Organization as such, or even on that of the vast majority of its Members; it depended solely on the will of the countries that manufactured weapons, that had been stockpiling them, that traded in them and that derived both military and political power and enormous financial profit from that lethal industry. So long as those countries were unwilling to disarm, to reduce the rate of weapons production or to place the interests of mankind in general above their own interests and hunger for power, nothing would be gained, no matter how many special sessions of the General Assembly or how many world conferences on disarmament were held.

33. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that at the previous meeting (A/AC.187/SR.6) the Mexican representative had suggested that the Secretariat should prepare a document comparing the replies sent to the Secretary-General by Member States pursuant to General Assembly resolution 31/189 B. He had also suggested some headings for the relevant subdivisions. In line with that suggestion, the Secretariat had prepared a draft list of eight headings, namely: (1) General remarks; (2) Objectives of the special session; (3) Preparatory work for the special session; (4) Agenda; (5) Organization of work of the special session; (6) Principal document or documents of the special session; (7) Role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament; and (8) Other matters.

34. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) said he had no objection to the headings suggested, but believed that one important subject was missing: the World Conference on Disarmament. Many of the Governments' replies had placed special emphasis on that matter. It had also been mentioned during the general debate at the organizational session of the Preparatory Committee and even in the statements at the current meeting. Several delegations, including the Polish delegation, had suggested that preparations for the World Disarmament Conference should be included as a separate item. It would seem logical to include it among the headings just read out by the Chairman. He would not officially press the matter, if it was understood that the question of the World Disarmament Conference would be included at an appropriate place and would be the subject of one of the working

papers to be prepared under one of the headings, such as the one relating to the agenda.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that the Preparatory Committee would of course decide what headings should be included in the Secretariat document. The question of the World Disarmament Conference was obviously extremely important, as had been acknowledged by most States Members of the United Nations.

36. It should be pointed out that the list submitted by the Secretariat had been very carefully worded in order to avoid mentioning specific subjects. Several questions, such as the declaration on disarmament or the programme of action on disarmament, had been mentioned in some replies but had not been included in the list of headings. The list was of a general nature and did not exclude any subject. A place could be found for the question of the World Disarmament Conference because, for example, in speaking of the objectives of the special session, the Secretariat would have to quote from the replies of Member States which had considered the World Disarmament Conference to be one of the main objectives of the special session.

37. Likewise, with regard to the heading "Agenda", once a consensus was reached on what items should be included, if it was felt that the World Disarmament Conference should be on the agenda, it would be mentioned under that heading.

38. Since the representative of Poland, in a spirit of co-operation, had said that he would not press his point, if the Chairman's explanation was understood to mean that the World Disarmament Conference would be somewhere on the list, he asked the Polish representative not to press his request; the eight headings submitted by the Secretariat could then be approved by consensus.

39. Mr. MIRZA (Pakistan) said that the Chairman had satisfactorily explained what subjects would be included on the list, but he had some difficulty understanding how it would contribute to a logical and systematic organization of work. In the proposal of the non-aligned group (A/AC.187/43), item 4 was entitled "Review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament and of the international machinery for negotiations on disarmament, including the question of convening a world disarmament conference". Since that item was on the agenda, he wondered whether it was necessary to include heading 7, "Role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament", of the Secretariat list. It seemed to him that the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament could be included under item 4 of the draft agenda.

40. He had no difficulty in accepting the list of headings and would not press his position, although he felt that his suggestion would permit a more systematic organization of work.

41. The CHAIRMAN explained that the draft agenda submitted by the delegation of Sri Lanka was being discussed with other regional groups and did not represent a final text. It was therefore too early to say whether item 4 would retain its present form or would be modified. That would depend on the outcome of the

discussions. If item 4 remained unchanged, the comments of the representative of Pakistan were very much to the point. Otherwise, heading 7 might be included.

42. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) suggested that heading 7 of the list proposed by the Secretariat should be amended to read: "Role of the United Nations and other international organizations in the field of disarmament". Comments on the importance of CCD in future work on disarmament would thus be taken into account. The suggestion would also ensure that reference to activities parallel to those of the United Nations in the field of disarmament was not omitted from the analytical document.

43. Mr. HARRY (Australia) considered that the proposed list of headings was adequate. If no consensus was reached on the agenda, it might be useful to summarize the proposals under heading 4. Otherwise, that would be pointless. As to where the views of Governments regarding a World Disarmament Conference should be included, that would depend on the context in which they mentioned the Conference, although generally speaking they would be included under heading 7. That heading did not require amendment, as it was sufficiently broad to cover the World Disarmament Conference, the special session and relations between the United Nations and other international bodies.

44. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) thanked the Secretariat for its useful response to his initiative. He believed that the proposed list should be approved, since the goal was to classify the replies of Governments by the beginning of the following week. As the list was not inflexible, the Secretariat could, if necessary, modify the headings later as more material became available.

45. Mr. SCHLAICH (Federal Republic of Germany) supported the proposal made by the representative of Iran the previous day to the effect that the analysis should include not only the replies of Governments but also the statements made at the current session during the general debate. As regards heading 7, he supported the suggestion of the representative of Italy that reference should be made to CCD. He also agreed with the interpretation given by the Australian delegation.

46. The CHAIRMAN considered that the suggestion of the representative of Iran was very helpful and that the opinions expressed during the general debate should be included. Nevertheless, there was a technical difficulty; the summary records of the Committee's meetings required three days to prepare and, if those were to be included in the document under discussion, it would be impossible to have it ready for the following week. The document would therefore have to be drafted on the basis of the definite information already available, namely, the replies of Governments. At the end of the current session, the opinions expressed during the general debate would be included in a subsequent document.

47. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka) said that he accepted the list of eight headings prepared by the Secretariat. He stressed the importance of producing the list as quickly as possible, so that it could be used during the work of the Preparatory Committee.

48. Mr. ALEM (Secretary of the Committee) recalled that at the fifth meeting of the Committee (A/AC.187/SR.5) the representative of Canada had requested a list of items which were usually included in the agenda of General Assembly sessions. The Secretariat had prepared and distributed Conference room paper No. 1, to which a small correction should be made. After item 1, the full stop should be replaced by a comma and the following words added: "in accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly". Rule 30 stated: "At the opening of each session of the General Assembly, the chairman of that delegation from which the President of the previous session was elected shall preside until the Assembly has elected a President for the session."

49. Following the item on the adoption of the agenda, there would be a list of the substantive items approved by the Committee, representing a recommendation by the Committee to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session. The closing meeting would repeat item 2 (Minute of silent prayer or meditation).

50. The other question raised by the representative of Canada had referred to the possible financial implications of any decisions taken at the special session. When it decided to convene a special session, the General Assembly also took a decision regarding the officers for the special session, including the President, Vice-President and Committee Chairmen. When a decision had financial implications, rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly should apply: the Secretary-General should inform the Committee of those implications and the information should then be forwarded to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions as well as to the Fifth Committee. If the officers and Committee Chairmen were the same as for the regular session of the General Assembly, that would mean that the Fifth Committee was in session and could therefore meet. Any recommendations made by the Fifth Committee would then be transmitted to the special session of the General Assembly, where a final decision would be taken.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

8th meeting

Friday, 13 May 1977, at 11.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.8

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to documents A/AC.187/29, A/AC.187/30 and A/AC.187/31 prepared by the Secretariat at the Committee's request, which contained a compilation of disarmament resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, a paper on existing principles and proposals for the conduct of disarmament negotiations, and a description of the existing structures and machinery for disarmament negotiations. The documents were in English; the other language versions would be circulated as soon as they were ready.
2. Mr. BJORMERSTEDT (Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament) said that delegations had asked the Secretariat to consider preparing a number of studies and background papers for use by the Preparatory Committee. The request had been considered from the standpoint of existing resources and of the time available for preparing such documents between meetings of the Committee.
3. With regard to the request made by the representative of Mexico, who had asked for information on the 10 working papers mentioned in the Mexican reply (A/AC.187/34), the Secretariat believed that it might be possible to prepare them, on the understanding that they would be summaries or comparative lists providing essential background information for the use of delegations, but would not in any way constitute in-depth studies on each topic.
4. He wished to mention that it would be rather difficult to obtain information on some of the 10 points mentioned in the Mexican reply, such as point 9, concerning agreements concluded in the strategic arms limitation talks, since those negotiations were confidential and it was impossible to obtain an up-to-date and reliable report on every detail. As to point 6, the report would be incomplete, since information was not available on every single disarmament meeting. With respect to the Polish request that the Secretariat should prepare a compilation of all disarmament agreements and proposals officially submitted to the United Nations, that information was already covered in detail in two books on the question of disarmament covering the period 1945-1975. However, the Secretariat understood that what the representative of Poland had in mind was a compilation of the essential parts of all the agreements. In that as well as in the other cases, the Secretariat would appreciate it if delegations would give it some guidance as to the urgency and priorities of the various papers envisaged, so that it could concentrate on those which would be of immediate use.

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

5. Mr. VAERNO (Norway) said that the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament offered a valuable opportunity for focusing global attention on a complex of problems which urgently required re-evaluation, fresh thoughts and, above all, political action. Not only did the arms race represent a

threat to peace and to the security of all nations; it also involved an unacceptable waste of resources in a world of poverty and distress. The special session would contribute to a greater understanding and awareness on the part of the public of issues which to an increasing extent were becoming technical questions only fully understood by experts. In that connexion, the non-governmental organizations had an important function to perform.

6. There now seemed to exist general agreement on the basic elements of the agenda for the special session, and he appealed to delegations to finalize that agreement so that the Committee could move on to other areas of activity.

7. Norway felt that disarmament issues should be viewed in a broad political context, and it would be particularly important to consider them also from a resource and development perspective. In that connexion, Norway would regard the preparation of a United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament and economic and social development, in the context of a new international economic order, as a valuable contribution.

8. Regarding specific arms control and disarmament questions, his delegation, like many others, felt that the special session should prepare a realistic programme of action. There seemed to be general agreement that the question of nuclear proliferation, vertical as well as horizontal, should be given priority.

9. Norway supported the idea that the agenda of the special session should include the question of strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. It would seem natural, as a first step, to base its work on the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament, adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session. He considered the following measures to be of particular importance: improving the methods of work of the First Committee of the General Assembly in disarmament matters; improving existing United Nations facilities for the collection, compilation and dissemination of information on disarmament issues; increased use of in-depth studies of the arms race, disarmament and related matters, and strengthening of the resources of the United Nations Secretariat.

10. With regard to negotiations on general and complete disarmament, Norway had always emphasized the particular importance of the participation of all nuclear-weapon States, whether in CCD, in the special session or in an eventual World Disarmament Conference. Such a conference would not be meaningful unless all militarily important States took part, especially all nuclear Powers. However, that did not seem to be a realistic prospect at present.

11. Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal) said the fact that the General Assembly resolution convening a special session devoted to disarmament had been adopted by consensus was an indication of the growing willingness of States to participate in disarmament negotiations in a broader forum. The existing bilateral and multilateral forums

for negotiations had been unable to achieve any significant results in the field of disarmament, and as a consequence the world was armed to the teeth with the most lethal array of weapons imaginable.

12. Sensing the urgency and seriousness of the problem, the non-aligned countries had taken a positive step at their fifth summit meeting in Colombo in 1976 and had adopted a resolution calling on the United Nations to convene a special session devoted to disarmament. The General Assembly of the United Nations had subsequently adopted, at its thirty-first session, a resolution to convene a special session devoted to disarmament.

13. Problems relating to disarmament could not be solved in one or two special sessions of the General Assembly. Everyone knew that the problems were too complex and myriad in nature. But the time had come to tackle the issues squarely rather than to avoid them simply because they were too numerous and complicated. The special session would provide an unprecedented opportunity and a suitable framework for all endeavours to that end. Success or failure would depend to a large extent on the work done by the Preparatory Committee and the progress achieved in its deliberations. The first task before the Committee was to agree on an agenda for the special session. Once there was agreement on the agenda, it would be much easier to plan the future work of the Committee. Although not exhaustive, the four items enumerated in document A/AC.187/43, submitted by Ambassador Amerasinghe on behalf of the non-aligned group, covered by and large the main areas that the special session would have to concentrate on. As pointed out in that document, the special session should proceed with the review and appraisal of the present international situation and the causes underlying the lack of progress in the field of disarmament, since such a stock-taking would make it possible to correct mistakes and chart a future course of action with greater prospects of success.

14. Disarmament must be linked with economic development. However unpalatable it might be to a few, the truth remained that disarmament could contribute to real development in a great number of countries and benefit the vast majority of mankind while at the same time imparting a sense of international peace and security.

15. The special session should take up other important questions like the comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty and the non-proliferation treaty, the concept of the nuclear-weapon-free zone and the creation of zones of peace. One of the most alarming features of the current situation was the phenomenal growth in conventional arms. The production and development of conventional weapons at present accounted for four fifths of the entire expenditure on armaments. That problem therefore required study, as did the effect of international trade in arms on the growth of conventional arms.

16. Having reviewed and discussed the existing situation, the special session should draw up and adopt a declaration of principles on disarmament, along with a



comprehensive programme of action in that field. There seemed to be a broad degree of agreement on that point.

17. A major area for consideration should be the machinery for disarmament. His delegation considered that the United Nations should play an increasingly active role in the field of disarmament. It supported the convening of a World Disarmament Conference with the participation of all major Powers, including the nuclear Powers.

18. In conclusion, he wished to point out that many non-governmental organizations had been actively associated for many years with questions relating to disarmament, their knowledge and experience should be utilized and they should be encouraged to continue their useful work.

19. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) said that the German Democratic Republic was striving for general and complete disarmament and was ready to exert the greatest efforts to that end. Now that the necessity of halting the arms race and making a start on disarmament was apparent, there was a more favourable climate for the adoption of concrete measures to that end. The United Nations had a special responsibility for maintaining international peace and security by implementing the decisions of its various organs.

20. The resolution on the World Disarmament Conference had been adopted in 1971 and had been confirmed at all subsequent sessions of the General Assembly. A World Disarmament Conference, with the participation of all States, would be a proper representative forum in which broad measures for disarmament could be discussed. The Government of the German Democratic Republic believed that such a conference would have the necessary authority to achieve real progress on the question of disarmament. A session of the General Assembly, or a special session, could not replace a world conference. In the view of the German Democratic Republic, the link between a special session devoted to disarmament and the World Disarmament Conference was that the special session could and should be made an important step in the process of convening a World Disarmament Conference. That position was in keeping with the Colombo Declaration, and he regretted the attempts which had been made to ignore the basic document of the Colombo Conference on so important a question.

21. With regard to the agenda for the special session, his delegation considered that it would be inappropriate at the current stage to adopt hard and fast formulations which in fact constituted an assessment of the situation prevailing in the disarmament field. The decisions of the General Assembly should not be anticipated, since there was always a danger of being mistaken.

22. It was a fact that the first partial results in the area of arms limitation and disarmament already existed in the form of bilateral and multilateral agreements. On the other hand, the arms race continued to an increasing extent and the danger of a world war was not eliminated.

23. The German Democratic Republic had always linked consideration of the problem of arms limitation and disarmament with that of many other questions of world-wide importance, since all were closely bound up with the security of States, and their solution was therefore very complex.

24. The failure of certain bodies to achieve positive results could frequently be explained by the lack of will on the part of States. His delegation hoped that the debate which would take place at the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament would create an atmosphere conducive to achieving positive agreements in the disarmament field.

25. Even if the special session merely established principles, that would nevertheless constitute a new step in the desired direction. The final document or documents might contain something more than mere principles, since proposals already existed with regard to curtailment of the nuclear arms race, prohibition of nuclear tests, banning and destruction of chemical weapons, prohibition of new types of weapons of mass destruction and reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons. In that connexion, the memorandum on questions of ending the arms race and disarmament, submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in September 1976 (A/31/232), deserved detailed study.

26. As to the final document or documents, there was a need for prior study of the replies sent by Governments to the Secretary-General in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 31/189 B. He regretted to note that fewer than half of all Member States had submitted replies.

27. During the forthcoming weeks questions directly related to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament would be considered in many forums. Disarmament questions would also be considered at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. The outcome of all those discussions should be borne in mind during preparations for the special session. Consequently, only after the thirty-second session would it be possible to make concrete preparations for drawing up a final document of the special session.

28. Like the other States of the socialist community, the German Democratic Republic felt that the special session should contribute to the solution of disarmament problems.

29. At the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee (A/AC.187/SR.1), his delegation had pointed out that, when the Committee was being set up, the views of the socialist States of Eastern Europe had not been taken into account. Accordingly, it would be appropriate if the question of the composition of the Preparatory Committee was examined at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly with a view to increasing the number of its members. The Committee's report to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session should include a recommendation to that effect.

30. In the statement made by Poland on 10 May 1977 (A/AC.187/SR.5), the Secretariat had been requested to provide the Committee with a document listing disarmament proposals officially submitted to the United Nations. That document would present the substance of the proposal, the date and country of submission, and the status of its follow-up. His delegation supported that suggestion, since it felt that the document would enrich the working documents available to delegations.

31. Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom) said that his delegation warmly welcomed the decision taken by the Committee at its fourth meeting (A/AC.187/SR.4) concerning the participation of non-governmental organizations in the work of the Committee, since the subjects under discussion affected the way of life, and even the lives themselves, of peoples all over the world. The non-governmental organizations, which reflected public opinion on questions of disarmament, should have the opportunity to make known to delegations their views on the matters under discussion, and it was to be hoped that they would take advantage of the possibilities which the Committee had provided for them.

32. On the subject of the agenda of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, he felt that the wording of the agenda should not be prejudicial to the points of view of any particular State or group of States. Therefore, with regard to item 1, which would consist of a general debate, his delegation did not favour language which appeared to make a judgement in regard to the present disarmament situation or attempted to single out some aspects of the special session's deliberations as being more significant than others. Similarly, with regard to item 4, his delegation felt it inappropriate to single out specific proposals concerning international disarmament machinery, since that could endanger the prospects of active participation by all members in the work of the special session. Such selection would amount to discrimination. His delegation hoped that the special session would result in broad agreement on disarmament machinery and the means by which the work of the special session should be followed up. The special session was still a year away and it was not appropriate in 1977 to prejudice decisions which the special session was to consider in 1978.

33. On the subject of the documentation which the Committee should request the United Nations Centre for Disarmament to provide, he was grateful to the representative of Mexico for his proposal that the Centre should prepare a document summarizing the views of Governments on different aspects of the special session under appropriate headings. For the rest, it would be necessary to proceed with some caution. In the first place, there was the question of finance. The General Assembly at its thirty-first session had allocated the sum of \$90,000 for the preparation of background documents for the special session, and he felt that the Secretariat should not be requested to provide material costing more than the sum available. Moreover, the Centre for Disarmament had limited manpower. More important, in requesting the Centre to prepare studies, it was necessary to bear in mind the political implications of those studies. His delegation had a high regard for the impartiality of the Centre for Disarmament and for its ability to deal with potentially difficult subjects in a non-controversial manner. However, it felt that the Centre should not be asked to prepare studies which would require of it political judgements of the sort which international civil servants, who must always remain impartial, should not be asked to make.

34. As to the future work of the Committee once the agenda for the special session had been agreed, his delegation agreed with the views expressed by the representative of Sweden at the 5th meeting (A/AC.137/SR.5) to the effect that the primary object of the present session of the Preparatory Committee should be to start action-oriented preparations for the special session so as to lay a basis for other discussions on the substantive issues before the special session itself. The representative of Sweden had also said that by the end of the current session of the Committee a decision should be taken concerning the work to be accomplished during the intersessional period. His delegation further agreed with the statement made by the representative of Romania on 11 May (A/AC.187/SR.6) to the effect that the Committee had the responsibility to complete the preparation of the draft documents of the special session before the session opened. In this regard, his delegation agreed with the suggestions made by the representative of Canada and was also willing to give positive consideration to other proposals concerning ways in which work on the basic documents of the special session could be pursued between the present time and September.

35. His delegation repeated its pledge to play an active and positive role in the search for a co-operative approach to the problems to be considered both by the Preparatory Committee and at the special session and drew attention to the fact that, in the reply sent to the Secretary-General in compliance with resolution 31/189 B, the United Kingdom Government had expressed the view that a special session could enhance the prospects for disarmament, provided that it was thoroughly prepared and widely attended, particularly by all significant military Powers. Thorough preparation meant that preparations should start as soon as possible, wide and active attendance would be facilitated by a sensible compromise on the question of the agenda. Such a compromise would be an important first step in the achievement of the co-operative approach which was sought.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

9th meeting

Monday, 16 May 1977, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.9

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. KAISER (Bangladesh) considered that the escalating global budget for the maintenance and expansion of the means of destruction, in a world where countless millions of people barely managed to subsist, was sufficient justification for the convening of the special session devoted to disarmament. In the opinion of his Government, the special session afforded a vital opportunity for tackling anew the fundamental problems concerning disarmament, on the basis of equal participation by all States. The most important objective of the special session must be to marshal the political will of all countries, big or small, to give new impetus and stimulus to the disarmament process. A critical element for the success of that catalytic endeavour was education of world public opinion regarding the magnitude and dangers of the arms race and the efforts required to halt it. Success would also depend on the ability of all States to create the necessary climate of mutual confidence and understanding, backed by objective facts and studies that could provide a positive framework and time-phased programme for future action.
2. There appeared to be an emerging consensus regarding the need to have a general declaration on disarmament, the main focus of which would be an evaluation of past endeavours, a set of practical guidelines and principles reflecting the common denominator of international consciousness and the incorporation of the major objectives desired.
3. His Government believed that the irrevocable link between security and economic development was of cardinal importance, since peace and prosperity were indivisible. He also stressed that considerations of national security were incompatible with disarmament, so long as no international security system existed. The real issue of disarmament, therefore, hinged on the balance between national insecurity and the degree of international trust that could be collectively reinforced.
4. The crucial role of the United Nations in the process could never be over-estimated; nor could the need to channel resources freed by disarmament measures towards the effective promotion of the social and economic progress of humanity, particularly in the developing countries. Equally important was the recognition of the right of all States to free and equal access to technology for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.
5. Among the most important principles governing future disarmament negotiations was the recognition that progress towards disarmament was the responsibility of all States, individually and collectively. Nevertheless, it was the special responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States to participate in and implement disarmament measures, and also to guarantee that they would not resort to the use, or threat of use, of nuclear weapons against other States and in particular against non-nuclear-weapon countries.
6. Disarmament was intimately related to the search for a new international political and economic order based on mutual trust and justice, on the principle of equal security for all States, on the recognition of national independence and on international co-operation.

7. The acid test of the Preparatory Committee, and indeed of the special session itself, would be its ability to formulate a programme of action-oriented recommendations, incorporating specific and achievable objectives and with machinery for co-ordinating, reviewing and following up action - a programme that was flexible and realistic enough to command the widest support.

8. Among the basic ingredients of such a programme, the highest priority must be given to measures pertaining to nuclear disarmament, the containment of vertical proliferation, including cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, and the reduction and complete elimination of nuclear arsenals. Equally important were efforts to contain horizontal proliferation, by increasing the credibility of measures towards that end. Closely related to those questions were problems posed by the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, their accessibility to all nations under effective international safeguards and the avoidance of dangers connected with nuclear explosive devices. His Government was vitally interested in measures to strengthen regional and subregional co-operation, in order to encourage the relaxation of tension and the settlement of disputes on the basis of friendship and recognition of equal sovereignty. Such collateral disarmament measures as the creation of zones of peace and nuclear-free zones were particularly important. Another area of vital interest was the generation of resources for peace through a more rational use of the vast sums wasted on the arms race. He therefore fully supported the proposal submitted by Sweden for a United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament efforts and economic and social progress.

9. Like other countries, Bangladesh also subscribed to the view that one of the serious omissions in the agenda in the past had been the phenomenal growth in the conventional arms race. The real threat to international security continued to emanate from conflicts located in States of the third world. The ramifications of those problems should also be the subject of discussion and recommendations during the special session devoted to disarmament.

10. So far as institutional and follow-up measures were concerned, he strongly supported the strengthening of the central role of the United Nations in the disarmament process. He agreed that attention should be devoted to streamlining and restructuring the working methods of existing bodies, such as CCD, in order to make them more representative and also to link them more intimately with the General Assembly.

11. Mr. ALZAMORA (Peru) said that, in view of the high hopes placed in disarmament by the vast majority of the human race, the Preparatory Committee was under an obligation to make every possible effort to ensure that proper preparations were made for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The special session was timely because the arms race had already reached an indescribable level. It was also important because all other efforts to consider the armaments problem in a suitable manner had been partial or had not won general

acceptance. The success of the current endeavour would be a victory not for any group or groups of countries but for the whole world community.

12. His Government believed that, although all States had a responsibility in the task of disarmament, some States had a greater responsibility than others, and that the failure of the claim that the arms race contributed to increased security must be borne in mind in all thinking on the subject. The special session must establish the broad objectives and the most important guidelines for future action. Substantive principles for disarmament must be compiled and identified. Requirements for action must be stipulated. Finally, decisions must be adopted so that the United Nations could play its appropriate role in the field of disarmament.

13. In the outline of action and the establishment of priorities, vital importance must be attached to the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests, to respect for nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace and other appropriate measures.

14. The Preparatory Committee had before it a draft agenda submitted by the delegation of Sri Lanka on behalf of the non-aligned countries. The adoption of an agenda in agreement with other groups of countries appeared to be very near and his delegation welcomed that first agreement, which would enable progress to be made on other important questions.

15. It had been suggested that the Committee should proceed to prepare the principal documents for the special session. His delegation agreed with that proposal since it was clear that the more progress was made in that preliminary stage, the better would be the atmosphere at the special session and the chances for the adoption of final agreements.

16. Mr. CORREA DA COSTA (Brazil) stated that, throughout the years, Brazil had shown its readiness to participate in efforts aimed at promoting the objective of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, not only in the General Assembly but also in CCD and in other international bodies. Brazil had co-sponsored resolution 31/189 B which had been adopted by the General Assembly by consensus:

17. The views of the Brazilian Government on the subject of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament were set forth in document A/AC.187/49 dated 11 May 1977.

18. In that reply, addressed to the Secretary-General in accordance with resolution 31/189 B, the Government of Brazil had envisaged the adoption by the special session of two basic documents: the first would be a political declaration of principles and guidelines for future negotiations on disarmament, and the second would be a programme of action for general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

19. The declaration of principles and guidelines should, in the view of his delegation, include the following essential elements: first, the international community should give maximum priority to negotiating efforts in the field of nuclear disarmament; second, disarmament measures should be correlated with the preservation and strengthening of international security in order to avoid the creation of military imbalances which might, during the negotiation process, jeopardize international peace; third, the principle that responsibilities and obligations should be balanced must prevail in the field of disarmament; furthermore, obligations should not be discriminatory in nature; fourth, new international confidence-building measures or measures of non-armament should be accompanied by truly significant steps in the field of real disarmament; fifth, the verification system should be an integral element of agreements on disarmament and should be implemented by the adoption of adequate methods, both at the national and international levels; sixth, all States, including those possessing nuclear weapons, should participate on an equal footing in international negotiations on disarmament; seventh, international efforts on chemical weapons should proceed at an accelerated pace, along with efforts to deal with weapons of mass destruction, arms which caused unnecessary suffering and those which were particularly inhumane; eighth, all countries must have free access to peaceful technologies both in the nuclear and other fields, with standardized non-discriminatory and universal safeguards. The system of safeguards should be applied equally to all States and should be extended, whenever necessary, to cover new advances in technological research and development. None of those measures, however, should permit unwarranted interference in the sovereignty of States or threaten scientific, technological or economic development for essentially peaceful purposes; ninth, firm commitments should be made to apply significant portions of the savings derived from disarmament measures to the promotion of economic development in less developed areas. Those commitments would facilitate the establishment of a new international economic order; tenth, the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States should rest on concrete commitments on the part of the nuclear-weapon States, such as the commitment to respect denuclearized zones and zones of peace, positive guarantees on the part of nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States belonging to denuclearized zones, and an agreed programme of measures for general and complete disarmament, elaborated on non-discriminatory bases and with special regard to the interests of developing countries.

20. With regard to the second of the final documents of the special session, his delegation was of the opinion that the programme of action should accord the highest priority to negotiations on effective measures in the field of nuclear disarmament, with particular reference to a comprehensive nuclear-weapon-test ban, to the destruction of stockpiles of such weapons, to the ending of the process of research and development of new types of nuclear weapons and to the freezing of production of fissionable material for military purposes. The programme of action should also refer to negotiations on chemical weapons, on new weapons of mass destruction and on conventional weapons.

21. With regard to preparations for the special session, he welcomed the



preparation by the Secretariat of the background papers in documents A/AC.187/29, 30 and 31, and looked forward to the prompt distribution of the comparative analysis of the comments received pursuant to resolution 31/189 B. However, the Preparatory Committee should not overburden the Secretariat with new requests until it was agreed, after careful study, that the preparation of a new document would clearly serve an immediate purpose in its deliberations.

22. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said there seemed to be a consensus that the Assembly should not allow the work of the special session to become a repetition of the debates in the First Committee. That the special session was not an appropriate forum for negotiating specific agreements or trying to draw up draft treaties and that it was necessary to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

23. The working paper submitted by the non-aligned countries had the advantage of clearly and concisely defining both the subject-matter and the fundamental purpose of the special session. In his view, that purpose was twofold. On the one hand, the aim was to conduct a debate on disarmament with the participation of all States Members of the United Nations and with the breadth, depth and high level of representation that the subject deserved. The purpose of the debate would be to review and appraise the present international situation in light of the urgent need to achieve substantial progress in the field of disarmament, the continuation of the arms race and the close interrelationship between disarmament, international peace and security, and economic development, and the role of the United Nations in disarmament and of the international machinery for negotiations on disarmament, including the question of convening a World Disarmament Conference, according to the draft agenda submitted by the non-aligned countries (A/AC.187/43) and slightly modified during informal talks. Furthermore, the debate must not be reduced to an academic exercise; that was why express reference was made to the adoption of two instruments that would include all the conclusions of the preparatory studies and the deliberations of the Assembly, avoiding unnecessary fragmentation. Those instruments would be a declaration on disarmament and a programme of action on disarmament.

24. In that context, unnecessary fragmentation should be avoided and an effort should be made to ensure that all the conclusions and provisions were contained in the two aforementioned documents. Thus, the declaration on disarmament would spell out all the most relevant and significant principles on the subject, such as the following: all peoples of the world had a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations; general and complete disarmament under effective international control should be the ultimate goal of mankind; gradual progress towards that goal required the conclusion of partial agreement on genuine disarmament measures; the gradual reduction of nuclear weapons leading to their total elimination should be given the highest priority among such measures; the reduction and elimination of other weapons of mass destruction should also be given high priority; the international transfer of conventional weapons should be restricted

and regulated; international verification was essential to many disarmament measures and the use of a combination of various verification methods provided the best guarantees; the declaration of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace was one of the most effective means of disarmament available to all non-nuclear-weapon States: nuclear-weapon States should faithfully comply with their obligations, as set forth in the definition approved by the General Assembly, towards nuclear-weapon-free zones and the States belonging to those zones; the reduction of the military budgets of the permanent members of the Security Council and of other militarily important States would be a commendable disarmament measure; although there was a close relationship between disarmament and international peace and security, on the one hand, and disarmament and development on the other, progress in one of those areas should not be conditional upon progress in the other; the growing arms race and the resulting waste of resources were incompatible with the decisions of the United Nations aimed at establishing a new international economic order based on justice and equity; a considerable portion of the resources released by the adoption of disarmament measures should be devoted primarily to promoting the economic and social development of the developing countries; in accordance with the Charter and with countless General Assembly resolutions, the United Nations had a vital role and responsibility in the field of disarmament and it should therefore keep abreast of all measures taken in the field of disarmament, whether they be unilateral, bilateral, regional or multilateral; the United Nations machinery for deliberations should be strengthened by the institutionalization of a World Disarmament Conference on terms acceptable to all Member States; the appropriate changes should be made in the organization and procedures of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in order to allow China and France to participate in its work; world public opinion should be adequately informed of the progress of work in the field of disarmament, in order that it might use its influence to intensify efforts to achieve positive results; non-governmental organizations recognized by the United Nations should have all the documentation they needed to carry out their complementary work effectively. A similar description, though much more extensive and detailed, could be made of the possible contents of the programme of action.

25. Referring to some matters that had already been discussed, he expressed the view that the special session should ideally last from six to eight weeks, since there would be no justification for summoning nearly 150 Members to a special session that would merely rubber-stamp the drafts prepared by a body such as the Preparatory Committee which represented slightly more than one third of the membership of the Organization. Naturally, if the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament completed a draft treaty on the cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests that had the support of the two super-Powers and of the other members of that body, the treaty could be opened for signature during the special session even though that was not the purpose of the special session. The completion of the draft treaty appeared to be a possibility in light of the statements made a year previously at United Nations Headquarters by the current President of the United States and of the memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on 15 February 1977.

26. As to Governments' statements and suggestions, his delegation viewed as particularly encouraging the opinion expressed by the United States (A/AC.187/17), which had always shown itself to be a staunch defender of the status quo in the matter of international disarmament machinery, to the effect that the special session should be prepared to undertake the necessary improvements in existing machinery and practices and to launch any new organizational steps required for achievement of the goals established at the session.
27. In his opinion there was no need to establish any subsidiary intersessional bodies of the Committee, since the intervening time would have to be spent analysing the material available and studying the working papers prepared by the Secretariat on future stages of the work; that would not, of course, preclude the continuation of informal talks with a view to the preparation of preliminary drafts, which could be begun in connexion with the Committee's September session.
28. He thanked the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Bjornerstedt, for the willingness of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament to prepare the working papers suggested by the Government of Mexico (A/AC.187/34). He agreed with him concerning paper No. 9 (Analytical list of the agreements concluded in the bilateral talks known by the acronym SALT). His delegation regarded the other working papers as purely descriptive and understood that they called for no value judgement by members of the Secretariat. His delegation had no preference in the matter of priorities and considered that the working papers could be issued in the order which the Centre deemed most appropriate for their preparation.
29. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the decision to allow Member States which were not members of the Preparatory Committee to participate in the Committee's work without the right to vote, gave the floor to the representative of Mongolia.
30. Mr. PUNTSAGNOROV (Mongolia) said that the views of the Mongolian People's Republic on the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament were contained in document A/AC.187/16. As could be seen from that document, the Mongolian People's Republic attached great importance to the special session, which would deal with the urgent problems of halting the arms race and bringing about disarmament.
31. Determined efforts to control the arms race and achieve general and complete disarmament occupied a prominent place in his country's foreign policy. The Mongolian People's Republic had sponsored many constructive initiatives and proposals aimed at disarmament. As a member of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, it had played an active part in the preparation of various conventions in the field of disarmament. The arms race had led to the present disturbing situation in which huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons were threatening the very existence of all mankind and technological advances were moving towards the manufacture of increasingly deadly and destructive weapons. Such prospects were inevitably disturbing to all the peoples of the world. The movement for peace and general and complete disarmament had thus assumed international proportions, as could be seen from the World Assembly of peace-loving forces which had been held in Warsaw in May 1977 and in which representatives of 125 countries and more than 50 international

organizations had taken part. Representatives of States Members of the United Nations should heed the voice of world opinion, which called for the adoption of effective general measures to lay the foundations of lasting world peace in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

32. In the opinion of his delegation there was an urgent need to eliminate the danger of a new world war. To that end, maximum use must be made of all positive conditions for the preparation and implementation of effective measures aimed at the reduction and prohibition of the arms race and at disarmament.

33. The problem of disarmament was connected with economic and social development, particularly in developing countries. The question of disarmament was a world problem affecting all States without distinction, and the appropriate solutions to that problem could only be adopted within the context of a world disarmament conference, which would constitute a suitable forum. The special session should discuss the convening of such a conference as a separate item.

34. In its reply to the Secretary-General his Government had expressed support for the recommendation adopted at the Fifth Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in August 1976 at Colombo, to the effect that the agenda of the special session should include an item on the convening of a world disarmament conference. It was to be hoped that that recommendation would be duly reflected in the agenda of the special session.

35. The special session should, above all, make a thorough analysis of activities being conducted in the field of disarmament. In the absence of an objective analysis of that kind it would be difficult to establish guidelines for future talks and negotiations on disarmament. The time had come for those nuclear Powers that had refrained from taking specific measures in the matter to join in the efforts of the international community to limit the arms race and bring about disarmament. If all States without distinction, whether nuclear or non-nuclear, large or small, assumed the obligation not to resort to the use or threat of force, the climate of international trust would improve and that would facilitate the solution of the problem of disarmament.

36. The Soviet Union's memorandum of 27 September 1976 contained a full programme of measures in the field of disarmament. The practical measures proposed in that document on the prohibition of nuclear tests, the prohibition of proliferation of nuclear weapons and their gradual elimination, the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, the prohibition of the manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction, etc. were of great interest. Both the measures proposed by the Soviet Union and those proposed by other countries could form a reasonable basis for agreement on practical disarmament measures.

37. The disarmament programme was a complex and delicate issue since the national security of all States was at stake. Hence, the document or documents approved by the special session should include the principle that the security of States must not be endangered. The special session should strengthen and enhance the efficacy of existing machinery for dealing with disarmament questions.

38. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that the United Nations had been established to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and that fulfilment of the other purposes of the Charter depended on ability to guarantee world peace. The purpose of the first resolution of the General Assembly, adopted in January 1946, had been the elimination of atomic weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. Despite that, military expenditure was currently of the order of \$350 billion, involving a criminal waste of precious natural resources and brain power in a world experiencing hunger and need. Politicians and generals were seriously discussing whether a pre-emptive nuclear strike was not a blessing in disguise. In that game of war, which had developed its own inexorable logic, the chief protagonists displayed a terrifying indifference to the condition of the rest of humanity. Never before in the history of evolution had man possessed the means of destroying all life on earth and the mad logic to justify it.

39. It was not the first time that India was playing an active role in disarmament questions, for its experience in the matter dated back to the early days of the United Nations. In 1949, India had submitted a draft resolution proposing a Declaration on the duties of States and individuals in respect of the development of atomic energy in such a manner as to ensure the elimination of atomic weapons from national arsenals. In 1950, India had proposed a draft resolution on the establishment of a United Nations fund for reconstruction and development, to be formed of resources released through disarmament measures. In 1960, India had introduced a draft resolution outlining the principles for disarmament negotiations which were incorporated the following year in the McCloy-Zorin Agreement. Since 1962, India had participated continuously and actively in all disarmament organs. The special session should deal with nuclear disarmament as a matter of high priority rather than attempt to find answers to all questions. The special session might not be able to do more than stimulate action in certain positive directions. Depending on its outcome, it might become necessary to hold a series of such special sessions culminating in a world disarmament conference.

40. His delegation hoped that the special session would address itself to the main issue of nuclear disarmament with a sense of realism and urgency. The survival of mankind should never be placed in jeopardy by any weapon. Nuclear weapons and other weapons of indiscriminate destruction should be prohibited as a matter of the highest priority. The doctrine of deterrence, which had led to the existing intolerable situation, should be re-examined with a view to preventing escalation from conventional to nuclear weapons. No solution would be possible unless there was agreement between the nuclear-weapon States. Since a nuclear war posed a threat to the very survival of mankind, non-nuclear weapon States, particularly the non-aligned, could play the role of a non-reacting catalytic agent in disarmament negotiations between the super Powers. However, as all States had a legitimate interest in the outcome of disarmament negotiations between nuclear weapon States, the negotiating machinery should be equipped with conciliatory procedures by which the non-involved States could play a useful role, when necessary.

41. The complexity of the disarmament question must not be overlooked; that was why the special session should confine itself to discussing concrete and feasible proposals. The nuclear-arms race was economically counterproductive and a threat to the existence of life on the planet. Yet, because of the doctrine of deterrence, there was a cynical acceptance of the arms race as inevitable. One side should take the risk of unilaterally halting the arms race and the others should be morally obliged to do the same. A halt to the arms race was feasible without the slightest jeopardy to national or collective security. The concept of a surprise nuclear attack should be outlawed. Among other confidence-building measures for improving the climate of international peace and security, the two draft treaties on disarmament proposed

by the United States of America and the Soviet Union in 1962 should be revised and updated by the authors for the special session.

42. Besides the moral imperative of peace, the other crying need of humanity was developed for all people so that justice and equality could prevail. But the fruits of development were worth noting as long as the danger of the total destruction of life on earth existed. It was to be hoped, therefore, that the special session would, as a matter of priority, take the first steps towards nuclear disarmament.

43. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document A/AC.187/51, of 14 May 1977, which had been circulated in English. The document, which had been prepared by the Secretariat, consisted of classification of the replies of Member States under the headings agreed upon by the Committee the previous week. He commended the Secretariat on its swift and painstaking work.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

10th meeting

Tuesday, 17 May 1977, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/ER.10

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said that the special session of the General Assembly on disarmament provided a unique opportunity to secure progress in arms control and disarmament. It should not be regarded merely as a stepping-stone for the establishment of new disarmament machinery, but should be used as a vehicle for appraising developments to date. It was important that delegations, when identifying the factors which had obstructed disarmament, should be less concerned about apportioning blame to any State or group of States than about making a concerted effort to overcome those obstacles.
2. One of the principal goals of the special session should be the elaboration of a framework within which arms control and disarmament issues could be examined and negotiations conducted. To that end, it was necessary to set out fundamental normative principles. However, those principles should be founded on political reality. For example, States would not be prepared to negotiate disarmament measures unless they felt militarily secure. Another major goal would be the identification of a consensus on the priority measures of arms control and disarmament and the issues of contention within those priority areas.
3. His Government did not believe that the special session would be an appropriate forum for the negotiation of any totally new arms control or arms limitation convention. However completion, by the time the special session convened, of agreements currently under discussion would demonstrate international determination to generate a new momentum in disarmament. More particularly, the Australian Government, whose position on the desirability of an immediate suspension of nuclear testing and the early negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty was well known, had warmly welcomed recent developments which demonstrated a new preparedness to reverse the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. In that respect it hoped that, by the time the special session commenced, a comprehensive test-ban treaty would either be negotiated, or at least, that agreement would have been reached on the basic elements for such a treaty.
4. Arms control and disarmament proposals touched directly the first responsibility of all Governments to provide for national security. All States sacrificed resources for military purposes which might otherwise be utilized to enhance the welfare of their citizens. Without ceasing to respect the sincerity of their position, it was essential to stop the endless international spending on more sophisticated weapons in a process which did not result in enhanced security.
5. Nevertheless, it was not enough for the super-Powers to take the step of achieving a more peaceful world. As they took steps to reverse the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons (and the other nuclear-weapons States had a similar responsibility, even if different quantitatively), other States should demonstrate their own preparedness to take complementary measures to guarantee that nuclear weapons did not become part of their own armouries. If the super-Powers were prepared to show the way by negotiating a comprehensive test-ban treaty, those

States which had still not ratified the non-proliferation treaty should be encouraged to do so.

6. The task of the current session of the Preparatory Committee was to establish the framework within which the General Assembly could approach its tasks at the special session and to take initial steps which would facilitate the efficient and timely completion of the necessary preparatory work. His delegation was ready to co-operate fully in the discussions and in the drafting of the essential documents.

7. Mr. CONSALVI (Venezuela) said that the arms race endangered not only the competing Powers but the whole of mankind. Suffice it to say, as Dr. Alva Myrdal warned, that the plutonium deposits in the hands of the Powers had become a source of insecurity to the very countries which possessed them. The arms race affected the entire international community, not only because more than \$300 billion were spent on it annually, while most people were denied the opportunity to enjoy the advances of science and technology, but also because of the crisis in ideals and constructive proposals which it revealed.

8. Venezuela had participated actively in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference and supported the Conference so long as all the nuclear Powers took part in it. However, while believing that the subject of its convening could be discussed at the special session, his delegation felt that the session should not be a mere milestone on the road to the World Disarmament Conference. Instead, it hoped that at the special session the General Assembly would duly study the various aspects of the arms race and its economic and social consequences and achieve positive results, such as the adoption of a set of principles and a programme of action which would constitute progress towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under international control. It should also reaffirm the right of all States and, in particular, non-nuclear-weapon States, to access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes because, in view of the energy problems confronting the world, the possibility of using atomic energy could not easily be discounted.

9. His delegation was pleased that a consensus had been reached on inviting non-governmental organizations and institutions involved in the field of disarmament to participate in the Committee's deliberations, in view of both the importance of their contributions and the appreciation which that measure implied.

10. He reaffirmed the need for the United Nations, through the Centre for Disarmament, to launch a wide-ranging public information campaign concerning the grave dangers of the arms race and its economic and social consequences. Furthermore, his country felt that the proposal by certain delegations that the First Committee of the General Assembly should deal solely with questions relating to disarmament and international security was a positive one.

11. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that disarmament depended primarily on the capacity of the international community gradually to eradicate the suspicion, mistrust and lack of understanding which undermined relations between countries. His Government had always done its utmost to improve its relations with the rest of the world and



intended to continue that policy and, if possible, to expand it in the field of disarmament. In that spirit, it had from the outset supported the initiative to convene a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and had co-sponsored the resolution on the subject.

12. At the special session the Assembly should first of all undertake a comprehensive review of the numerous problems which the United Nations was prepared to face in the field of disarmament. It would be necessary in that regard to reach a decision on the nature of the role to be played by the United Nations and on the instruments required to strengthen that role. Secondly, the Assembly should concentrate on the priority issues selected by the Committee. In that connexion, the special session should not indulge in generalized rhetoric or detailed technical negotiations. Above all, it should avoid duplicating the activities of existing fora, such as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which his Government still viewed as a highly useful negotiating forum, although it was prepared to consider constructive proposals designed to improve its structure, procedures and organization.

13. Considering the diversity of the proposals on the objectives of the special session, it was essential to identify those proposals on which agreement was possible and concentrate on the search for a common basic position on those issues. At the same time, while identifying priority objectives for immediate action, the General Assembly should not ignore the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament or the general principles already established by the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament. Bearing that in mind, the Italian Government had repeatedly stressed the need for a coherent and comprehensive programme of complete disarmament, and considered that the special session should endeavour to elaborate a far-reaching plan for gradually achieving the total elimination of arms in order to create a world based on détente, understanding, co-operation and on an international security system.

14. To begin with, nuclear disarmament measures should be pursued with the greatest urgency, going ahead with the negotiations for a comprehensive nuclear test ban (CTB) and with the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT). Arms reduction must follow a balanced pattern in both the nuclear and conventional weapons sectors. In the case of conventional weapons, the geographical factor should not be overlooked. In that connexion he recalled that Italy had proposed that the Security Council, under Article 29 of the Charter of the United Nations, should set up a committee, divided into regional sub-committees with the participation of major arms suppliers and purchasing Powers from each region, with the task of maintaining conventional weaponry at the lowest possible level. Furthermore, in order to lay the groundwork for the establishment of those subsidiary bodies, one could envisage the possibility of setting up parallel but separate regional committees or groups comprising the recipient countries. An agreement on the elimination of chemical weapons should also be actively pursued as a matter of the greatest urgency. A successful conclusion to the current negotiations in Geneva, in time for the special session, would be a major contribution to progress in the field of disarmament.

15. One should not lose sight of the final goal, namely, the establishment of a new collective international security system within the framework of the United Nations, which was a prerequisite for a more just and equitable political and economic order. What the world community needed for its development was economic and social reform, as well as a better distribution of those human and material resources which currently were absorbed to a disproportionate extent by the arms race.

16. The CHAIRMAN, acting in accordance with the Committee's decision to allow Member States which were not members of the Committee to participate in its work, without a vote, gave the floor to the representative of Denmark.

17. Mr. SVANE (Denmark) said that the special session represented a valuable means of directing international attention to the arms race and making public opinion aware of the opportunities which existed for disarmament as well as the difficulties involved. Moreover the session should serve as a catalyst for arms control and disarmament negotiations and encourage further negotiations at the global, regional or bilateral level.

18. At the same time the special session would inevitably focus public attention on the adverse effects which massive arms expenditure had on the economic and social development of nations. Substantial progress in the field of disarmament could lead to the release, for more constructive uses, of vast material and human resources which were currently being devoured for military purposes. The Danish Government included a minister without portfolio, who would devote much of her attention to disarmament while at the same time having the responsibility for development aid.

19. As regards the organization of the work of the special session, his Government had emphasized, in its reply to the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution A/RES/31/189 B, that the general debate should leave sufficient time for thorough consideration of specific proposals. In any case such main committees as were established should be able to begin their work without waiting for the conclusion of the general debate.

20. Besides formulating a declaration on disarmament, it should be the main purpose of the session to identify the fields in which action should be taken and to establish priorities. He wished to draw particular attention to the problem of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and also to the conclusion of a treaty for a comprehensive nuclear test ban. It was clear that progress in the SALT negotiations would create a climate which would facilitate the finding of solutions for the nuclear issues he had mentioned. Those problems should not, however, be given exclusive attention to the detriment of efforts for curbing the conventional arms race. Recipient countries within a given region might help to further conventional arms control.

21. It was difficult to achieve disarmament without a climate of trust in the world; in that respect the progress registered in disarmament was a barometer indicating the level of mutual international confidence, which would be enhanced if States permitted international control and effective verification when undertaking commitments for disarmament. The world had to become a place where the force of argument replaced the argument of force.

22. Mr. TÜRKMEN (Turkey) said that his delegation fully shared the views of those Governments which considered that the goal of the special session devoted to disarmament was not to negotiate arms control agreements or to resolve outstanding questions immediately, but rather to produce guidelines for future bilateral, multilateral and regional negotiations. His delegation believed that the special session would give significant impetus to those negotiations and would promote and accelerate efforts towards the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It could also generate greater support for disarmament efforts through a better understanding of the questions relating to disarmament. His Government had therefore welcomed the decisions taken by the Preparatory Committee relating to the participation of non-governmental organizations in its work.

23. The Preparatory Committee had an urgent responsibility for the preparations required for the special session, but he would like to stress the important role that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament could play in doing everything possible to produce the necessary background material in time.

24. As measures relating to disarmament must enjoy the support of the great majority of States, the agenda for the special session, as well as the final document, should reflect the broadest possible agreement. His delegation hoped that the ongoing consultations regarding the draft agenda submitted by the non-aligned members would shortly result in a compromise text.

25. The next step in the preparatory work would undoubtedly be the elaboration of principles that would constitute the basis for a final political declaration. As the success of the preparatory work would depend on working out, in advance, a text reflecting a consensus on the basic content of such a final document, the Turkish delegation supported the suggestion that a committee of the whole should be established and entrusted with the drafting of that final document. He also supported the idea that the appropriate arrangements should be made for the intersessional work of the Preparatory Committee.

26. As to the content of the final document, a set of guiding principles should be agreed upon taking into account the concepts so far developed in the course of past negotiations on disarmament. In that context, stress should be laid on the principle of balance in disarmament measures and on the absolute need to prevent situations which would enable any State or group of States to gain military advantage.

27. As to the establishment of priorities in the field of disarmament, his delegation considered that, although prime importance should be attached to nuclear disarmament, the fact that measures relating to conventional weapons were just as important and urgent should not be overlooked.

28. Another item of high priority was the strengthening of the non-proliferation régime. It was to be hoped that while further measures to prevent the horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons were being considered the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy without restrictions would be assured. The importance of security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States should also be

stressed. His Government shared the concern expressed with respect to the current state of trade in, and the transfer of, conventional weapons and hoped that the question would be considered at the special session.

29. Another field that merited special attention was the connexion between disarmament and economic and social development. In that respect, his delegation supported the proposal by the Swedish delegation calling for a new United Nations study on the relationship between disarmament efforts and economic and social progress.

30. It was generally recognized that a prerequisite for the success of disarmament efforts was a global perspective and the universality of agreements. That required the direct participation of all nuclear States, as well as other militarily important Powers, in all negotiating forums. In the opinion of his Government, the chances for success would be greater if the negotiations were undertaken in bodies set up for specific purposes, such as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The special session would, however, provide an opportunity to review existing international disarmament machinery and to make the necessary improvements.

31. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan) said that it was of crucial importance that the special session should achieve its objectives. Those objectives must be defined with clarity and realism. The success of the session would, of course, depend on the will and resolve of all States in general, and the great Powers and other militarily significant States in particular, to overcome their differences so that meaningful results could be achieved.

32. Consideration of the record of the past 30 years led to the inescapable conclusion that, although a number of noteworthy measures had been taken in the field of disarmament, they had failed to bring the world anywhere near the goal of an international order based on collective security as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, 17 years after the General Assembly had formally declared general and complete disarmament as the goal of the United Nations, military expenditures continued to grow, both qualitatively and quantitatively.

33. Weapons of extreme precision had been added to weapons of mass destruction. Technological developments had given the arms race, particularly between the super-Powers, a self-perpetuating character. The spiral could only be broken by simultaneous endeavours aimed at bringing about a relaxation of tension and disarmament. The real danger facing mankind stemmed from the existence of huge nuclear arsenals and the possibility of their use. The complete prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and the eventual destruction of stockpiles should be the primary goal of action in the field of disarmament. In the opinion of his delegation, pending the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, urgent action should be taken in three areas: first, agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on a substantial reduction in the size of their nuclear arsenals and strategic delivery systems; second, agreement to refrain from further sophistication of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems; and, third, an undertaking by the nuclear-weapon Powers to refrain from the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear States.

34. Pakistan agreed that nuclear disarmament measures could not be considered in isolation from the problem of the high level of conventional armaments. There was thus an urgent need for the conclusion of specific agreements aimed at the reduction of conventional weapons, particularly those at the disposal of the two power alliances. In the opinion of his delegation, such reductions would not endanger, but would rather enhance, their security and would, furthermore, release vast resources which could be used for the betterment of the peoples of the countries concerned. In that context, he favoured the Swedish proposal that a new study should be made on the connexion between disarmament and economic development in all its aspects.

35. The special session must, of course, examine the problem of ensuring the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against nuclear attack or the threat of such attack. The ultimate aim must be the establishment of a system of positive guarantees, in other words, the system of collective security envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations. Pakistan considered that the special session could make progress on that issue on the basis of paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 31/189 C. Moreover, the non-nuclear-weapon States, which constituted the vast majority of the Members of the United Nations, should take the opportunity provided by the special session to show that they were prepared to take regional security measures against the nuclear danger. In that context, Pakistan supported the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace and reiterated its support for the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace.

36. Referring to the question of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, he said that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the IAEA system of safeguards proved that States were willing to accept certain restrictions on their freedom of action in the interest of eliminating nuclear weapons from the world. A viable system could not be based on the assumption that there could be a monopoly in the field of knowledge and technology or by making arbitrary distinctions. The most effective measure to restrain both vertical and horizontal proliferation would be a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. His delegation considered that a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests should not be made conditional on its acceptance by all nuclear-weapon States.

37. Pakistan accepted the broad list of items contained in the draft agenda submitted by the group of non-aligned countries, but suggested that consideration should be given to another item or subitem entitled "Adoption of agreements on disarmament" since, by the time of the special session, a comprehensive test ban treaty and a treaty banning chemical weapons might be ready.

38. As the special session was unlikely to complete its work in less than four to five weeks, and as very thorough preparations must be made in regard to the proposed declaration of principles and programme of action, it would be useful to arrange for the Preparatory Committee or a working group of the whole to meet between sessions. It would also be appropriate for the Centre for Disarmament, with the assistance of outside experts, to prepare background papers on important issues, a list of which could be drawn up after consultations.

39. Mr. ELLIOT (Belgium) said that the special session should provide the opportunity to implement a comprehensive disarmament programme under which all States, without distinction, would agree to participate in the implementation of recommended measures. The arms race, with its risks of destabilization and its impact on the economic development of States, was currently affecting all regions of the world. Disarmament was becoming an increasingly important matter of concern to all States, although some States, because of the weapons they possessed, had to assume special responsibilities.

40. The past 20 years had witnessed the growth of the role of the non-aligned world in international affairs. It was satisfactory to note in that connexion that the non-aligned countries had originated the idea of convening a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The General Assembly, in the proposed declaration, should emphasize the universality and parallelism of the activities to be undertaken, without necessarily selecting one field of action for absolute priority in relation to the others. In disarmament matters, the method of selecting priority fields and questions had often resulted in the long neglect of entire sectors in which useful efforts and activities could have been undertaken. The scope was broad enough to permit the preparation of a comprehensive programme in which activities would be carried out side by side, without prejudice to the special responsibilities of certain States, particularly the nuclear States.

41. Belgium had always believed that one of the main reasons why international efforts had come to a standstill was the lack of communication among nuclear States, whose responsibility to the international community should motivate them to seek ways of establishing a dialogue among themselves. It was to be hoped that the special session would help to bring about the conditions - particularly the institutional conditions - which would enable such a dialogue to begin. The Preparatory Committee should bear that objective in mind and prepare documentation which would enable all States to attend and participate in the special session.

42. For its part, the General Assembly should endeavour to broaden the scope of the measures which could contribute to disarmament. In that connexion, the question of the transfer of conventional weapons should receive closer attention from all States. Similarly, the United States suggestions concerning measures designed to improve the climate of international confidence and to reduce tension should be reflected in the agenda. The Assembly might also consider new working and negotiating methods which had scarcely been tried thus far. In that connexion, his delegation had already drawn attention at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, to the possibilities afforded by a regional approach to disarmament. It was not a question of a regional approach as opposed to a global approach. All such approaches, like any potential bilateral measures, were complementary. It should be borne in mind that the prospects for agreement on certain aspects of disarmament could vary from one region to another. His delegation intended to propose at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly that a global study of the regional aspects of disarmament should be undertaken.

43. Meanwhile, the Committee should develop the topic of the regional aspects of disarmament in the documents which it was to prepare for the special session.

44. As far as the organization of work was concerned, his delegation could agree to an extension of the third session of the Committee, which should soon address itself, in a practical manner, to the substantive questions to be included in the agenda of the special session. With regard to the studies to be undertaken by the Secretariat, as referred to in particular in Mexico's reply to the Secretary-General, the Committee should, in the light of the large volume of documentation already existing on disarmament questions, draw up precise terms of reference which would meet practical considerations and not place an undue burden on the Secretariat. If the Committee carried out its preparatory work adequately, the objectives of the special session might be achieved in a shorter time than that indicated by the representative of Mexico.

45. The CHAIRMAN invited the representative of Bulgaria to speak, in accordance with the provision permitting States Members of the United Nations which were not members of the Committee to participate in the work of the Committee without the right to vote.

46. Mr. KOSSEV (Bulgaria) said that the People's Republic of Bulgaria attached great importance to efforts to curb the arms race with the ultimate aim of achieving general and complete disarmament under strict international control. In conjunction with other socialist countries, Bulgaria was doing everything in its power to overcome the obstacles to disarmament in order to achieve decisive results in that area and to bring about the same relaxation of tension in the military field as had been achieved in the political field. Bulgaria would always speak out decisively in favour of the control of the arms race and disarmament.

47. In recent years, as a result of a process of relaxation of international tension and as a result of international and bilateral agreements, a number of measures had been taken to bring the arms race within established limits. Important negotiations were currently in progress on the adoption of new measures to limit armaments and bring about disarmament. However, although progress had been made towards reducing the danger of a new world conflict, there had been no slowing down of the arms race, which continued to be an obstacle to world peace and security, consumed enormous material resources and adversely affected world economic progress. For those reasons, the limitation of the arms race was a legitimate cause for concern for all nations and peoples and one of the most urgent tasks of the contemporary world. In that connexion, he referred to the proposal of the representative of the USSR concerning the convening of a world disarmament conference. That proposal had received the support of the majority of States Members of the United Nations and also of the Fifth Conference of Non-Aligned Countries. In a forum of that size, Governments could, with some hope of success, undertake an examination of all aspects of disarmament questions and take effective measures. Unfortunately, in spite of the numerous General Assembly resolutions supporting the world disarmament conference, it had not been possible to hold the conference thus far, for reasons which were well known.

48. At the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, most delegations, including his own, had supported the resolution on the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, on the understanding that that session was not to take the place of the world disarmament conference but was to be an important stage in the preparation of such a conference.

49. His delegation's views on the special session were clearly stated in the reply of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to the Secretary-General of the United Nations contained in document A/AC.187/36. As far as the agenda of the special session was concerned, it was very important that it should include, as a separate item, the question of the convening of the world disarmament conference. His delegation believed that, in order to achieve further progress in the disarmament talks, the final documents drawn up by the special session should state clearly that the main objective of the efforts of all States in the field of disarmament should be general and complete disarmament; should indicate the need for all militarily important States, in particular the nuclear-weapons States, to participate in the negotiations; and should emphasize the importance of the principle of not seeking unilateral advantages or endangering the security of States during the negotiations at the special session and in the taking of decisions. With regard to the priority measures which must be taken in the disarmament field, his delegation considered that the memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly deserved special attention. That document set out a realistic and pragmatic programme for joint action by all States on the main disarmament issues. The special session should not take the place of the existing machinery for negotiations on the question of disarmament, but should provide it with new vigour and improve its efficiency.

50. In conclusion, his delegation wished to point out that, in setting up the Preparatory Committee, the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, whose active work in the area of disarmament was well known, had not been done justice. It was to be hoped that, at the thirty-second session, the General Assembly would remedy that state of affairs and would enable the remaining socialist countries of Eastern Europe to take part in the deliberations of that important body as full members. Bulgaria had participated in the work of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva since its inception and was a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. He expressed the hope that the Preparatory Committee would include a recommendation on that question in its report to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session.

51. The CHAIRMAN appealed to members of the Committee to reach agreement on the agenda for the special session, so that the Committee could adopt it by consensus and proceed to subsequent phases of its work.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.



11th meeting

Wednesday, 18 May 1977, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.11

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. MESTIRI (Tunisia) said that, since the end of the Second World War and the establishment of the United Nations, disarmament had been one if not the main concern of the international community. Every year for the past 30 years the General Assembly had reiterated its conviction that the arms race constituted a danger the consequences of which would be catastrophic for all peoples without exception. For many years that concern - it might almost be called obsession - had found expression in many statements, and many solutions to the complex problem of the arms race had been proposed, unfortunately to no great avail. In certain sectors, the negotiations conducted in recent decades had yielded some partial and limited results which fell far short of the objectives the United Nations had set itself.
2. It had long been said that it was for the nuclear Powers alone to solve the disarmament question and that the achievement of agreement on objectives and on methods of limiting or completely eliminating the danger threatening everyone depended on those Powers alone. In view of the present complexity of the problem, however, and of the interdependence of the interests of peoples, it was vitally important to involve all members of the international community in the search for an effective solution to the arms race, since all had to suffer its consequences.
3. In the opinion of his delegation, the convening of a special session devoted to disarmament would make it possible to remedy the inadequacies of the methods adopted in recent years. One of the main tasks of the special session was to secure and define a common political will, which alone would make it possible to establish a new international strategy with universal participation. That was why Tunisia supported the idea of the adoption of a declaration on disarmament. That document should not only embody the political undertaking of all Member States to take effective action for disarmament but should also establish the objectives to be achieved and the guiding principles to be followed. The endeavour would succeed only if account was taken of the interests of all, particularly those who had not had an opportunity to express their opinion on that serious matter.
4. It would also be useful to draw up a comprehensive list of the various aspects of the arms race including, for example, those directly affecting the countries of the third world. In that connexion, Tunisia endorsed the Swedish delegation's proposal that the United Nations Centre for Disarmament should make a comprehensive study of the effects of the arms race on economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries.
5. The danger that the special session would merely turn into a repetition of the debates of the First Committee of the General Assembly must be avoided. A new political consensus must be formulated which would make it possible to adopt concrete and realistic measures. In view of the difficulty of the task, the

possibility of a second special session must not be ruled out; in any case, there remained the World Disarmament Conference, the convening of which had been supported by most Member States, including Tunisia.

6. His delegation endorsed the decision to invite non-governmental organizations directly concerned to participate in the work on disarmament, since they would not only submit useful suggestions and proposals but would also help to create a new awareness in world public opinion, which would constitute the best stimulus in the disarmament process.
7. He referred to the great discrepancy between the slow progress of disarmament negotiations and the speed with which technology facilitated the manufacture of new weapons and the rapidity of the geographical spread of the problem to all continents. That meant that the arms race was a problem for which a solution was urgently required.
8. As to the organization of work, the establishment of an intersessional working group with the task of examining Governments' proposals and formulating recommendations for their consideration by the Preparatory Committee would represent a considerable contribution to the success of the work.
9. The CHAIRMAN said that, in pursuance of the decision that Member States which were not members of the Preparatory Committee should be allowed to participate in the Committee's work without the right to vote, he proposed to invite the representatives of the Netherlands, New Zealand and Czechoslovakia to make statements.
10. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands) said that his Government's reply to the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 31/189 B on the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament showed that the Netherlands attached great importance to the problem of disarmament in both the nuclear and the conventional fields. In the United Nations, the Netherlands participated, in CCD and other bodies, in negotiations to bring about a limitation of the arms race, the ultimate goal being general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The special session would provide an opportunity to focus the attention of world public opinion on that question. His delegation hoped that an agenda for the special session would be drawn up and that it would reflect the political will of Governments to give new importance to United Nations efforts and other international efforts in the field of disarmament and arms control.
11. Referring to the excessive increase in conventional armaments, he said that there was no justification for the fact that both in the industrialized countries and in the developing countries scarce resources were being used to obtain arms in quantities beyond those required for national security. The special session should attach particular importance to the problem of the considerable expansion in the conventional arms trade, which absorbed means that could have contributed to the economic and social well-being of mankind.

12. Problems related to arms control and disarmament were connected with problems in other fields, such as economics and sociology. There was a relationship between development and disarmament: although they constituted separate aims, substantial progress in disarmament would favourably affect the economic development of the developing countries and enhance prospects for a new international economic order. In that connexion, the Netherlands supported the Swedish proposal that the United Nations should undertake a study on the subject of the interrelationship between disarmament and economic and social progress. Such a study would not only be a follow-up to the excellent work previously done on that subject but would also take into account the results of the sixth and seventh special sessions. In particular, it could deal with the following issues: the effects of arms control and disarmament measures on the release of financial resources, including determination of the extent to which a system could be devised whereby resources released would be used not only for national development but also for purposes of international development; the release of human resources, including discussion of whether persons employed in the armaments industry could be easily transferred to other industries and whether there should be national or international efforts to assist companies and workers in the conversion from arms manufacture to peaceful applications; the release of technological resources, including how technological know-how in the manufacture of arms could be switched to peaceful uses; the release of material resources, including examination of the fact that, whereas the release of such resources had immediate beneficial effect, it could produce negative effects for certain developing countries as a result of the drop in demand for certain materials for which there would be no immediate use in peaceful applications. It would also be necessary to study the effects of the arms race in terms of macroeconomic phenomena, including economic growth, inflation and employment. Another very important aspect was that of security. It was obvious that any country's development reached an optimum level to the extent that it felt secure from external threats. Genuine progress in international disarmament and arms control would create a favourable climate for economic growth. Although quantification was difficult, various qualitative aspects of the relationship between security and development could be studied.

13. Mr. TEMPLETON (New Zealand) said that his country's support for the convening of a special session was a direct reflection of its concern at the lack of substantive progress on disarmament. The continued proliferation, both vertical and horizontal, of nuclear weapons jeopardized the relaxation of international tension. It was clear that the production and refinement of nuclear weapons could not be halted by bilateral negotiations between super-Powers. The problem was not simply one of maintaining a balance of terror among the leading military Powers. The economic burden of armaments at their present level could not be supported by either the developed or the developing countries.

14. In New Zealand's view, the overwhelming priority of the special session must be nuclear disarmament. A further major step towards nuclear disarmament following

the Partial Test-Ban Treaty and the Non-Proliferation Treaty was overdue. The next logical step was a comprehensive test-ban treaty, for which the General Assembly had been calling with increasing urgency for a number of years. If a draft comprehensive test-ban treaty were to be prepared and ready for signature at the special session, that would in itself guarantee the session's success. The acceptance of a small number of general principles would facilitate the negotiation of such a treaty. Those general considerations included the following: (i) while it was obviously desirable for all nuclear-weapon States to participate from the beginning in the drafting of a treaty, the fact that one or more nuclear-weapon States might not be ready to do so did not constitute a reason for delaying the drafting of a treaty; (ii) there should be provision for verification which permitted a reasonable degree of certainty regarding all nuclear explosions of significant size. The verification issue was important, but should not provide a pretext for putting off the political task of negotiating a treaty; (iii) a comprehensive test-ban treaty must provide a satisfactory solution to the problem of so-called peaceful nuclear explosions. It had yet to be proved that the benefits - if there were any - to be derived from such experiments were likely to outweigh the political and environmental problems they created.

15. There was no justification for delaying the negotiation of a comprehensive test-ban treaty beyond 1977. His delegation trusted that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament would give first priority to that task, in order to allow for the completion of a draft treaty by the time the special session was held. Opening the treaty for signature at that time would generate maximum pressure for early ratification. The conclusion of that treaty would be an important step towards limiting vertical proliferation, but it was to be hoped that in the interval before the special session bilateral agreements would be concluded between the Governments possessing the most advanced nuclear-weapon systems. Such agreements should encompass actual reductions in the numbers of weapons in existing arsenals as well as prohibition of the development of new types of weapons.

16. No less important than the limitation of vertical proliferation were steps to halt horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons. Further ratifications of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, especially by potential nuclear-weapon States, and more effective controls on the supply of nuclear materials and nuclear technology which could be used to produce nuclear weapons, were urgently required. New Zealand would actively support proposals designed to secure those objectives while continuing to permit access to materials and technology required for the production of electric power through nuclear fission.

17. High priority should continue to be accorded to efforts to prohibit the use of inhumane weapons. New Zealand welcomed indications that agreement on a treaty to prohibit chemical weapons was within reach and that such a treaty would be open for signature by the time the special session was held.

18. New Zealand shared the widespread concern at the political and economic ill effects of a spreading arms race in conventional weapons. In its view, the principal arms producers should exercise restraint in responding to excessive demands and deny arms to States whose Governments engaged in the systematic violation of human rights. A United Nations study should be undertaken as soon as possible of all aspects of the problem of arms sales and his Government would continue to support initiatives to that end. Of fundamental importance in that regard was the need to release resources for social and economic development, particularly in the third world countries.

19. It was apparent that one special session of the General Assembly would not be able to formulate a wide range of new disarmament measures; however, if one or more major disarmament agreements were opened for signature at the time of the special session, the possibility of ratification would be increased. In addition, the special session should adopt a general declaration on disarmament and a programme of action. Likewise, a review of the United Nations disarmament machinery was an essential part of the task of the session. New Zealand recognized the need for a relatively small negotiating body, such as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, but at the same time it shared the dissatisfaction that had been expressed with that body's record. Nevertheless, during the current year CCD had shown signs that it was concentrating on issues of greater importance than in the past and was keeping United Nations Members better informed of the progress of its deliberations. New Zealand's approach to any proposed alteration of the existing machinery was a pragmatic one: it was disposed to judge by results. The special session would provide the opportunity to do so and if, before the convening of the special session, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was unable to reach agreement on those important issues, New Zealand would not rule out the possibility of seeking new methods of negotiation including, if necessary, the establishment of a new negotiating forum.

20. While understanding the reasoning behind the adoption of a conservative formulation concerning the participation of non-governmental organizations in the work of the Preparatory Committee, the New Zealand delegation reiterated its belief that such organizations had made and could make a distinctive contribution to the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament. It was confident that they would be able to make a positive contribution to the work of the special session.

21. Mr. SMID (Czechoslovakia) said that his Government had been very much interested in becoming a member of an organ as important as the Preparatory Committee. He therefore regretted the fact that, as a result of the inadequate representation of the States of the socialist community, it had not been possible for the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to sit on the Committee. His Government felt that the inadequate representation of the socialist countries failed to reflect the important role which those countries played in disarmament talks. He would therefore like to take the opportunity to stress his Government's continuing interest in becoming a full-fledged member of the Preparatory Committee. He hoped that that interest would be taken into consideration during the debate on the special session which would take place at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.

22. The convening of the special session was fully in keeping with the preparations for the world disarmament conference and would represent an important stage on the road towards its realization. That position did not conflict with the views expressed regarding the possibility of holding repeated special sessions on disarmament or with the emphasis placed on the need to prepare for the world disarmament conference, which his Government regarded as the only universal platform having the necessary authority to adopt concrete, effective disarmament measures.

23. His delegation was of the opinion that a number of positive and realistic proposals had already been submitted in connexion with the preparations for the special session. He wished, for example, to draw attention to the Soviet memorandum of 28 September 1976 on questions of ending the arms race and disarmament. The special session should give proper attention to that document, which was in harmony with the goals that the international community hoped to attain through the convening of the special session.

24. His Government felt that the agenda for the special session should include items on the preparations for the world disarmament conference, on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and on the adoption of a declaration on disarmament. The declaration should set forth basic guidelines on disarmament, the principle of the universality of negotiations, and priorities and guidelines for disarmament negotiations.

25. It was essential that the special session devoted to disarmament should not weaken or undermine the existing machinery for disarmament talks but, on the contrary, make them more effective. His delegation was in full accord with the view expressed by the representative of the German Democratic Republic (A/AC.187/SR.8) that those organs should not be held responsible for the inadequate progress of the disarmament talks, since they had proved their viability. The blame lay, rather, with a lack of will on the part of States, and that could not be dealt with by organizational measures. The special session should stimulate that will.

26. As to the question of the decisions to be adopted by the special session, his Government believed that the individual responsibility of all States Members of the United Nations - and, in particular, that of the nuclear Powers - would be expressed in the form of decisions. He therefore presumed that the principle of consensus would prevail at the special session, thus eliminating the possibility that only certain countries or groups of countries would accept its decisions.

27. His delegation was convinced that the special session would demonstrate the readiness of States to put an end to the arms race and would thus represent a concrete step towards general and complete disarmament, which was the goal of all realistic, sensible nations of the world.

28. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) said that Iraq attached the greatest importance to the question of disarmament, believing that it should be one of the fundamental goals of the United Nations since it was linked with the problem of maintaining international peace and security and could create a suitable atmosphere for

promoting international co-operation and accelerating the process of social and economic development, particularly in the developing countries. It was deplorable that, while millions of people were suffering from malnutrition, huge sums of money and tremendous efforts were being wasted on the manufacture of nuclear and other types of destructive weapons. Those resources could and should be used for world economic and social development, especially in the developing countries where they were most needed.

29. His delegation believed that the United Nations should be at the heart of that process and had therefore joined with other non-aligned countries in sponsoring the resolution calling for the convening of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. An appeal for the convening of a special session had been made at the Colombo Summit Conference, and he felt that the proposals made at that time by the non-aligned countries could serve as a fruitful basis for a successful session. He also wished to emphasize that the convening of a special session devoted to disarmament should in no sense represent an alternative to a world disarmament conference.

30. He observed that the aspirations of the international community for peace and security could not be attained in a vacuum. The granting of independence to peoples under foreign domination, the elimination of racism and colonialism, respect for the sovereignty of States and non-interference in their internal affairs would eliminate some of the factors which had led to the resort to arms. Genuine peace and security could not be achieved unless the strategies aimed at acquiring spheres of influence and world hegemony were eradicated.

31. The CHAIRMAN said that, since the negotiations for the adoption of the agenda by consensus were proceeding in a very positive manner, the request had been made that the Committee's work should be suspended for half an hour in order to permit an exchange of views on the subject.

32. The meeting was suspended at 11.55 a.m. and resumed at 12.40 p.m.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

33. The CHAIRMAN observed that the final phase of the negotiations had probably been reached and that, once the agenda for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was approved, the Preparatory Committee should make the best possible use of its time in considering other matters. Among the latter were the procedures to be employed in completing the preparatory work entrusted to the Committee, including the preparation of the draft Declaration on Disarmament and draft Plan of Action on Disarmament which were to be submitted to the special session. The Committee would also have to set the dates of its next session.

34. In view of the limited time and staff resources available to the Secretariat, the Committee should also draw up a list of priorities for the required documentation.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

12th meeting

Wednesday, 18 May 1977, at 4.20 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.12

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka) informed members that the informal consultations on the draft agenda proposed by the non-aligned members of the Committee (A/AC.187/43) had been successful and that a consensus had been reached on a final version. On behalf of the non-aligned countries, he wished to thank members for their co-operation and spirit of understanding.
2. The following amendments had been made in the draft agenda proposed by the non-aligned members: in paragraph 1, the words "lack of adequate progress" should be replaced by the words "pressing need for substantial progress"; in paragraph 2, the words "of principles" should be deleted; in paragraph 4, the word "including" should be replaced by the words "including, in particular,".
3. He also announced that he had just submitted a background paper (A/AC.187/55) on the special session which might be helpful to members in preparing their comments pursuant to General Assembly resolution 31/189 B. It was intended to be used as a working paper, and he would welcome any comments that members might wish to make on it.
4. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee approved the text of the draft agenda as read out by the representative of Sri Lanka.
5. It was so decided.
6. The CHAIRMAN thanked members for their spirit of co-operation, which had enabled the Committee to reach a consensus on the draft agenda. He particularly thanked the representative of Sri Lanka for the leadership which he had provided in the conduct of negotiations.
7. He suggested that the Committee should adjourn its formal meeting and continue its deliberations in an informal meeting. If he heard no objection, he would take it that members so agreed.
8. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.



13th meeting

Thursday, 19 May 1977, at 11 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. HARRY (Australia)

A/AC.187/SR.13

GENERAL DEBATE (continued)

1. Mr. SCALABRE (France) said that his Government's criticisms of disarmament efforts, as currently conceived and conducted, were well known. However, criticism was not sufficient. That was why his Government - which, as the French Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated in the General Assembly, was prepared to support any proposal aimed at genuine disarmament, i.e. the effective destruction of all types of weapons, both nuclear and conventional, at a reasonable rate of speed and under effective international control - welcomed the convening of a special session devoted to disarmament.
2. His Government had made known its views on the work of the special session and the Preparatory Committee in the communication it had addressed to the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 31/189 B, in which it had emphasized in particular that participation in the special session should be universal, with no privileges for any State, regardless of its size and regardless of the responsibilities devolving on it because of the size of its arsenal. It had been stated in the communication that no aspect of disarmament should be excluded from the competence of the special session, which should freely discuss all problems relating to that complicated undertaking without, however, interfering in ongoing negotiations or departing from a subject which must be constantly borne in mind.
3. The text of the draft provisional agenda submitted by the non-aligned countries (A/AC.187/54), which had been adopted with minor changes at the previous meeting, reflected the concern of its sponsors to establish a broad framework, open to all opinions and in no sense prejudging those views which, in the course of the special session, would form the consensuses hoped for by all.
4. At its September session, the Preparatory Committee would examine the question of a declaration of principles and a programme of action. His delegation would participate actively in that work, and it wished to emphasize now that one of the main objectives of the special session should be a thorough study of disarmament procedures and structures leading to the establishment of an effective negotiating body which would work in close co-operation with the United Nations. Secondly, although there was obviously a need for nuclear disarmament - and it should be emphasized that that was a problem separate from the cessation of nuclear tests - the fact that nuclear disarmament could not be achieved without parallel progress in conventional disarmament should not be overlooked. Only if there was parallelism between the two spheres would it be possible to avoid the disruption of the strategic balance and the insecurity which might arise during the gradual development of the stages which should characterize such a delicate undertaking.

5. Mr. OGISO (Japan) said that if the special session was to achieve its objective - general and complete disarmament - all participating States must remember that political confrontations were counterproductive and that the special session represented a constructive opportunity for deliberations which would lead to concrete disarmament measures.

6. His delegation commended the non-aligned members of the Committee for their efforts to achieve a balanced formulation of the agenda which had been adopted at the previous meeting (A/AC.187/54) and believed that in all deliberations due consideration should be given to the interests of nuclear-weapon States which were not members of the Preparatory Committee. It hoped that that policy would continue to be followed at all stages of the Committee's work so that all nuclear-weapon States would participate in the special session.

7. His delegation felt that in future the Preparatory Committee should concentrate its attention on the formulation of the final documents, namely a declaration of principles and guidelines and a programme of action. The declaration should be adopted by consensus, with the support of all nuclear-weapon States. The programme of action should be comprehensive and integrated and should provide a broad and flexible framework for future work. It should be broad enough to ensure that account was taken of the concerns of all countries and flexible enough to permit the adoption of realistic and concrete measures in the immediate future and in the medium and long term, according to priorities. The programme should aim at giving world public opinion a broad, organic picture of concrete tasks in the field of disarmament, to be executed in successive stages but without a rigid time-table.

8. Although a number of significant agreements on arms control and disarmament had been concluded in the past two decades, mainly as a result of the efforts of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, the measures adopted thus far did not seem to have produced sufficient progress. That was due to the fact that, in the past, disarmament negotiations had tended to give priority to preventive and peripheral measures. Accordingly, his Government earnestly hoped that the special session would devote itself to deliberations on crucial and central issues which would lead to the final goal of general and complete disarmament. Hence, in its reply to the Secretary-General pursuant to resolution 31/189 B, his Government had stated that at the special session high priority should be given to such issues as cessation of the nuclear arms race and the reduction of nuclear armaments, a comprehensive nuclear test ban, the prohibition of chemical weapons, regulation of the international transfer of conventional weapons and the reduction of military budgets.

9. Nuclear disarmament was unquestionably the crux of the disarmament problem. As a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Japan was convinced that if the Treaty was to be effectively implemented universal accession to it was essential; at the same time, however, no effort should be spared to rectify the inequality inherent in the fact that the Treaty granted a special status to nuclear-weapon States. The special session would be an appropriate

time for the nuclear-weapon States to acknowledge their grave responsibility for nuclear disarmament and to adopt measures aimed at halting the nuclear arms race and reducing nuclear stockpiles; otherwise, the régime of the Non-Proliferation Treaty could not be maintained permanently. As a first step, it was urgently necessary to conclude a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty which would pave the way for prohibition of the development and improvement of nuclear weapons.

10. The special importance of nuclear disarmament should not divert attention from the struggle for conventional disarmament, for the recent acceleration in international transfers of conventional weapons would not only intensify existing conflicts but also increase the danger that new disputes would arise in many parts of the world. A great many countries had expressed the view that that matter should be carefully examined at the special session, and his delegation felt that a common stand in favour of giving more attention to the question of conventional disarmament had developed. The special session should therefore place the utmost emphasis on measures to move forward in stages towards the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and towards the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces.

11. Mr. RIOS (Panama) recalled that on many occasions in the course of the history of mankind attempts had been made to abandon the possession and use of arms. With the increasing sophistication of weapons, the situation had become more alarming and, since the middle of the previous century, efforts to limit and control weapons had multiplied. In that connexion, mention should be made of the three Hague Conferences, the references to the question contained in Wilson's 14 Points and in the Treaty of Versailles, and the initiatives taken by the League of Nations. Both the League's Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments and other subsequent attempts had failed dismally.

12. Since its earliest days, the United Nations had been preoccupied with the question, and the determination of the peoples of the United Nations to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war had found expression in the preamble to the Charter. Although since then much had been said and written about the subject in the Organization, the results were frankly disappointing. It was unquestionably an almost impossible task, given the number of political and economic interests involved. Nevertheless, despite the frustrations and the deceit of those who spoke of disarmament while secretly manufacturing weapons, despite the fact that the arms trade was excellent business, and despite the lack of trust and the fear that lay at the heart of the situation, general and complete disarmament would ultimately have to come about.

13. The day was not far distant when third world Governments, aware of the global threat of the arms race and of the fact that the astronomical amounts being spent on the production of, trade in and purchase of weapons could otherwise be used to meet the most basic needs of their peoples, would rebel against that state of affairs and impose an international boycott on arms suppliers.

14. His delegation reiterated its support for the proposal of the Colombo Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries calling for the convening of a world disarmament conference or a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament; it supported, in general, all measures favouring the holding of the special session, which should make an important contribution to the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. At the special session, the General Assembly would have to take decisions on such concrete steps as convening a world disarmament conference and demanding that the great Powers destroy their nuclear arsenals under safe and responsible international control.

15. The arms race was repugnant to the conscience of the world because, in addition to threatening the very existence of mankind, it enabled certain powerfully armed States to establish military bases in other countries and to maintain troops in their territory in violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter. It kept non-weapons-producing countries in a state of humiliating dependence. In many parts of the world, colonial enclaves and racist régimes maintained themselves by force and the use of arms against the will of indigenous majorities, and the same could perhaps be said with regard to the 14 military bases maintained by one great Power in the Panama Canal Zone. The arms race was often promoted by those who manufactured and traded in arms for profit or by Governments desirous of expanding their sphere of influence or pursuing neo-colonialist interests. Nor should it be forgotten that the manufacture, stockpiling and transport of certain types of arms had an adverse effect on the environment.

16. He suggested that it might be advisable to have the great Powers provide films on the weapons currently included in their stockpiles for projection during the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Such a "document" would be more convincing than many speeches, studies and statistics.

17. His delegation wished to express its appreciation to those delegations which year after year had worked for the cause of disarmament and, particularly, to the Mexican delegation for its untiring efforts and concrete contributions to that cause.

18. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) said that the great majority of mankind had always yearned eagerly for general and complete disarmament. The growth of the arms race, which drained away huge resources that should be used to improve the living conditions of all peoples, was arousing justified alarm throughout the world. Never before had arms had such destructive power nor had the risk of the destruction of the human race been so real, for the currently existing nuclear stockpiles had the potential to destroy the planet earth several times over.

19. In 1973, the international community had spent \$30 million an hour on armies and weapons, i.e. more than \$300 billion a year. The funds thus wasted in four days could have fed, for a whole year, 200 million children who were the victims of poverty in various parts of the world. Nevertheless, the arms race continued while hundreds of millions of human beings lacked the bare essentials of life. That apparent paradox was inexplicable if one forgot that war and the threat of war had

been and were a fabulous business for powerful imperialist monopolies. The latter were the worst enemies of world peace; they had introduced gross distortions into the economies of a number of capitalist countries, which could apparently find no outlet but in promoting international tension and conflict. Accordingly, universal disarmament could not be achieved without establishing a system of international relations that was based on equality and respect for the rights of all peoples, that excluded all manifestations of a policy of aggression, domination and interference, and that enabled all States, large and small, to develop peacefully, independently and safely.

20. The present situation called for prompt action. The process of détente should be extended to the military field. In that connexion, Cuba reiterated its support for the proposals contained in the memorandum of 28 September 1976 addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

21. The members of the Preparatory Committee could make an important contributions to the cause of disarmament by ensuring that the forthcoming special session of the General Assembly did not become just another exercise in rhetoric but rather a framework for promoting practical results. To that end, it was essential to observe the principle of consensus in the adoption of decisions and to ensure the equitable participation of all ideologies and groups of States in the preparatory process for the special session. In that connexion, his delegation supported an increase in the representation of the socialist States in the Preparatory Committee and trusted that the General Assembly would take the necessary decisions to put an end to the existing imbalance, which was unfair to that group of States.

22. His Government attached the greatest importance to the prompt convening of the world disarmament conference, which had been consistently advocated by the non-aligned countries since their first summit conference held in 1961 in Belgrade. The conference, with the participation of all States, could examine the agenda in proper perspective, giving due attention to all the factors involved. His delegation therefore felt that the world disarmament conference should be given high priority as a separate item on the agenda of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. However, the special session should not be regarded as a substitute for the world conference but should rather be a gateway leading to its early convocation.

23. The international community could thus advance towards general and complete disarmament in conditions which guaranteed the independence, territorial integrity and legitimate rights of all countries and which strengthened the process of international détente, making it irreversible and world-wide.

24. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) recalled that there was a close relationship between disarmament and international security. However, for many years the disarmament effort had been kept isolated, with no parallel effort for international security. That isolation had deprived negotiations of the necessary background of international security and of the resulting climate of confidence. The United Nations Charter, particularly Articles 11, 26 and 47, showed the close relationship

between disarmament and security. Furthermore, the first resolution adopted by the United Nations in 1946 had been devoted to disarmament and linked to the question of security. In another early resolution (41 (I)), the General Assembly had asserted that the problem of security was closely connected with that of disarmament. However, subsequent General Assembly resolutions on disarmament in the 1950s had made no mention of international security. The many rounds of negotiations that had followed had yielded no results. High hopes had been raised in 1961 by the McCloy-Zorin joint statement of agreed principles on general and complete disarmament. In the long disarmament negotiations over many years, attention had been focused on the mechanics of disarmament proposals without any parallel effort towards international security. Yet, the joint statement of agreed principles, in article 7, had clearly provided that progress in disarmament should be accompanied by necessary measures to maintain international peace and security, including the obligation of States to place at the disposal of the United Nations agreed manpower necessary for an international peace force to be equipped with agreed types of armaments.

25. At the current stage of disarmament discussions, it must be accepted the progress on disarmament could not be achieved outside the political context of the world. Effective progress on the problem of the arms race and disarmament would continue to be hampered so long as there was no means of ensuring the security of nations other than dependence on armaments. The functions of the United Nations, and more particularly of the Security Council, for the maintenance of international peace and security would have to come into play.

26. Co-operative efforts in a climate of confidence were pre-eminently needed in the disarmament endeavour. Such a climate required a framework less antagonistic than that of the outworn concept of balance of power, which was but the extreme of mistrust - short of war. Regrettably, during all those years of disarmament efforts, there had been no diminution of the arms race. The stockpiling of nuclear megatonnage had gone from 6,000 in 1960 to 320,000 in 1968, and it continued to escalate. According to expert opinion, no more than 12,000 megatons in terms of radio-activity alone would be enough to destroy all human life on the American continent and beyond. Thus, the existing stockpiles of hundreds of thousands of megatons could destroy not only all life on the planet but the atmospheric environment that made life possible.

27. As reported in 1961, world military spending had stood at \$120 billion annually. By 1970 it had risen to \$200 billion - an increase of \$80 billion in 10 years. In 1975-1976, it had risen to \$300 billion. Expenditure at the present time was estimated at \$400 billion, representing a sudden increase of almost \$100 billion in one year. Such a tremendous waste of valuable resources, which were needed for the preservation and development of human life but which instead were diverted towards its destruction, in itself represented an economic problem of vast dimensions and linked development directly with disarmament. The arms race and military spending were formidable obstacles to solving development problems. Disarmament, development and international security must be examined together in a highly interdependent world. His delegation therefore proposed formally that the Secretary-General, with the help of consultant experts, should undertake a study on the interrelationship between those three factors.

28. So that generally acceptable solutions could be reached, all States must participate in consultations which would take into account their views and suggestions. It was therefore essential that formal and informal consultations on the content and drafting of the documents to be adopted by the special session should be conducted on the basis of studies and papers concerning a new approach.

29. What was needed above all was a return to a modicum of legal order, which ironically had never before fallen to such a low point as at present, in the United Nations era. The road to world legal order lay through international security, which would become a reality only when decisions of the Security Council were effectively enforced. The interest of Cyprus in legal order and international security was not related only to the present situation in that country. In its first statement in the general debate, in 1960, when Cyprus had become a Member of the United Nations as a newly independent country, his delegation had stressed the need for international security, as stipulated in the Charter, through the establishment of a United Nations force to maintain world peace and security. It was a tragic irony of fate that subsequently Cyprus had become a living example of the lack of international security, even when Security Council decisions had been unanimous. In 1968, Cyprus had submitted a draft resolution proposing a study of the link between disarmament, development and international security. He was gratified to note that the concept of international security as a pre-condition progress disarmament had received support in some of the replies from Member States to the Secretary-General on the subject of the special session.

30. Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria) expressed the satisfaction of his delegation at the success of the Preparatory Committee in drawing up a draft agenda for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, with the approval of all members of the Committee. He was particularly gratified that the draft reflected the views of the Algerian Government, as transmitted to the Secretary-General in its reply (A/AC.187/28), on the lack of adequate progress in disarmament, on the continuation of the arms race and on the need to create conditions favourable to disarmament. In that connexion, his Government attached great importance to the need to establish a climate of confidence between States, through the final resolution of local conflicts, the elimination of the last remnants of colonialism and racism, and the ending of policies of spheres of influence, of interference in the internal affairs of States, and of denial of the right to self-determination of peoples under foreign domination.

31. His delegation noted with satisfaction that the Committee had decided to include in the agenda a review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament and of the international machinery for negotiations on disarmament. It considered that the United Nations should assume its natural role of providing leadership and guidance in the field of disarmament and should participate more actively in the disarmament process. It continued to support the convening of a World Disarmament Conference in which all nuclear-weapon States would participate.

32. The second phase of the Committee's preparatory work involved the preparation of a declaration of principles on disarmament and of a programme of action. The

non-aligned members of the Committee had prepared a working paper which, he hoped, would form the basis for informal talks as a prelude to negotiations. His delegation agreed that the talks should be informal during the period between the end of the current session and 31 August, when the third session was due to start. He regretted that he did not share the views of those delegations which had suggested that the third session should take place after the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament had finished its work. It had to be remembered that the dates of the third session had been set by the Committee at the beginning of its first session and that the majority of the Committee members were not members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament; most delegations would also be busy with the ad hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, which was scheduled to meet between 12 and 15 September next. Furthermore, he could not accept the idea of the Preparatory Committee becoming a kind of subsidiary organ of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and having to modify its programme of work accordingly. It should also be remembered that the documentation approved by the General Assembly on the basis of the work done by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament included a recommendation that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should submit an annual report to the General Assembly in sufficient time to enable Member States to examine it. He therefore considered that the dates originally set for the third session of the Preparatory Committee should be maintained.

33. He also considered that, during that session, the Preparatory Committee should concentrate on preparing its provisional report for submission to the General Assembly at its next session.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

34. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that decisions had still to be taken regarding informal intersessional consultations and talks, as well as on whether informal meetings should be held before the Committee's next official meeting. The Committee would also have to reach a decision regarding the documentation to be requested from the Secretariat.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.



14th meeting

Friday, 20 May 1977, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.14

1. Mr. MACAULAY (Nigeria) said that as a result of the endeavours of the founding members of the non-aligned movement to make known the objectives and perspectives of the group, Africa had remained relatively safe from atomic blasts. Paradoxically, nationalism had recently been increasing at a time when the most serious issues facing mankind could only be resolved through recognition of interdependence. As Mrs. Bandaranaike, the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, had said at the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, the polarization of the world around two power centres, which was the case until recently, was neither conducive to world security and peace nor even beneficial to the national or regional interests of the countries which had been parties to the military alliances of the immediate post-war period.
2. His delegation was pleased to note that the principles to which he had referred had gained support even outside the ambit of the group and it hoped that the non-aligned movement would become a melting-pot of nationalities. He expressed his appreciation to the delegations of Austria, Sweden, Pakistan, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and many other countries, which had indicated their willingness to support the movement, and to the many non-governmental organizations which had pledged their unflinching support to the common endeavour to safeguard mankind.
3. In welcoming any assistance offered to the non-aligned group, he wished to make it clear that the group had never aspired to be a monolith and that, to the extent that circumstances permitted, its members could have reservations with respect to the group's official working paper or other working papers, which did not pretend to be an immutable blue print, but rather guidelines leading to agreement by consensus.
4. In the opinion of his delegation, at the special session devoted to disarmament the General Assembly should examine the following questions: the structure and functions of existing negotiation machinery on disarmament matters; the link between disarmament and economic and social progress, particularly in the third world; the link between sales and/or transfers of arms and local conflicts or wars in third world countries; the link between mining and prospecting rights and the control of scarce raw materials and disestablishment, or threats of disestablishment, in smaller and weaker countries; the observance of existing zones of peace and nuclear-weapon-free zones and the creation of others where necessary; the need to make available to smaller countries, particularly the non-nuclear-weapon States, the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear technology, bearing in mind, inter alia, that, apart from Australia, Africa produced all the uranium necessary for nuclear development; the need to guarantee the safety of safeguards, for it was inconceivable that, in order to reap the benefits of technology it should be more profitable for countries to remain outside the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons than to ratify it, and that whole cargoes of uranium could disappear for clandestine uses.

5. In conclusion, he said that the world should not wait for a catastrophe before deciding that the time had come to reach a viable global agreement on nuclear weapons. It was intolerable that, according to reports, some 500,000 scientists in the United States and some 900,000 in the Soviet Union were engaged in research geared to war, when some of their knowledge could more profitably be used in studying the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, particularly in the developing world.

6. Mr. LEONARD (United States of America) said that the informal discussions and exchanges of view - which, in the opinion of his delegation, provided the best and most effective means of carrying out the work assigned to the Committee - had led to a consensus on the particular task of the current session, namely, the preparation of a draft agenda for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It was encouraging to note the evidence of willingness on all sides to understand different points of view and make the necessary concessions.

7. Although the agenda approved would probably serve as a useful framework for the work of the special session and the future organization and direction of preparatory work, it must be recognized that it represented only a small fraction of the immense task facing not only members of the Committee but also those countries willing to contribute to the success of the special session. In the coming months it would be necessary to clarify and consolidate objectives, determine the main areas to be examined and reach agreement on the best means of seizing the opportunity provided by the special session to give a strong impetus to disarmament negotiations. That would require intensive preparations at the national level and a broad and sustained pattern of consultations. For its part, the United States would continue its endeavours to identify ways in which the special session could lead to an acceleration and broadening of the disarmament process in the light of the pressing need for substantial progress in the field of disarmament.

8. His delegation hoped that the momentum generated at the current session would not be lost and that bilateral, regional and multilateral talks would continue. In that connexion, it supported the Chairman's proposal that work should be continued on an informal basis between sessions. While it would be necessary for Governments to bear responsibility for decisions in the field of disarmament, the delegation of the United States of America believed that support and ideas should be sought from all available sources. In particular, it believed that private and non-governmental organizations and national and international research institutes could make significant contributions. It hoped such bodies would use their talents and energies to develop ideas for the special session.

9. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed satisfaction with the constructive nature of the debates and considered that the exchange of ideas would guarantee the success of the preparations for the special session. The adoption of an acceptable draft agenda marked an important achievement of the current session and would lead to positive results. The next step would be to consider the opinions expressed by the various Governments and the nature of the decisions the General Assembly would have to adopt at the special session. In the documents adopted, emphasis would have to be placed on the pressing need to halt the arms race, the need to avoid a third world war, and the dangers inherent in the arms race, which absorbed resources that could be used for other constructive purposes.

10. Although the concrete results so far achieved were unsatisfactory, it must be acknowledged that some of the conditions necessary for halting the arms race existed. In that context, the relaxation of tension and peaceful coexistence of recent years were conducive to the holding of fruitful discussions. Referring to statements made by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, Mr. Brezhnev, he said that the negotiations would have a favourable outcome to the extent that the participants demonstrated a genuine desire to consolidate peace and were prepared to reach decisions that would not endanger the interests of some countries or give unilateral advantages to others. The Soviet Union was acting on the basis of those criteria.

11. Agreements concluded in recent years on limitation of the arms race were of great importance for progress towards disarmament. Their importance was such that they should be reflected in the final documents of the special session. They included agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States on the reduction of nuclear weapons and limitation of strategic arms, negotiations on the banning of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, and the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and ocean floor. Negotiations on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons were also vitally important, as were the conventions on the prohibition of bacteriological (biological) weapons and other agreements on the reduction of armaments. On 18 May, at Geneva, a large number of States had signed the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques. That represented an important step towards strengthening the peace and security of peoples and safeguarding the environment.

12. It should be emphasized in the final documents prepared by the special session that inter-State discussions were taking place on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, the prohibition of chemical weapons, and the prohibition of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. Negotiations on further reductions of strategic weapons were continuing between the USSR and the United States, as were talks on the reduction of military forces and armaments in Central Europe. Participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe had undertaken not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In the United Nations, consideration was being given to the question of a universal treaty on the non-use of force in international relations.

13. In the opinion of the Soviet Union, the principal approaches to the solution of the problem of disarmament at the current stage of international relations should be stated in the resolutions of the special session. States should be encouraged to pursue the basic and final objective of all disarmament efforts, namely, general and complete disarmament under strict international control, since that was the only way in which mankind could be guaranteed universal peace and security on a lasting and firm basis.

14. From that standpoint, all States had an obligation to progress towards the achievement of concrete goals, taking every possible opportunity to prohibit and eliminate existing types of weapons, to prevent the manufacture of new systems of weapons of mass destruction, to keep entire regions of the world out of the arms race, and to reach agreement in other areas.
15. One of the main prerequisites for success in disarmament agreements should be the principle of allowing the greatest possible number of States, particularly nuclear States and those with the most powerful weapons and forces, to participate in the talks and in the adoption of measures. As for nuclear disarmament, the participation of all the nuclear Powers was absolutely essential.
16. Measures to solve the problems of the arms race and disarmament should not in any way jeopardize the security of States. If that principle was violated or if any attempt was made to obtain undue unilateral advantages, the effectiveness of negotiations for the adoption of viable agreements could not be guaranteed.
17. It was also important that the decisions to be taken by the special session should include provisions concerning the use of the resources released as a result of disarmament measures for the improvement and well-being of mankind, the accomplishment of the main tasks facing mankind, such as the war against hunger, disease and illiteracy, and the solution of social, energy and ecological problems, as well as for the economic progress of the developing countries.
18. The special session should establish guidelines for States in their disarmament efforts. In that connexion, the USSR had submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session a memorandum setting forth several measures that could be taken to solve the problems faced by mankind in the field of disarmament. Above all, it was essential to achieve the cessation of the nuclear-arms race. Nuclear disarmament measures should include the prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the supply of such weapons to the armed forces of States, as well as the reduction of existing stockpiles and, as a final goal, their complete destruction.
19. The question of the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, which also represented a threat to peoples, should be considered simultaneously with the question of nuclear disarmament.
20. One of the priority measures to be taken in the prohibition of the nuclear-arms race was the general and complete ban on nuclear-weapon tests. Another important task was the strengthening of the system for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. It was important to enhance the effectiveness of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons by making it genuinely universal and by reinforcing the IAEA system of safeguards. It was essential to ensure that international co-operation in the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes did not become a channel for the proliferation of nuclear weapons.
21. The special session should also take decisions concerning the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons so as to prevent scientific and technological

advances from being used for destructive purposes. Similarly, practical measures should be taken for the reduction and limitation of aircraft, artillery, tanks and other types of conventional weapons.

22. The adoption of regional measures of military détente and disarmament, such as the establishment of zones of peace in various regions, in particular in the Indian Ocean, would make a substantial contribution to the limitation of the arms race and to disarmament by eliminating foreign military bases and by prohibiting the shipping of nuclear weapons in the Mediterranean.

23. The reduction of military budgets was one of the most powerful means for limiting the arms race. The resources thus released could be devoted to furthering the economic and social progress of peoples, particularly those of the developing countries.

24. The USSR was prepared to take into account the opinions of other States on those and other matters and to take an active part in the formulation of constructive decisions. The existing negotiation machinery should be maintained, as it had already proved effective. At the special session, special attention should be given to the adoption of further measures for the convening of the World Disarmament Conference, in accordance with the agreement to include an item on the convening of the World Disarmament Conference in the agenda of the special session.

25. The CHAIRMAN said that, once the general debate was over, the Committee had to take up three matters: the date of the next session of the Preparatory Committee, the procedures to be followed between sessions in order to expedite the work and, finally, the working papers that had been or would be requested from the Secretariat.

26. With regard to the question of the dates for the next session, during informal meetings it had apparently been agreed that members of the Preparatory Committee would begin unofficial meetings on 22 August 1977 and that the official meetings would be held from 31 August to 9 September. In response to a remark by the representative of Canada, he said that if the Committee felt it advisable to continue unofficial meetings beyond 31 August it could do so, but in any event official meetings would have to be held in order to place the Committee's work on record. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the schedule he had suggested reflected the consensus of the Committee.

27. It was so decided.

28. The CHAIRMAN noted, with regard to the procedures to be followed between sessions, that at the unofficial meetings it had been suggested, and the various delegations had agreed, that contact groups should be created; it should be made clear, however, that that would not be an institutional or organic arrangement. It might be advisable to use some other expression, such as "liaison representatives". He suggested that each group should designate its own representatives so that at any given moment it would be clear who should be

contacted to ascertain the views or reactions of the various groups of States within the Preparatory Committee. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that procedure.

29. It was so decided.

30. The CHAIRMAN said that the third question concerned the working papers that had been or would be requested from the Secretariat. The representatives of Mexico, Poland and Cyprus had made suggestions in that connexion at previous meetings and he now intended to call upon them to make statements.

31. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that the text of the views of the Government of Mexico on the agenda and other relevant questions relating to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament appeared in document A/AC.187/34. In that text, his Government had suggested that the Secretariat should prepare as working papers 10 authoritative studies on the background and most relevant aspects of disarmament and the nuclear-arms race.

32. In response to a suggestion by the Chairman, his delegation had held talks on the matter with all delegations which had shown interest in the subject and with other delegations which it had deemed advisable to consult. As a result, a consensus had been reached whereby it was now proposed that eight working papers should be prepared. One of the studies omitted was the one originally listed as (9) namely, an analytical list of the agreements concluded in the bilateral talks known by the acronym SALT, regarding which the Director of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament had said that perhaps some of the delegations that had participated in the SALT talks had more complete information than the Secretariat. With regard to the working paper originally listed as (6), "A list of bilateral or multilateral meetings on disarmament held outside the United Nations since 1945, with an indication of the procedures followed in each case to keep the Organization informed", part had been omitted, and the rest had been added to working paper (1). Of the remaining titles, (2), (3) and (4) remained exactly the same as in the original list, and (8) was the same as that originally listed as (10).

33. He then read out the list of documents on which a consensus had been reached in the Committee:

(1) A brief synopsis of negotiations on disarmament and arms limitation, including their results, held since 1945 (a) within the United Nations, (b) on a regional basis or (c) bilaterally, with an indication, when appropriate, of the procedures followed in each case to keep the Organization informed;

(2) A comparative study of the scope originally proposed or aimed at in draft multilateral disarmament treaties of a universal character concluded under United Nations auspices and the scope finally fixed in those treaties, including the contemplated measures for expanding that scope;

(3) A comprehensive study of official proposals or declarations made and decisions taken by the General Assembly on the procedure of unilateral or negotiated moratoria as a provisional measure for the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests, as well as their application by any State;

(4) A synthesis of the arguments adduced for and against each of the four proposals for the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones that have been included in the General Assembly's agenda (Africa, South Asia, the Middle East and the South Pacific) and for and against the proposal for the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, including a subject index and a country index;

(5) A comprehensive study of the origin, development and present status of various views proposed for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons;

(6) An analytical summary of studies made by the United Nations describing the effects of the use of nuclear weapons, bacteriological (biological) weapons and napalm and other incendiary weapons, as well as those relating to the reduction of military budgets, including the economic and social consequences of the arms race and disarmament and the relationship between development and disarmament;

(7) A comparative study of global military expenditures and development assistance since 1945, as recorded in available official and unofficial documents;

(8) A descriptive report on the human and material resources available to the United Nations Secretariat for its work on disarmament and on the organization of that work.

34. With respect to title No. (7), he pointed out that reference was made to "global" military expenditures because it was impossible to break down military expenditures on a country-by-country basis. Unfortunately, Governments still had not heeded the suggestion made on a number of occasions in the General Assembly that they should regularly provide the Secretary-General with information regarding their military expenditures. It should be noted that at the time of the League of Nations such information had been made available. Moreover, the phrase "the possible significance of such expenditures in the economic and social field", which had appeared in title No. (8) of the original, had been omitted because it might present serious problems for the Secretariat.

35. His delegation hoped that the text, as amended, would be adopted unanimously by the Committee.

36. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) said that his proposal was very simple and had already been formulated at the meeting of 10 May 1977. He then read out the relevant part of summary record A/AC.187/SR.5: "... his delegation proposed that, for the next session of the Preparatory Committee, the Secretariat should compile a document listing disarmament proposals officially submitted to the United Nations. The list should present the substance of the proposal, the date and country of submission, and the status of its follow-up."

37. That list would enumerate chronologically the proposals on disarmament which had been submitted in the United Nations and in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. His delegation had consulted with a number of delegations and felt that such a compilation would constitute a very useful document for the Preparatory Committee. Furthermore, he believed that it could be prepared quite easily and without considerable additional cost.
38. The CHAIRMAN asked if the representative of Poland was referring only to proposals which had been adopted, or to all proposals, including those which had not.
39. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) said that he was not referring to resolutions, which appeared in other documents, but to specific proposals, some of which had been adopted and others rejected. That would be clarified when the status of the particular proposal was discussed. It was possible that some of the proposals submitted might be reconsidered at the special session.
40. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that the study proposed by his delegation referred to the close interrelationship between disarmament, international peace and security and economic development, that it was part of the study required under item 1 of the draft agenda, and that it should be submitted to the forthcoming session of the General Assembly, to which the Preparatory Committee must also submit a report in accordance with its mandate. The study should therefore be completed in time for submission to the General Assembly.
41. The CHAIRMAN said that the proposal of Cyprus was addressed to the Secretary-General. Since it involved financial implications on which the Committee could not yet take a decision, it might be useful if Cyprus would submit it to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, at which the relevant decision would be adopted. If his view was accepted, perhaps the study might be ready before the special session.
42. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) inquired whether the Secretary-General did not have the funds to carry out certain studies, in the event that the Committee decided to make the request in question. He did not believe that the costs would be excessive. Otherwise it would be necessary to await the decision of the General Assembly.
43. The CHAIRMAN said that the Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs had replied negatively to the question of the representative of Cyprus. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the proposals submitted by Mexico and Poland.
44. It was so decided.
45. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) thanked the Committee for having adopted the proposal submitted by Mexico and, in connexion with the working paper submitted by his delegation (A/AC.187/56), said that the title defined it clearly: "Some fundamental principles and norms for inclusion in the 'Declaration on Disarmament' envisaged in the draft agenda of the special session of the General Assembly devoted



to disarmament, approved by the Preparatory Committee on 18 May 1977". He pointed out that in the English translation an essential adjective had been omitted. It should read "for possible conclusion" rather than only "for inclusion", because it was not the intention of his delegation to dictate the terms of the Declaration on Disarmament. He hoped that document would stimulate thought and an exchange of ideas.

46. The CHAIRMAN thanked the Bureau and the Secretariat for their valuable co-operation and welcomed the atmosphere of consensus and the mutual understanding which had permitted the adoption of various important decisions, including the authorization for non-governmental organizations to participate in the Committee's debates, the adoption of the agenda for the special session, the decision on the timing of the next session of the Committee, the determination of the procedures to be followed to expedite consultations between delegations and adoption of the list of documents the Secretariat would be asked to prepare. He then declared the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament closed.

The meeting rose at 12.40 p.m.

Wednesday, 31 August 1977, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.15

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

1. The provisional agenda was adopted.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

2. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to pay a tribute to the spirit of co-operation and the flexibility shown by all delegations during the informal meetings, which had made it possible to agree on a series of measures that could be formally adopted at the present meeting.
3. The SECRETARY recalled that, at its 14th meeting on 20 May 1977, the Preparatory Committee had decided to ask the Secretariat to prepare a number of background papers on the disarmament topics listed in the summary record of that meeting. The Secretariat had attempted to produce as many as possible of those documents for the present session. The documents available in English were A/AC.187/67, A/AC.187/69, A/AC.187/71, A/AC.187/72 and A/AC.187/76. Some of those documents were also available in languages other than English. The Secretariat had also prepared document A/AC.187/51/Add.1, which contained additional replies from Member States pursuant to operative paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 31/189 B (XXXI). The full set of documents would be available in all languages used by the Committee as soon as possible. Documents in the final stage of preparation, which would be issued very shortly, were A/AC.187/68, A/AC.187/70, A/AC.187/73, A/AC.187/74 and A/AC.187/75. In accordance with the Committee's decision, the Secretariat was also publishing documents submitted by non-governmental organizations in A/AC.187/INF.4.
4. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in accordance with the wishes of many delegations, only one formal meeting each afternoon should be scheduled during the session, leaving the mornings free for consultations. Additional meetings could be held in the morning if they became necessary, and a formal meeting could at any time be replaced by an informal meeting if delegates so wished.
5. It was so decided.

PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO  
DISARMAMENT

6. The CHAIRMAN said that Conference Room Paper No. 2/Rev.1, containing the draft provisional agenda of the special session, was being distributed to delegates. It was the same as the previous version except for the reversal of the order of items 6 and 7, which had been decided upon at the informal meeting held on the previous day. The draft agenda in its updated form was therefore before the Committee for consideration, and it should not cause any difficulty since it had already been debated in great detail. If adopted, it would become a document of the Committee.
7. Mr. GARCIA ROELIS (Mexico) observed that the debates had been conducted in an exemplary manner during the informal meetings and that the Committee had probably completed 80 per cent of its work by the beginning of the present formal session.

Concerning the draft agenda for the special session he wished to bring to the attention of members the matter of the reports to be considered by the special session. Under item 6, only the report of the Preparatory Committee to the special session was mentioned. He thought it advisable to make provision for a special report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which submitted an annual report to the regular sessions of the General Assembly. Since that was the practice at the regular sessions, it would be difficult to explain why at the special session on disarmament there was no report from the only multilateral body for negotiations on disarmament, which was also the only standing body concerned with the question.

8. Mr. FERRETTI (Italy) supported the proposal made by the representative of Mexico.

9. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) said that he had no objection to the proposal but thought it would be more appropriate if the initiative came from the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament itself, since the Preparatory Committee could not make the decision on the latter's behalf. It would also be logical, if the Preparatory Committee were to go beyond the scope of its own work that it should not restrict itself to a report of CCD but should ask for a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference. Item 12 of the draft agenda made specific mention of a world disarmament conference, and it would be logical and pertinent for the Ad Hoc Committee, as a competent General Assembly organ, to submit a report containing proposals on all relevant aspects of the convening of such a conference. In reply to a question by the Chairman, he added that he was not proposing a separate item on the subject for the special session but was suggesting that a report of the Ad Hoc Committee should be included in the review. If the Preparatory Committee took a decision to approach the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, it should treat the Ad Hoc Committee in a similar manner.

10. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) supported the proposal of the representative of Mexico. It was important for the special session to have a report from the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The question was whether such a report should be included as a separate agenda item. He had no objection to requesting a report from the Ad Hoc Committee, but it was not necessary for that report to appear as a separate item; it could be included among the documentation for the special session. The delegates to the special session could not fail to be aware of the work done by CCD and the Ad Hoc Committee. It would therefore be wiser to maintain the present wording of item 6 and ask for reports to be submitted by CCD and the Ad Hoc Committee as part of the documentation for the special session. With reference to the observations made by the representative of Poland, he wished to point out that most of the members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament were present as members of the Preparatory Committee and that a decision could therefore be taken on its behalf by the Preparatory Committee.

11. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said that the purpose of item 6 of the provisional agenda seemed to be to provide a place for the report of the Preparatory Committee, which was the principal United Nations document for the special session. However, the inclusion of that item did not mean that everything in the report of the Preparatory Committee would be debated at that point. He had assumed that the debate on the report would take place under items 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. The question raised by the representatives of Mexico and Poland, as well as by his own delegation, was whether an additional item should be included in order to provide complete documentation.

12. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that he could not give an immediate opinion as to whether a specific item should be included for a special report by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament or should be dispensed with on the understanding that, if a report was submitted, its contents would be discussed when the substantive points were considered in relation to items 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of the agenda. The matter required further consultation, and no immediate decision need be reached. With reference to the point raised by the representative of Poland, his view was that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was answerable not to the Preparatory Committee but to the General Assembly. The Assembly sometimes asked that Committee to send special reports on specific topics such as the total cessation of nuclear-weapon tests. Any representative could propose to the Assembly that CCD should be asked to submit a report to the special session.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that a decision on the matter need not be reached at the present meeting. The Preparatory Committee could, after further consultation, include the proposal of the representatives of Mexico and Poland among the recommendations it would adopt.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

14. The CHAIRMAN noted that at the informal meetings a consensus had been reached that the date for the opening of the special session should be 23 May 1978. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to ratify that informal agreement.

15. It was so decided.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that in accordance with General Assembly resolution 31/139 B, the special session was to be held in New York. In the light of information from the Secretariat concerning the remodelling and expansion of the plenary hall of the General Assembly as decided by General Assembly resolution 31/195, the Preparatory Committee had unanimously agreed at its informal meetings that it should recommend to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly that a decision be taken to reverse the phases of construction work at Headquarters, so that the work in the General Assembly hall scheduled for 1978 would be done during 1979. A decision along those lines would make it possible for the special session to make use of the plenary hall. Administrative measures to reschedule the programme were, however, required at an early date, and a decision must therefore be made by the General Assembly at its next regular session by 15 October. He therefore took it that the Preparatory Committee agreed by consensus to include in its report to the General Assembly a recommendation to reverse the order of work on expanding and remodelling the General Assembly hall.

17. It was so decided.

18. The CHAIRMAN said that, with regard to the duration of the special session, three views had been expressed during the informal consultations, favouring alternatively a session of four weeks, a session of four weeks which could be extended to five weeks, and a session of six weeks. The representative of Mexico

had asked for a report on the number of meetings held on disarmament topics in the First Committee at the twenty-ninth, thirtieth and thirty-first sessions of the General Assembly. In reply to that request, he could report that, at the twenty-ninth session, 40 meetings had been scheduled and 32 held, lasting approximately 26 working days. At the thirtieth session, no specific number of meetings had been allocated to the subject, and 37 meetings had been held, lasting approximately 26 working days. At the thirty-first session, 50 meetings had been allocated, and 33 meetings had been held, lasting approximately 22 working days. Consultations were now in progress concerning the duration of the special session, and it was hoped that the matter could be settled by consensus.

19. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that the number of meetings to be held by the special session should be kept to a minimum, out of consideration for economic factors and for the experts working with the Committee, whose services were also needed elsewhere. At the same time, he reminded members of the Preparatory Committee that the work of the two last special sessions at the General Assembly had had to be completed under pressure because of insufficient time, resulting in the production of some documents which were less polished and consistent than might have been desired. He hoped that the Preparatory Committee could strike an appropriate balance in that regard during informal consultations.

20. The CHAIRMAN said he felt that there was a broad foundation for consensus in the Preparatory Committee and that in a day or two, during which he would have consultations with delegations, it should be possible to settle the matter.

21. In their informal discussions, the members of the Committee had reached a consensus that the number of Vice-Presidents of the special session should be the same - 17 - as at the regular thirty-second session of the General Assembly. It was understood that there could be substitutions of Vice-Presidents within the quota allowed for each geographical group.

22. The CHAIRMAN said it had been suggested that the special session should establish a Committee of the Whole, which could establish working groups as and when necessary. All such working groups would be open-ended. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee ratified its agreement that a recommendation to that effect should be included in its report.

23. It was so decided.

24. The CHAIRMAN said it had been agreed that the composition of the Credentials Committee of the special session should be the same as at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. If he heard no objection, he would make a recommendation to that effect in the report.

25. It was so decided.

26. The CHAIRMAN said he had received suggestions that the General Committee of the special session should consist of: the President of the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, the 17 Vice-Presidents, the Chairmen of the seven Main

Committees, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole of the special session, and the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee. It had also been suggested that the Chairmen of the Main Committees, like the 17 Vice-Presidents, could be replaced by other members of the delegation or regional group to which they belonged. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee ratified its agreement to include a recommendation to that effect in its report.

27. It was so decided.

28. The CHAIRMAN said it had been agreed in informal consultations that the rules of procedure of the General Assembly would also apply in the special session, on the understanding that every effort would be made to ensure that all decisions on matters of substance at the special session were adopted by consensus. If he heard no objection, the Preparatory Committee's report would contain a recommendation to that effect.

29. It was so decided.

30. Mrs. SHELLEY (Office of Public Information), replying to points raised in informal discussions by the representatives of Poland and Sri Lanka, said that while the production of the brochure mentioned in item A.1 (b) of Conference Room Paper No. 3/Add.1 would be within the work programme of OPI and would therefore entail no additional expenditure, additional funds would be needed for the translation and publication of the brochure in the various languages listed under that item.

31. Mr. FONSECA (Sri Lanka) requested that the word "official", appearing in item A.1 (b) of the "Pre-Session Information Activities" section and in item (a) of the "Post-Session Information Activities" section of Conference Room Paper No. 3/Add.1, should be replaced by the word "working". He also asked where the Duri language was spoken, since his own inquiries on the matter had proved fruitless.

32. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee agreed to the request of the representative of Sri Lanka. He confessed that the Secretariat did not know where Duri was spoken, but he promised to make the information available as soon as possible.

33. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) requested that the word "Tagalog", appearing in item A.1 (b), should be replaced by the word "Filipino".

34. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee approved the request of the representative of the Philippines.

35. It was so decided.

36. Mr. MULYE (India) asked whether a complete list of the languages into which the brochure would be translated could be provided.

37. Mr. HARRY (Australia) commented that, while there was clearly broad agreement that the material on the special session should receive wide international distribution, the Preparatory Committee should not impose the use of particular languages on OPI. He suggested that Conference Room Paper No. 3/Add.1 should use a more general formula, "in all languages possible" might be thought appropriate.

38. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) agreed that a more general formula should be used. The important thing was the dissemination of information about the activities of the special session to the masses of the people, and not the details of any given OPI publication.

39. Mr. HARRY (Australia) and Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) expressed support for the views put forward by the representative of Iran and said that stress should be laid on the role of individual Governments in publicizing the work of the special session.

#### PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

40. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had before it documents A/AC.187/55, A/AC.187/56 and A/AC.187/60, submitted by the non-aligned countries, by Mexico and by Mauritius, respectively. Other documents had been received from Romania and from Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. They would be placed before the Committee as soon as possible. Those documents would deal with substantive matters which would be taken up in due course. In the meantime, he urged all delegations to take part in consultations with a view to reaching a consensus on the various issues.

#### ORGANIZATION OF FUTURE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE

41. The CHAIRMAN said that, during the informal discussions, a consensus had been reached on the dates for two sessions of the Preparatory Committee in 1978. The fourth session would run from 24 January to 24 February, and the fifth from 10 to 21 April. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the consensus was ratified by the Preparatory Committee.

42. It was so decided.

#### CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE TO THE THIRTY-SECOND SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

43. The CHAIRMAN said that there would be ample time, as the work of the Preparatory Committee progressed, to provide a provisional text of the draft report to delegations for their inspection and comment.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.

16th meeting

Thursday, 1 September 1977, at 3.40 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.16/Rev.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to Conference Room Paper No. 8, which contained the record of recommendations of the Committee to the General Assembly and had been prepared at the suggestion of the representative of the United States. Under item 1 (e) of that document, reference was made to the President of the special session as one of the members of the General Committee. The special session would elect its President, and, in that connexion, he wished to inform the Committee that the seventh special session had elected as its President the President of the previous regular session of the General Assembly. The same had been true of the third, fourth, fifth and sixth special sessions. In view of the qualities of the candidate proposed as President of the thirty-second regular session, he believed that the special session would follow the precedent that had been set and elect that person as its President.

2. Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden), introducing document A/AC.187/80, said that one of the issues which had been given a prominent place in the replies of most Governments to the Secretary-General regarding the special session was that of the enormous resources devoted to armaments and the relationship between disarmament efforts and measures to achieve economic and social progress. Those resources were urgently needed to meet the demands of economic and social development, particularly in developing countries. At the second session of the Committee, a number of delegations had expressed considerable interest in a continuation of the earlier United Nations efforts to shed light on those matters. Recent assessments indicated that resources devoted to armaments were larger than had previously been estimated. At the same time, United Nations studies and other reports confirmed the distressing situation regarding world poverty. Furthermore, problems resulting from under development and world economic crises affected both industrialized and developing countries. It was against that general background that the delegations of Norway and Sweden and the observer delegations of Denmark and Finland had decided to submit working paper A/AC.187/80. Those Governments had come to the conclusion that the role of military expenditures in the world economy and the conditions for a successful redeployment of resources to civilian purposes must be further clarified in order to lay a solid foundation for the necessary political decisions.

3. Earlier studies had convincingly proved that a redeployment of military resources would bring about considerable advantages with respect to economic and social development. What was needed was a clarification of the matters relating to such a redeployment the conditions for political decisions, the consequences with regard to employment and production, and the prerequisites for utilizing in the most efficient manner the reallocated resources.

4. The working paper contained a preliminary indication of the direction such an international study might take, and the sponsors hoped that the Committee in its report to the General Assembly would recommend such a study. The terms of reference for the study had to be further elaborated, and that could be done in



the continuing preparatory work with a view to having the special session take a final decision on the matter. The proposal was based on the view that the study should be clearly oriented towards providing the groundwork for political decisions. It was an absolute prerequisite to know exactly what were the present conditions with respect to the utilization of manpower and material resources for military purposes and the extent to which those particular resources would be needed for purposes of civilian development. It would furthermore be necessary to consider the consequences of a continuing utilization of resources along current lines, the reallocation of the resources of the world economy and a restructuring of production.

5. Questions arose as to what would be the effects of continuing arms production with regard to economic development and the utilization of labour and what would be the effects on the utilization of natural resources. Those questions could be, and indeed largely had been, answered in a general way. However, in order to develop a realistic strategy for disarmament, the implications of alternative options had to be known. For example, the employment issue had been brought up in public debate as one of the most difficult problems to be solved within a programme for disarmament. On the one hand, it had been argued that the long-term effects of disarmament would increase possibilities for employment, while, on the other hand, the immediate repercussions of disarmament measures seemed to be more uncertain in that regard. Such questions had to be studied very carefully.

6. The proposed study should lead up to a detailed analysis of the conditions for a redeployment of resources that would be released from military use. An analysis of the demands of the civilian sector would be fundamental when considering alternative production. Once that was done, the factors decisive to the process of readjustment must be analysed in order to achieve the necessary co-ordination between disarmament measures and measures of economic policy directing the transition to civilian purposes.

7. It should be in the interest of all countries to find a way of redeploying national resources, now disproportionately devoted to military purposes, to more constructive ends. The goal of the proposed United Nations study was to provide the world with the necessary mechanisms to meet the political requirements of such a redeployment, including mechanisms for transferring resources to development efforts in the developing countries. That would dramatically alter the prospects for economic and social development and promote the ultimate realization of the goals of a new international economic order.

8. Mr. VAERNO (Norway) said that his Government attached particular importance to the disarmament/development issue and had actively engaged in co-operation with the other Nordic countries in an attempt to further clarify that relationship. Norway believed that the study proposed in document A/AC.187/80 would be a valuable contribution to the search for a new international economic order. It hoped that that proposal would receive the necessary support.

9. The fact that an increasing volume of resources was being used each year for military purposes in a world in which many people were unable to satisfy their

basic needs represented an indisputable misuse of resources. It had been stated that if merely the increase in military expenditures during the decade 1960-1970 had been used for development aid, that would have represented a quintupling of the official aid from rich countries. In addition to the financial outlays, the world's military sector as a whole claimed a large number of the best-qualified scientists and engineers. Some of that manpower should instead be mobilized with a view to solving some of the present-day world's most pressing problems.

10. The present decade had been declared not only a disarmament decade but also a development decade. It therefore seemed appropriate that a special session on disarmament should also examine the question of the relationship between armaments, resources and development. Furthermore, in resolution 3462 (XXX) the General Assembly had declared that the continuing arms race was not compatible with efforts aimed at establishing a new international economic order. It had also, in resolution 3470 (XXX), called upon Member States and the Secretary-General to intensify their efforts in support of the link between disarmament and development so as to promote disarmament negotiations and to ensure that the human and material resources freed by disarmament were used to promote economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries. In order to move in that direction, efforts should be made to achieve concrete measures for the reallocation of resources from military to civilian purposes.

11. The relationship between armament/disarmament and development had already been the subject of other studies within the United Nations. The sponsors, however, felt that there was a need for an examination of the basic conditions for a successful redeployment of resources released as a result of disarmament measures. Such a study would help to achieve the goals of a new international economic order. The close relationship between the main problems facing the world - poverty and the arms race - should be clarified in a manner sufficiently elaborate to stimulate public debate and to serve as a basis for decisions on concrete action.

12. The fact that expenditures on armaments were still rising gave cause for serious anxiety. An uncontrolled military build-up constituted an obvious danger to international security and stability and to the survival of mankind itself. Millions of people throughout the world were suffering from poverty, and that situation could in large measure be relieved through a more reasonable redistribution of resources. It was in that context that the unacceptable misuse of resources which the military arms race represented should be viewed. The purpose of the Nordic proposal was to clarify the basic conditions for releasing resources now allocated to armaments in order to promote the realization of a new international economic order that would help to eliminate the present inequalities in the world community - inequalities which in themselves were an important source of tension and conflict.

13. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the 15th meeting, the Office of Public Information had been requested to provide clarifications of certain points in Conference Room Paper No. 3. OPI was now prepared to provide those clarifications.

14. Mr. GRIBKOV (Office of Public Information), drawing attention to Conference Room Paper No. 3/Add.1/Corr.1, said that OPI had, as requested, replaced the term

"official languages" by "working languages". The phrase "several other languages" in item A.1 (b) referred to languages such as Portuguese, Japanese, Hindi, Swahili, Swedish and others. It was assumed that the brochure would be produced in those versions only if the Committee approved the allocations requested. The spelling of the word "Dari" had been corrected, and the word "Tagalog" would be replaced by "pilipino" as requested by the representative of the Philippines. OPI also assumed that funds would be available to produce the brochure in the German language.

15. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) asked for an explanation regarding the last sentence of the second paragraph in Conference Room Paper No. 3, which stated that a special effort was planned to present the 1977 Yearbook on Disarmament in time for the special session, although possibly not in printed form and in all languages. He wondered what the present schedule was regarding publication of the Yearbook.

16. Mr. BJORNERSTEDT (Assistant Secretary General, Centre for Disarmament) replied that the sentence had been included as a matter of caution. The Yearbook was being prepared for the first time, and while it was hoped that it would be published in time for the special session, it was still too early for the Secretariat to make a commitment that it would be available by 23 May 1978.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that, at a later stage, the Committee would again take up the question of the role to be played by OPI in information activities for the special session.

18. With regard to the role of non-governmental organizations, he drew the Committee's attention to Conference Room Paper No. 7, which would be discussed as soon as delegations had had sufficient time to study it.

19. The representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization had requested an opportunity to address the Committee in order to bring to its attention UNESCO's continuing role in the field of disarmament. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to give a hearing to the representative of UNESCO.

20. It was so decided.

21. Mr. MARKS (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that the links between development and disarmament had been recognized by UNESCO since the late 1940s and would no doubt be among its primary concerns as the special session gave impetus to efforts to achieve disarmament. From the time the General Assembly had begun considering the matter of general and complete disarmament, UNESCO's executive organs had begun stressing the importance of that matter in UNESCO's programme. When the Secretary-General of the United Nations had implemented resolution 1516 (XV) and had entrusted to a group of expert consultants the preparation of a study on the economic and social consequences of disarmament, the General Conference of UNESCO, at its twelfth session, had drawn attention to the report of the Secretary-General transmitting the study and had endorsed the unanimous conclusion of the expert consultants. The same resolution

had authorized the Director General to inform the Secretary-General of his readiness to supply him with any information and studies within the competence of UNESCO.

22. Beginning with the seventeenth session of the General Conference, a new direction had been taken on the basis of promotion of the study of the positive consequences of disarmament in school and out-of-school education for young people and adults, the mobilization of public opinion in favour of disarmament through the use of the mass media, encouragement of the activities of non-governmental organizations to further the cause of disarmament, and research on the economic and social consequences and on the dangers to man and his environment inherent in modern armaments and techniques of warfare. Those new orientations in UNESCO's contribution to disarmament had been further developed, and the Director-General had been invited to make extensive use of UNESCO's communication and publication activities. Furthermore, at its eighteenth session the General Conference had for the first time in the organization's history adopted an intersectoral programme on human rights and peace, one of the main activities of which was to implement an interdisciplinary programme designed to promote education and information with regard to the disarmament problem.

23. UNESCO's activities continued to reflect the basic approach suggested by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in his message to the fourteenth session of the General Conference, in which he had expressed his belief that UNESCO could effectively supplement the efforts of the United Nations to contain and reduce the grave dangers inherent in the new weapons of mass destruction brought about by progress in science and technology. As a result of that statement, UNESCO's present activities included a number of studies and documents that were being prepared for publication as part of the organization's contribution to the special session. Other activities had been undertaken following the adoption by the General Conference at its nineteenth session of the medium-term plan for 1977-1982 and of a special resolution on the role of UNESCO in generating a climate of public opinion conducive to the halting of the arms race and the transition to disarmament.

24. In a special resolution on disarmament, the General Conference had noted that a series of obstacles to the strengthening of peace were presented by the continuing arms race and had concluded that UNESCO, by virtue of its experience and world wide authority, could and should make an effective contribution to solving that vital problem. In addition, UNESCO had ongoing activities in its Division of Human Rights and Peace. Those activities could be divided into three groups: (a) studies and a seminar on the theme of obstacles to disarmament and the ways of overcoming them, (b) activities relating to disarmament education, (c) publications. The seminar on obstacles to disarmament was scheduled for early 1978 in time for the results to be made available to the special session. With regard to disarmament education, a world survey was being conducted with the assistance of non-governmental organizations in order to determine where and how disarmament was being taught in universities in the various member States. UNESCO planned to issue various publications in time for the special session. They included: a volume on the role of international organizations in reducing the arms race and promoting disarmament, which would be part of a series of teaching materials being prepared for university courses on international organization; a reader containing a selection of previously published scientific articles from

different regional and disciplinary perspectives dealing with various historical efforts to achieve disarmament and with current social and economic aspects of disarmament; an annotated bibliography and report on the trends of research relating to the economic and social aspects of the arms race and disarmament.

25. In its work in the field of disarmament, UNESCO was of course guided by the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. It had the responsibility of advancing thought on the major problems of the day, developing school and out-of-school programmes aimed at furthering peace and international understanding, promoting the advancement of scientific knowledge and encouraging research designed to elucidate the conditions and principles governing international action to build peace. UNESCO remained ready to contribute in any way the Committee might find appropriate to the special session and in any way the General Assembly might wish to recommend with regard to the implementation of a programme of action in the field of disarmament.

26. Mr. COROLIANU (Romania), introducing the working papers (A/AC.187/77, A/AC.187/78 and A/AC.187/79) prepared by his delegation, said that they were based on items 11 and 12 of the provisional agenda (Conference Room Paper No. 2/Rev.1), which had been adopted by the Committee in May for the special session: under those items it had been intended to adopt a declaration on disarmament, a programme of action on disarmament and a review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament and of the international machinery for negotiations on disarmament. Those were the subjects dealt with in the papers presented by his delegation, which he hoped would help to stimulate the work of the Preparatory Committee and assist in the process of drafting the documents needed for the special session. He wished to express his appreciation of the speedy way in which the Secretariat had produced the documents required for the Preparatory Committee.

27. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that he wished to inform members of the Preparatory Committee of the tentative conclusions reached by his delegation at the present stage concerning the preparation of the principal document or documents resulting from the special session. Although it could not be expected that that task would begin before January, members might well consider the matter at the present stage. He would prefer, for the time being, that the General Assembly, at its special session, adopt one final document divided into three sections or chapters. The first section would describe the situation in general terms, stating what had been achieved in disarmament efforts and reviewing the facts with regard to the destructive capacity of nuclear stockpiles and the astronomical sums spent yearly on armaments. It might be supplemented by some comparative data regarding disarmament and development. It should also explain the contents of the following two sections, which would contain, respectively, a declaration of intent and principles and a programme of action. The declaration should seek to define the principles and purposes of disarmament. It should be comprehensive in nature, containing the principles which should govern all negotiations and all disarmament activities, and the immediate and long-term purposes of such activities. The programme of action would not have to be exhaustive. It should be based on a strict process of selection, not seeking to cover the rest of the century but merely a period a little longer than the remainder of the disarmament decade. One

of the first items in the programme should state that if, three years after the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, a world disarmament conference had not been held, a second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament should be held. That special session would be devoted to studying the degree of compliance with the programme of action and to adopting measures for supplementing the programme. The programme would also provide that the General Assembly should have an item each year in the agenda for its regular session concerning compliance with the decisions of the special session of 1978. In that way, the peoples of the world would be fully aware that, while the programme of action was not in itself too ambitious, all possible measures had been adopted to keep the degree of compliance with the programme under constant review and to complete it within three years.

28. Another item required in the programme to co-ordinate disarmament activities was a recommendation that an ad hoc body, established by the General Assembly for the purpose, on the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, after having undergone the alterations required to permit the participation of France and China, should be asked to prepare a comprehensive and exhaustive disarmament programme. That programme would cover all the necessary measures to achieve what should continue to be the final goal of all disarmament negotiations, namely general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

29. The programme of action in the final document would be the result of careful selection and of consultations during the remaining proceedings of the Preparatory Committee. His delegation repeated that it would prefer the final document to be a single unit, in view of the close links among its constituent parts. It was, however, willing to consider with an open mind any views that might be expressed by other members of the Committee.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

30. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a question by the representative of Iran, said that items 1 to 8 of the provisional agenda (Conference Room Paper No. 2/Rev.1) had been dealt with. There had been considerable progress as a result of the understandings reached during the informal meetings, which it had been possible to formalize in the decisions taken at the meeting of the previous day. Those decisions appeared in Conference Room Paper No. 8, which was being distributed to members. Certain questions remained to be resolved. Consultations were in progress concerning the organization and duration of the special session and concerning its agenda. Following the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico at the previous meeting, consultations were also in progress concerning a possible new item, a report from the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and at the suggestion of the representative of Poland it was also being discussed whether the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference should be asked to submit a report. It was hoped that by the next day, or the next formal meeting, an understanding would have been reached on those questions and that a decision could be taken by consensus. It was also hoped that a consensus would be reached on the role of non-governmental organizations and the activities of OPI. The Secretariat had prepared papers on those two items. The Committee needed to give further attention to item 5, the

matter of the principal documents for the special session. At the present session, the Committee would not deal with the question of drafting the principal documents, but a major step forward would have been taken if agreement could be reached on what those principal documents should be and how they should be arranged. It would also be advisable for the Committee to reach an understanding, whether at a formal or an informal meeting, as to how work would proceed during the intersessional period.

31. He suggested that the meeting on the following day should be an informal meeting during which members could freely exchange views on the remaining items. If agreement was reached, decisions could then be adopted at the next formal meeting. The informal meeting on the following day could be held in the morning, the next formal meeting being that of Tuesday, 6 September.

32. It was so decided.

33. In reply to a question by the representative of Sri Lanka, the CHAIRMAN said that during the informal meeting on the following day it should be possible to decide on the duration of the special session as well as the matter of reports from CCD and the Ad Hoc Committee. If members wished, they could also deal with the role of non-governmental organizations and the activities of OPI. The only pending item would then be that of the principal documents for the special session, and agreement would be required on their format.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.

17th meeting

Tuesday, 6 September 1977, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.17

PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO  
DISARMAMENT

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that, in informal discussions since the previous meeting, members of the Preparatory Committee had reached a consensus on the draft provisional agenda of the special session as contained in Conference Room Paper No. 2/Rev.1. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the following draft provisional agenda:

- "1. Opening of the session in accordance with rule 30 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.
2. Minute of silent prayer or meditation.
3. Credentials of representatives to the eighth special session of the General Assembly:
  - (a) Appointment of the Credentials Committee;
  - (b) Report of the Credentials Committee.
4. Election of the President.
5. Organization of the session.
6. Report of the Preparatory Committee to the Special Session.
7. Adoption of the agenda.
8. General debate.
9. Review and appraisal of the present international situation in the light of the pressing need to achieve substantial progress in the field of disarmament, the continuation of the arms race and the close interrelationship between disarmament, international peace and security and economic development.
10. Adoption of a declaration on disarmament.
11. Adoption of a programme of action on disarmament.
12. Review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament and of the international machinery for negotiations on disarmament, including, in particular, the question of convening a world disarmament conference."

2. It was so decided.



3. The CHAIRMAN said that a consensus had also been reached on the following draft recommendations as contained in annex 1 of Conference Room Paper No. 9:

"The Preparatory Committee recommends that the General Assembly, at its thirty-second session, request the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to submit to the special session a special report on the state of the various questions under consideration by the Conference.

"The Preparatory Committee also recommends that the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference submit a special report to the special session on the state of its work and deliberations. These special reports would be submitted to the special session with the report of the Preparatory Committee, as part of the documentation prepared for the special session."

4. Mr. SKINNER (Canada), referring to the recommendation that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should be asked to submit to the special session a special report on the state of the various questions under consideration by the Conference, asked how that special report would differ from the annual report regularly submitted by CCD.

5. The CHAIRMAN said that the "special" report would be special only in that it would be drawn up before the Conference in Geneva was over and would therefore cover the state of the various questions under consideration only up to the date of its submission.

6. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) informed the Preparatory Committee that during CCD his delegation would express the view that a report covering so short a period would be limited and not very useful. It would suggest that the report should provide an idea of the state of all the questions on the agenda of CCD in order to provide the special session with a full picture of the debate in CCD.

7. Mr. MORENO (Italy) agreed with the views expressed by the representative of Mexico. He observed that CCD would have to make its own decision as to the form and content of its report, but, since it also had many other difficult problems to deal with, it was to be hoped that it would not use too much valuable time in reaching that decision.

8. The CHAIRMAN observed that the Preparatory Committee could not dictate the form of the CCD report. It could, however, emphasize the potential value to the special session of a report on the state of the various questions under consideration by CCD. Since there seemed to be a general consensus in the Committee on that point, he took it that the Committee agreed to adopt the following recommendations contained in Conference Room Paper No. 9:

"1. Draft provisional agenda of the special session

Subject to agreement on the text of the recommendations attached as annex 1, the draft provisional agenda circulated as Conference Room Paper No. 2/Rev.1 has been agreed upon by the Preparatory Committee.

"2. Organization of work of the special session

(a) Duration

The special session will be held between 23 May and 28 June 1978.

(b) Level of representation

It would be desirable that States Members be represented at the special session at the highest possible level."

9. It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

ORGANIZATION OF FUTURE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE (continued)

10. The CHAIRMAN said that, during informal consultations, members of the Committee had reached a consensus that the special session would last from 23 May to 28 June 1978. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee ratified that consensus.

11. It was so decided.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that, in view of the importance of the special session, Members of the Committee had informally agreed to recommend that States Members should be represented at the session at the highest possible level. If he heard no objection, he would take it that that agreement had been ratified.

13. It was so decided.

14. Mr. CHAMPENOIS (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the member countries of the European Economic Community, said those countries believed that it was too early and not really necessary to come to a decision on the number and form of documents to be submitted to the special session.

15. During informal discussions, the representative of Iran had suggested that two working groups should be set up to deal with the drafting of documents and other substantive matters at the beginning of the fourth session of the Committee in January 1978. Many delegations had expressed the desire to begin working on substantive matters as soon as possible at the beginning of the fourth session. His own delegation felt that to have two working groups would create problems of communication and co-ordination. Instead, it proposed that the complete Preparatory Committee, under its present Chairman, could reconvene, as a working group, for the fourth session. As a working group, it would be open-ended and would be empowered to create more specialized subgroups as and when necessary.

16. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) said that her delegation associated itself with the informal proposal made by the representative of Iran. The Committee should decide to establish a single working group to draft documents at the fourth session so that work on matters of substance could start at the very beginning of the session

17. Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria), Mr. VAERNÖ (Norway) and Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka), the latter speaking for the non-aligned countries, expressed agreement with the views of the representatives of Iran, Sweden and Belgium.

18. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said he recognized that the negotiation of texts of a declaration on disarmament and a programme of action would have to take place during the fourth session of the Preparatory Committee. He felt, however, that it was important to reach some agreement now on the nature of the documents to be negotiated and to establish that any member of the Preparatory Committee would be entitled to participate in the working group or groups set up for that session.

19. While not wishing to impose any rigid guidelines, his delegation felt that the Committee could profitably conduct informal discussions on the drafting of a comprehensive report to be adopted at the special session. An introductory part would contain information about the antecedents of the special session, the reasons why it had been convened and the work of the Preparatory Committee. It might also include a review of the general debate at the special session. The documents adopted by the special session, including a declaration on disarmament and a programme of action - both of which should be adopted, if possible, by a broad consensus - would be included in the report. Proposals for implementation machinery could be included in the introduction and programme of action, or they could appear in a separate section.

20. The Australian delegation believed that it would be helpful if there was a common attitude towards a framework of a declaration on disarmament. If a measure of agreement could be reached now, the later work of the Committee in reconciling texts submitted to it would be greatly facilitated. While it did not propose to submit the text of a suggested outline formally, the following were the main elements which, in its view, should be included:

21. An introductory section should provide a review of the present disarmament situation and its implications for world peace.

22. A second section should deal with general objectives. These would fall broadly into three categories: the strengthening of international peace, security and stability, and the elimination of the possibility of war; a call for an intensification of efforts by all States to conclude multilateral disarmament measures, and a call for the reallocation of resources currently devoted to military purposes.

23. A third section would deal with the major principles governing relations among States. It would urge the renewal of States' commitment to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and would exhort them to commit themselves to the adoption of defensive postures and to confidence-building measures designed to relax international tensions.

24. There should be a section on the principles governing disarmament negotiations. It would emphasize the need for the widest possible consensus on all matters relating to disarmament, the principle of balanced agreements providing undiminished security for all States, and the need for effective measures of verification.
25. A fifth section should deal with general measures of disarmament and the priorities to be adopted. It would cover: multilateral disarmament measures (perhaps with subcategories for the different types of weapons), regional measures of arms control and disarmament, the reduction of military budgets, other measures of arms control and disarmament, and the adoption of international confidence-building measures.
26. There should be a section on the need to strengthen the international machinery for disarmament negotiations.
27. Finally, a concluding section should reaffirm the ultimate goal, appealing to all States to do everything possible to promote general and complete disarmament. It should also seek to mobilize international opinion for that purpose.
28. The Australian representative stressed that, in particular, the declaration on disarmament should be designed to be read by as many people as possible. It should therefore be drafted in clear, simple language, making minimal use of technical vocabulary and containing as little "UN-ese" as possible.
29. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) said his delegation felt that the substance of the documents to be submitted to the special session was a matter of great importance. For the moment, it favoured the submission of two documents: a declaration on disarmament with a section stating the principles on which **all negotiations and agreements concerning disarmament should be founded, and a programme of action, which would state what should be done and how.**
30. His delegation would not oppose the submission of just one document or the creation of just one working group, but it felt that such decisions could better be taken in January 1978, when the Committee could work in the light of the decisions taken at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.
31. Mr. GAVIRIA (Colombia) said that his delegation was in favour of the Iranian proposal that the present session should decide whether the Committee would, at the next session, work as an open-ended working group to study the documents to be submitted to the special session. In that connexion, he believed that initially the Committee should work as an open-ended working group and that, if the need arose, it could then establish various subgroups.
32. Mr. ULUCEVIK (Turkey) said his delegation shared the view that no time should be lost at the next session on matters of procedure. It believed that the Iranian proposal regarding the future work of the Committee was a useful one. Much progress could be made if the Committee worked, at the next session, as an open-ended working group.

33. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) noted that he had previously set forth the tentative conclusions of his delegation regarding the possible structure of the main document to be submitted to the special session. His delegation was open to other views and did not exclude the idea that there could be several documents if that was the wish of the majority. From the statements made, it appeared that most were in favour of the idea of a single document, and his delegation believed that that was the best way to proceed.

34. His delegation had been surprised to read in press release DC/969 of 1 September 1977 that at the 16th meeting he had stated that if the eighth special session could not agree on a programme of action, then another special session on disarmament should be held in 1981. As everyone knew, he had said no such thing. He hoped that the press release on the present meeting would more accurately reflect his statement.

35. With regard to the statement just made by the representative of Australia, his delegation believed that apparent differences could be overcome if delegations made efforts to comment on statements made by others. The representative of Australia had said that the introduction to the proposed declaration on disarmament should refer to the work that had been done leading up to the special session. His delegation believed that that would be out of place in a document such as the proposed declaration. In that connexion, his delegation saw two possibilities: The final act of the special session could contain a summary, even a detailed one, of the entire background of the work leading up to the special session. Such a summary could include the work done as far back as 1957, when the General Assembly had first taken up the question of disarmament. It would then be stated that, as a result of that work, the special session had adopted the final act. Such a summary, however, should not be in the declaration itself. Alternatively, as the General Assembly had done on previous occasions, a resolution could be adopted which would include in its preamble a summary of the background of the work leading up to the special session. The operative part of that resolution could then say that in the light of that work the General Assembly had adopted the final act. Whatever the format decided on, the point was that it should be a suitable one that would maximize the impact of the final act.

36. His delegation felt that the proposal by the representative of Iran represented the best way to proceed at the next session in January. It also fully supported the proposal by the Nordic countries in document A/AC.187/80 for a United Nations study on disarmament and development. Of course, four studies had already been made, but none of them referred to the basic conditions for a successful redeployment of resources released as a result of disarmament measures.

37. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said that the representative of Mexico might have gained the wrong impression of the statement he had made. He did not believe that the declaration on disarmament should be weighed down with the entire background of the work leading up to the special session. What he had said was that if there was to be a single document submitted to the special session, then the first part could be a sort of introduction summarizing the work that had led up to the special session. His delegation certainly had not envisaged that the preamble of the declaration would be a lengthy or complex one.

38. Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka) said that his delegation wished to reiterate what it had previously said on behalf of the non-aligned countries. The final document adopted at the special session should include a brief introduction, a declaration stating the problem and **principles applicable in the field of disarmament**, a programme of action on measures to accelerate the disarmament process and, finally, a section on machinery for implementing the programme. It would be premature at the present stage to decide how those four components, which should be complementary, would be presented or whether there should be one or more documents.

39. Mr. KAJAL (Nigeria) said that his delegation wished to thank the Nordic countries for their proposal submitted in document A/AC.187/80. It was a worthy contribution which reflected the concern of those countries for development throughout the world. Such a study on the effects of armament/disarmament on development would be a timely one, since the current trend was for assistance to developing countries to take the form of military hardware. It now appeared that the relationship between the developed and developing worlds lay primarily in the field of armaments.

40. Studies had shown that if the developed countries were to reduce their expenditures on arms by 10 per cent and use those funds to aid the least developed countries, there would be an additional \$3 billion annually earmarked for development assistance. A thorough study on the effects of armament/disarmament on development was most important, and his delegation therefore commended the Nordic proposal to the Committee. Such a study, however, would be meaningful only if its purpose was to show the world how the misused resources could be redeployed to aid all mankind in an unequal world and if it sought to demonstrate the futility of the arms race.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that the useful exchange of views that had taken place had apparently led to a consensus on various issues. Firstly, with respect to the principal documents of the special session, all delegations seemed to be quite flexible and it appeared that there was agreement in principle that the document or documents should include an introduction or preamble, a declaration on disarmament, a programme of action and, finally, a section on the machinery for negotiations leading to disarmament. That did not, of course, exclude the possibility of submitting other documents which the Committee might feel would be important for the special session. Secondly, there seemed to be some flexibility on the question of whether a single document or two or more documents should be submitted, although most appeared to prefer the idea of a single document. He shared the view that it was not necessary to decide on that matter at the present session. What was important was that the consensus achieved should be maintained so that delegations could now concentrate on the four elements of the basic document or documents.

42. There also seemed to be a consensus on the organization of the work of the Committee at its next session. In that connexion, he wished to express his gratitude to the representative of Iran for raising the subject of how that work should be approached. It appeared that the consensus was that the Committee should, at the next session, work as an open-ended working group which would deal with the basic themes to be submitted to the special session, leaving open the

possibility that, if it so desired, the Committee could establish two or more subgroups as circumstances dictated. At the next session, it would also decide on how it would meet, that is, formally or informally.

43. The representatives of Mexico and Nigeria had supported the Nordic proposal contained in document A/AC.187/80, and that proposal was still open for discussion in the Committee.

44. He believed that there was now a consensus on the role of the Office of Public Information regarding public information activities for the special session. It appeared that the Committee was now prepared to approve the recommendation that, as far as possible, OPI activities should fall within the Office's regular budget.

45. Mr. WEILLER (United States of America) said that his delegation appreciated the way in which the Chairman had conducted the work leading to a consensus on various issues. It now expected that much progress would be made at the next session and had profited from the useful exchanges of views held both in the Committee and during informal discussions.

46. With regard to the activities of OPI, his delegation noted that at the meeting in May 1977 of the Committee for Programme and Co-ordination (CPC), that body had stated that OPI's funds for 1978-1979 were in excess of the guidelines approved by the General Assembly at its thirty-first session and had recommended that the General Assembly, at its thirty-second session, should instruct OPI to redeploy resources from lower-priority items. His delegation hoped that the General Assembly would follow that recommendation and did not therefore wish any action of the Preparatory Committee to be taken as an endorsement of OPI's general funding programmes. Accordingly, while his delegation would support OPI's programme of activities for the special session, it felt that those activities could be carried out through a reallocation of resources, and he hoped that the report of the Preparatory Committee to the General Assembly would reflect that view.

47. The CHAIRMAN said he believed that any recommendations which the Preparatory Committee might adopt with respect to OPI would be limited to the draft programme of action because, while the Committee could make its views known on budgetary matters, the relevant financial implications would be revised by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session. Any decision on those financial implications would have to be taken by the General Assembly, and in particular by the Fifth Committee. The United States delegation and other delegations with strong views on the matter would then be able to make those views known.

48. If there were no other comments, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee approved the draft programme of action by OPI regarding public information activities for the special session.

49. It was so decided.

50. The CHAIRMAN said that the Preparatory Committee still had to take a decision on the Nordic proposal contained in document A/AC.187/80.

51. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said that his delegation had not had time to complete its study of the Nordic proposal and hoped that the Committee would agree to postpone a decision on it.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that the matter would be postponed until the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.



18th meeting

Wednesday, 7 September 1977, at 3.40 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/C.187/SR.18

ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN asked the members of the Committee whether they were now able to adopt by consensus document A/AC.187/80, the working paper prepared by Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. If so, the Committee's recommendation to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly would be that the Assembly should recommend initiating a study as provided in the document.
2. Mr. SCALABRE (France) said that, although he had no objection to a decision by consensus on the working paper, he could not give his full assent to the Chairman's proposal since he had received no instructions from his Government on the matter.
3. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that a study along the lines proposed in document A/AC.187/80 would in no way prejudice any decisions that might be taken on that study.
4. The CHAIRMAN said that, if the Committee recommended to the General Assembly that it should initiate the study proposed in the Nordic paper, the thirty-second session would take an appropriate decision. It could accept or reject the recommendation of the Committee.
5. Mr. OXLEY (Australia) said that his delegation had studied the Nordic working paper and that it merited serious consideration. However, it was difficult to endorse the idea of a study without knowing what its terms of reference would be. His Government recognized the need for a study of the economic and social consequences of the arms race and had provided an expert for the Secretary-General's expert group which had been established, in accordance with resolution 3462 (XXX), to update the existing United Nations report on that subject; however, his delegation had not had the opportunity to refer the proposals in the Nordic paper to the Australian Government. It was indicated in the paper that the objective was for the General Assembly to endorse the idea of a study, which might lead to specific action of some kind by the United Nations. However, several possible studies were outlined in the paper. He would be happy to support the principle of a study if the terms of reference were more clearly defined. He would be grateful if the representatives of the Nordic countries would make clear what they hoped the General Assembly would endorse.
6. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) said she wished to emphasize that the representatives of the Nordic countries were not asking the Preparatory Committee to adopt the ideas contained in document A/AC.187/80. They were merely suggesting that the Committee recommend to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly that a study should be made of the question of disarmament and development within terms of reference which would be further elaborated by the General Assembly, so that the special session could take the final decision in May 1978.
7. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the following recommendation by consensus: that the General Assembly at its thirty-second regular session decide to begin a study on disarmament and development, whose specific terms of reference would be considered

by the General Assembly in the First Committee in the course of consideration of the recommendations of the Preparatory Committee.

8. It was so decided.

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

9. Mr. TIMERBAEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on behalf of his own delegation as well as those of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Mongolia and Poland, said that he wished to propose draft basic provisions for the declaration on disarmament and the programme of action on disarmament.

10. With regard to the declaration on disarmament, their view was that the document could consist of two parts. The first part should contain appraisals of a general character arising from an objective analysis of the present situation in the field of disarmament. In formulating those appraisals, account should be taken of the fact that, despite the efforts of the peace-loving forces, there had been no success in halting the arms race. Its continuation posed the most serious threat for all peoples. The task of stemming the arms race and attaining disarmament was particularly urgent at the present time because of the actions of the opponents of détente, particularly the United States, which threatened to intensify the danger of nuclear war. The recent decisions of the United States regarding cruise missiles and the neutron bomb and the increase in NATO's armed strength in Europe bore witness to that danger. On the other hand, recent years had seen some success in halting the arms race. There had been a positive development in international relations towards the reduction of tension, and that process was determining the course of events in the world. Significant agreements had also been reached in recent years in the matter of arms limitation and the prevention of nuclear war.

11. However, further progress had to be made in solving both long-standing and recent problems. There was no lack of problems to be tackled, and the present task was to give practical effect to the useful initiatives which had been made and to direct efforts towards achieving effective international agreements in the field of disarmament.

12. The second part of the declaration could contain a number of fundamental provisions to be put into effect through talks and agreements designed to halt the arms race and achieve disarmament. Many members of the Committee had referred to the need for such basic provisions, and a majority of States had expressed a wish for them in their replies to the Secretary-General's letter concerning the special session.

13. It was important for the declaration to make the point that success could be achieved in reducing international tension if there were concrete results in limiting the arms race and in disarmament. The special session should declare itself in favour of strengthening détente, so that the process of reducing international tension could advance smoothly.

14. World peace and security on a firm and permanent basis could only be guaranteed by general and complete disarmament under strict international control, which must be the chief aim of all disarmament efforts.
15. The declaration should also state the importance of partial measures in limiting the arms race. Such measures were sometimes viewed sceptically. However, partial measures were stages in the process of achieving general and complete disarmament. They reduced the danger of war, lightened the burden of the arms race and helped to reduce the arsenals maintained by States.
16. The declaration should also state that all countries should refrain from actions which could have a negative effect on disarmament efforts. The willingness of States to adopt a constructive approach to international negotiations and demonstrate a political will to achieve agreement was an important condition of success in arms limitation talks. Another was the principle that the security of States must not be impaired. The strict observance of that principle had always brought positive results, and attempts to circumvent it and gain unilateral advantage had always hampered the search for solutions. That principle had been reflected in the Soviet-American agreements of recent years and was the basis of the Vienna Strategic Arms Limitation Talks as well as of all current disarmament negotiations.
17. The socialist delegations also proposed that the future document should emphasize the importance of a general affirmation of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations within the context of creating favourable conditions for halting the arms race. That principle was the corner-stone of United Nations activities and was emphasized in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. At the thirty-first session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union had put forward a draft world treaty on the non-use of force (A/31/243). In the view of the socialist countries, the declaration should call on all States to refrain from the use of force or the threat of force, so that the principle would become a law of international conduct.
18. Many of the replies received from States concerning the special session had expressed serious concern that the growth of armaments was overtaking the efforts of States in the field of disarmament and that that tendency had increased in recent years. It was essential to limit armaments, especially weapons of mass destruction. A useful contribution could be made by applying the principle of using the achievements of science and technology exclusively for peaceful purposes.
19. The participation of all States of the world was needed in order to solve a problem as important as that of disarmament. Disarmament could not be achieved if certain States disarmed while others were permitted to increase their war potential. The socialist countries therefore proposed that the declaration should contain the principle of participation in negotiations and elaboration of agreements by the largest possible number of States, especially the nuclear Powers and those possessing the most powerful weapons and armed forces.

20. Many delegations had referred to the importance of effective control of disarmament measures, and it would be useful for the declaration to contain a statement to that effect. The scope and nature of the control measures would be determined by the scope, nature and specific characteristics of the concrete measures provided for in the disarmament agreements.

21. The declaration should also provide that the resources released as a result of disarmament measures would be used to solve world problems, improve the standard of living of peoples, and contribute to the economic and social progress of the developing countries.

22. The second final document, the programme of action on disarmament, should define the direction which priority efforts of States in that field should take. The views of the Soviet Union concerning the most pressing tasks had been set forth in detail in the memorandum on questions of ending the arms race and disarmament (A/31/232), which had been presented to the thirty-first session of the General Assembly. The main task to be defined in the programme was the halting of the nuclear arms race. The production of nuclear weapons, the equipping of armed forces with such weapons and the development of new types must be halted. At the same time, measures must be undertaken to limit the production of conventional armaments. Useful experience had been achieved through the Soviet-United States Agreement on Measures to Reduce the Risk of Outbreak of Nuclear War, the Soviet-French Agreement on the Prevention of Accidental or Unauthorized Use of Nuclear Weapons, and others. The special session must emphasize the usefulness of such measures.

23. Another important task was the outlawing of nuclear tests. That problem had recently been considered by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and further talks on the subject would begin on 3 October between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union.

24. An important aspect of the struggle against the threat of nuclear war was action to strengthen the régime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The threat would be immeasurably increased if new States obtained such weapons. That such a possibility existed was apparent from the reports of preparations for nuclear tests in the Republic of South Africa. The possession of nuclear weapons by the racist régime in Pretoria would be a direct threat to the security of African States and would lead to a rapid escalation of instability and tension in southern Africa besides increasing the nuclear threat to all mankind. The programme of action should therefore contain a provision for increasing the effectiveness of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. International co-operation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy was valuable, but such co-operation must not become a means of furthering the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

25. Chemical weapons of mass destruction must also be prohibited and destroyed. That problem was being intensively discussed in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and also between the Soviet Union and the United States.

26. His delegation was glad to note that many States were proposing that the programme of action should deal with the prohibition of the development of new

types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. A new draft agreement on that question had been proposed by the Soviet Union in early August in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and could lead to progress in achieving a new and important international agreement. Another matter of interest to many States was the creation of nuclear-free zones. That was an important regional means of disarmament and would increase the security of States in such zones.

27. The programme of action should emphasize the importance of limiting conventional armaments. Most of the expenditure for military purposes was devoted to such armaments, and armed conflicts involving their use led to tragic loss of life and material resources. Military bases in foreign territory must be eliminated and foreign troops withdrawn from such territory. The programme of action should also provide for the complete demilitarization of the sea-bed and for regional measures of disarmament.

28. Although a number of States, in expressing their views in relation to the special session, had expressed the wish for rapid progress in disarmament, the programme of action should be realistic in character and concentrate on truly urgent matters.

29. The present system of disarmament negotiations was not in itself responsible for the slow progress being achieved; the form of the discussions corresponded to the scale and nature of disarmament problems. However, more effective work could be done, particularly in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The success of disarmament efforts ultimately depended on the political will of the States concerned. His delegation was convinced that the question should be considered in the widest and most authoritative forum possible, namely in a world disarmament conference. Such a forum could consider all questions connected with disarmament and take effective decisions. If properly organized and provided with working organs to prepare agreed decisions that took account of the interests of all States, a world disarmament conference could elaborate concrete, effective measures for limiting the arms race and achieving disarmament. The programme of action should therefore contain recommendations concerning the preparation and organization of a world disarmament conference. A date should be proposed for the conference and a preparatory committee established.

30. The impact of the declaration and programme of action would depend on the degree of consensus which they reflected. It was therefore important that the Committee's work should produce solid documentation. Mr. Gromyko, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, had observed at the luncheon in Moscow on 5 September in honour of the Secretary-General of the United Nations that goodwill was not lacking on the part of the Soviet Union. Given similar goodwill on the part of other States, the special session would be constructive and play an important part in preparing for a world disarmament conference.

31. He hoped that the members of the Preparatory Committee would give careful consideration to the proposals of the Soviet Union and the other socialist States concerning the final documents for the special session.

32. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) said that his delegation saw in the contents of the two documents just submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union not only important evidence of the consistent and constructive line of action of the socialist community in the field of disarmament but also the outline of a programme which was in conformity with the vital interests of all States, regardless of their size, geographical location or level of socio-economic development. It was happy to note that the principles of disarmament negotiations and agreements contained in those documents represented the highest common denominator of numerous ideas and proposals advanced by a great majority of States.
33. Those principles, none of which would diminish the security of any State, fully reflected the basic requirements of security of all States and the scope of their responsibility in the field of disarmament. Adherence to those fundamental principles was the condition sine qua non of success in all disarmament negotiations.
34. The basic provisions of the draft programme of action on disarmament submitted by the Soviet Union were based on consideration for the undiminished security of all States and reflected concern that certain States should not gain unilateral advantages at the expense of others.
35. While they were realistic in their approach to the extremely complex subject of disarmament, they were still intended to solve without further delay the most important and pressing disarmament problems. They took into consideration a number of elements of the respective positions of various groups of States. The adoption of such a programme of action on disarmament and the commencement of its implementation would be the most effective method of achieving substantial progress in bringing closer the ultimate objective, namely general and complete disarmament.
36. Thanks to the progress made in political détente and peaceful co-operation between States, the ensuing growth of confidence in international relations and the establishment of a new peace- and progress-oriented relationship of forces in the world, objective political and material conditions had emerged for a radical turn in halting the arms race and greatly accelerating disarmament processes. The proposals of the socialist States took due account of that fact and of the inseparable link between disarmament, security and the socio-economic development of States.
37. Nevertheless, his delegation felt that the results of the indisputably important disarmament negotiations held so far were still insufficient and that ever greater efforts were needed to accelerate the negotiating process.
38. One of the conditions for substantial progress in disarmament was the complete isolation of the champions of cold war, who continued to be active and were seeking to increase tension and continue the arms race. Furthermore, all States must refrain from actions which might have a negative effect on the over-all disarmament effort. He was referring in particular to attempts to develop and manufacture new types of weapons of mass destruction.

39. In order for disarmament measures to be really effective, they must be adhered to by all States without exception, especially those possessing nuclear weapons and a significant military potential.

40. Poland participated actively in the solution of the most pressing disarmament problems at both the regional and the international levels. Its delegation would do its utmost to contribute to the preparations for the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and to its constructive deliberations and fruitful results. It believed, however, that in order to achieve a real breakthrough towards general and complete disarmament it was essential to convene a world disarmament conference. The special session should therefore include in its programme of action a decision to convene such a conference on a specific and not too distant date. The General Assembly should request the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference, as the competent Assembly organ, to submit a report to the special session containing observations and proposals on all aspects of the convening of a conference. It was gratifying that the Preparatory Committee had reached a consensus to that effect.

41. The President of the thirty-first session of the General Assembly had laid down the principle that all interests should be properly represented in the Preparatory Committee. The present composition of the Committee did not reflect the active involvement in, and extent of contribution to, disarmament efforts of the group of Eastern European States. The Committee's report to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly should therefore contain a recommendation calling for action to take adequate account of the interests of all groups of States and rectify the present imbalance in the Committee.

42. His delegation would spare neither goodwill nor effort in maintaining fruitful co-operation with all those who were genuinely interested in putting an end to the arms race and accelerating effective disarmament.

43. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) said that the working documents submitted by the Soviet Union on behalf of the socialist countries, of which his delegation was a co-sponsor, reflected the experience accumulated by those countries in 10 years of striving for disarmament.

44. In order for a comprehensive agreement to be reached, all States must be prepared to show political goodwill and to maintain a constructive approach to the negotiations taking place in the Committee. He urged all States to refrain from actions which might adversely affect the Committee's efforts in the field of disarmament. Obviously, nuclear weapons were of primary importance in that regard, but it should be borne in mind that the problems of disarmament were complex and that there was a definite link between nuclear and non-nuclear arms systems. For that reason, the Soviet papers proposed that a reduction in nuclear arsenals should be matched by a reduction in military forces and stockpiles of conventional weapons.

It was important for as many countries as possible to reach a consensus on those matters, especially countries with nuclear arsenals and large armed forces.

45. Agreement had still not been reached on the convening of a world disarmament conference, which could be of great value in promoting the cause of disarmament. His delegation hoped that the special session would make significant progress towards the convening of such a conference.

46. His delegation agreed with the point made by the representative of Poland on the representation of Eastern European countries in the Preparatory Committee. Neither Bulgaria nor Czechoslovakia, both of which were co-sponsors of the Soviet documents and had played a considerable part in disarmament negotiations, were members of the Committee. That situation should not continue. The dissatisfaction of various delegations with the make-up of the Committee should be reflected in the latter's report to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.

47. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan) said that the special session should not become another occasion for general, abstract discussion. The adoption of a declaration or resolutions on disarmament would not in itself represent an advance towards actual measures of disarmament. What was needed was agreements on specific issues.

48. Bearing in mind that the comprehensive test-ban treaty and the treaty banning chemical weapons could be expected to be finalized before May 1978, his delegation had in May 1977 proposed the addition of a subitem to the draft agenda of the special session in order to facilitate their discussion. The Preparatory Committee had adopted the agenda without that subitem, but that did not preclude the possibility of conducting discussions on specific disarmament agreements during the special session.

49. The special session should give particular attention to two areas: the security of non-nuclear States, and the creation of non-nuclear zones. In that connexion, his delegation commended the document submitted by Mexico to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD 545), of which it had become a co-sponsor.

50. The Secretariat should enlist the aid of experts in preparing the documents for the special session. It was important that information on the work of the special session should be disseminated as widely as possible. Members of the Committee had come to agree on the great importance of the role played by OPI and the non-governmental organizations in publicizing the work of CCD. It was to be hoped that that work would continue for the special session, which was likely to be the most important event in the United Nations calendar for 1978.

51. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said that he regretted the harsh and recriminatory tone of some of the statements in the speech made by the representative of the Soviet Union. The Preparatory Committee was not the place to discuss ongoing negotiations. It would be better for its members to accept the challenge of the special session and to use their imaginations collectively to advance the common effort to attain the goal of real progress in disarmament. Harsh words had never dismantled a single cannon, missile or nuclear weapon.

52. Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom) suggested, in view of the wide support in the



Committee for the idea that the non-governmental organizations could fulfil a useful function, both in the Committee and at the special session, that the same facilities should be extended to the NGOs during the special session as at the current session of the Committee.

53. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that he supported the United Kingdom proposal because the non-governmental organizations did much useful and constructive work.

54. When the question of the relationship between disarmament and development had been raised, he had proposed that a study should be undertaken on the relationship between disarmament and international security. It had been said at that time that no funds were available for the purpose, and he now wished to give notice that he would again raise the issue in the First Committee of the General Assembly. Disarmament could be achieved only by halting the arms race; the question, however, was how to achieve that goal. Up to the present time, only half-measures had been taken, such as the partial nuclear-weapons test-ban treaty, which permitted underground tests to continue.

55. International security was today based not on the principles of the Charter but on the balance of power. The latter was in fact a balance of weapons, and as long as it remained the basis of peace, there would be no halt to the arms race. It was therefore vital to conduct the proposed study in order to determine how international security and disarmament could be achieved under the United Nations Charter.

56. Mr. SKINNER (Canada) associated his delegation with the remarks made by the representative of the United Kingdom concerning non-governmental organizations. He hoped that other delegations, too, would support that proposal, and in that connexion he drew attention to the memorandum to States members of the Preparatory Committee submitted on 29 August by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, which had been circulated as a supplement to Conference Room Paper No. 3.

57. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) said that her delegation appreciated the United Kingdom initiative regarding non-governmental organizations. She recalled that at the second session of the Committee a proposal on NGOs by the Bureau had been adopted by consensus, and at that time she had said that she had hoped that the Committee would be able to go further in broadening its relationship with the NGOs. That had not been possible then, or even at the present time, and her delegation was therefore prepared to accept a consensus along the lines of the United Kingdom proposal. She hoped that many delegations would be ready to engage in informal consultations with non-governmental organizations, and she wished to inform the NGO members present that her delegation was certainly prepared to do so.

58. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) recalled his statement on non-governmental organizations in his note verbale of 26 April 1977 (A/AC.187/34, para. 14) and said that the valuable co-operation of non-governmental organizations would no doubt help to highlight the importance and sensitivity of the issues to be discussed at the special session. Accordingly, his delegation fully supported the United Kingdom proposal.
59. Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria) said that his delegation, too, supported the United Kingdom proposal and hoped that it would be acceptable to the Committee at large.
60. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) associated his delegation with the United Kingdom proposal and said that activities outside the halls of Governments and international organizations were as important as those inside for the prospects for progress in disarmament. His delegation, too, would welcome the views of non-governmental organizations prior to, during and after the special session.
61. Mr. SCALABRE (France) associated his delegation with the statements made in favour of the United Kingdom proposal and said he wondered whether the Committee might be prepared to adopt it at the present meeting.
62. Mr. ULUCEVIK (Turkey) said that his delegation wished to add its voice in support of the United Kingdom proposal.
63. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee adopted the United Kingdom proposal that the Preparatory Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that non-governmental organizations in the field of disarmament be accorded the same facilities at the special session as had been granted to them in the Preparatory Committee.
64. It was so decided.
65. Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka) said that, in connexion with the date and duration of the special session, certain changes would have to be made in the schedule of the construction work to be undertaken in the General Assembly hall and in other conference rooms. The Committee on Conferences was meeting currently and was about to prepare its report to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly. He believed that the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee should inform the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences of the decisions taken in the Preparatory Committee so that the Committee on Conferences could adopt the necessary administrative measures to obtain the required changes in the construction schedule.
66. The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Sri Lanka for his timely suggestion and said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed that the Secretariat should inform the Committee on Conferences of the decisions taken by the Preparatory Committee so that the necessary administrative measures could be taken.
67. It was so decided.

ORGANIZATION OF FUTURE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE (continued)

68. Mr. SCHLAICH (Federal Republic of Germany), referring to the matter of intersessional work, recalled that the Chairman had stated that most delegations represented in the Preparatory Committee would be participating in the debate on disarmament in the First Committee of the General Assembly. He therefore believed that it would be advisable during those weeks for members of the Preparatory Committee to hold informal or even formal meetings of the Committee convened by the Chairman after consultations. That would provide an opportunity for an exchange of views and for the distribution of various papers and would help to accelerate the preparatory work for the fourth session.

69. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, in the course of the debate at the present session, he had said he believed that major progress could be achieved through frequent contacts in the intersessional period. He had also suggested that, if some delegations found it useful, the Committee could perhaps meet either formally or informally on organizational matters. He therefore suggested that he, as Chairman, should consult the Bureau in the event that some delegations wished to convene a meeting. If the Bureau agreed, he would then convene a meeting, which, he wished to make clear, would deal with organizational matters only; in other words, no substantive matters would be discussed. In the absence of other comments, he took it that the Committee so agreed.

70. It was so decided.

71. Mr. WATANABE (Japan) said that he wished to raise the question of whether all nuclear-weapon States would actually take part in the special session. While it was true that all of those States were Members of the United Nations and had the right to participate, he believed that the report of the Preparatory Committee to the General Assembly should state that the success of the special session would depend on the active and constructive participation of all Member States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States.

72. The CHAIRMAN thanked the representative of Japan for his timely suggestion, which would be included in the report of the Committee to the General Assembly.

73. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) drew attention to the summary record of the 16th meeting and said that his statement, as there reproduced, had been completely misinterpreted. He intended to submit a corrected text to the Secretariat so that his statement, which had been very well summarized by the Chairman, could be accurately reflected.

74. The CHAIRMAN said that he vividly recalled the statement made by the representative of Mexico at the 16th meeting and was grateful to him for pointing out the inadvertent errors in the summary record. He wished to assure the representative of Mexico that his statement would be accurately reflected in the corrected record.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.

19th meeting

Thursday, 8 September 1977, at 3.45 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.19

DRAFT PROGRESS REPORT

1. Mr. ALFARARGI (Egypt), Rapporteur, drew the attention of the Committee to Conference Room Paper No. 11, which contained the draft progress report on the work of the current session. A number of drafting changes and additions to the draft report were contained in two corrigenda which had also been circulated to the members of the Committee.

2. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should consider the draft progress report paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1-2

3. Paragraphs 1-2 were approved.

Paragraph 3

4. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) proposed the addition of the following sentence at the end of the paragraph: "Views to that effect were also expressed at the sessions of the Preparatory Committee and are reflected in the summary records annexed to this report."

5. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said that his delegation would not formally object to the Polish amendment. He noted, however, that the paragraph did not mention the letter to the President of the General Assembly from the Group of Western European and other States on the question of the representation of that Group in the Preparatory Committee, in which it was indicated that the Group had selected its members on the understanding that no changes would be made in the allocation of seats in the Committee; it might therefore be appropriate to retain the paragraph as it stood.

6. The CHAIRMAN noted that the information contained in paragraph 3 had been drawn from document A/31/475, which contained the text of the letter written by the Chairman of the Eastern European Group. While that document also reported the views of the Group of Western European and Other States, it contained no mention of a specific letter from that group.

7. Paragraph 3, as amended, was approved.

Paragraph 4

8. Mr. ALEM (Secretary of the Committee), referring to the question of replies from Member States to the note verbale of the Secretary-General, said that on 9 June 1977 the Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of China had informed the Centre for Disarmament in an oral communication that the position of the Chinese Government on the question of a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament had been put forward by its representatives at the 25th and 50th meetings of the First Committee of the General Assembly at the latter's thirty-first session and that that position had remained unchanged.

9. Paragraph 4 was approved.

Paragraphs 5-8

10. Paragraphs 5-8 were approved.

Paragraph 9

11. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) observed that the phrase "in order to facilitate the knowledge of non-governmental organizations' contributions" was somewhat vague and proposed that it should be replaced by the phrase "in order to facilitate dissemination of information on the contributions of non-governmental organizations".

12. Paragraph 9, as amended, was approved.

Paragraphs 10-19

13. Paragraphs 10-19 were approved.

Paragraph 20

14. The CHAIRMAN said that he would send a letter to the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences, asking for account to be taken of the recommendation approved by the Preparatory Committee concerning the phases of construction work in the General Assembly hall.

15. Paragraph 20 was approved.

Paragraph 21

16. The CHAIRMAN proposed inserting a new paragraph before paragraph 21 stating that the Committee felt that the General Assembly would wish to continue its previous practice of considering the President of the regular session to be the President of the special session. That would require inserting an additional subheading, "Presidents", to be numbered 3, and renumbering the subsequent subheadings and paragraphs.

17. It was so decided.

18. Paragraph 21 was approved.

Paragraphs 22-26

19. Paragraphs 22-26 were approved.

Paragraph 27

20. Mr. VALDERRAMA (Philippines) proposed adding the words "adoption of" after the words "The Committee recommends".

21. Paragraph 27, as amended, was approved.

Paragraphs 28-29

22. Paragraphs 28-29 were approved.

Paragraph 30

23. In reply to a question by the representative of India, the CHAIRMAN said that the Preparatory Committee would transform itself into a working group at its fourth session and that all officers of the working group would be the same as those of the Committee itself unless the Committee took a decision to the contrary.

24. Paragraph 30 was approved.

Paragraph 31

25. Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden) proposed adding the following words at the end of the paragraph: "and further recommends that the final decisions in this respect be taken by the special session".

26. Paragraph 31, as amended, was approved.

Paragraph 32

27. Paragraph 32 was approved.

28. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a question by the representative of Yugoslavia, said that the reference in Conference Room Paper No. 12 under the heading "Organization of the future work of the Preparatory Committee" to a possible meeting of the Committee during the thirty-second session of the General Assembly had not been included under section IV (B) of the draft report because the matter was not one requiring a decision by the General Assembly.

29. The first reading of the draft progress report had now been completed. The report, as amended, would be adopted formally at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

20th meeting

Friday, 9 September 1977, at 11.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.20

DRAFT PROGRESS REPORT (A/AC.187/R.1) (continued)

1. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway), commenting on paragraph 3, said that the question of the size and composition of the Preparatory Committee had been discussed at length during the thirty-first session of the General Assembly and subsequently. The discussion had been reflected in two communications, only one of which was mentioned in the draft report. The other was a letter of 27 January 1977 to the President of the General Assembly from his delegation, acting as Chairman of the Group of Western European and Other States. It stated that "the selection of candidates from the Group has taken place on the definite understanding that there will be no change in the following agreed distribution of seats to the various regional groups: Africa, 14; Asia, 11; Eastern Europe, 6; Latin America, 10; and Western Europe and Others, 13." That quotation should appear in full in the summary record of the meeting, which would be annexed to the report.
2. It was so decided.
3. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) observed that that did not preclude the possibility that the General Assembly would adopt other decisions at its thirty-second session. However, in stressing the right of the Eastern European Group to enlarge its representation to 8, that Group was not opposing modifications in the composition of the Committee with regard to the representation of other regional groups.
4. Mr. BROWN (Australia) said that, in raising the point originally, he had not intended to prejudge the question of greater representation for the Eastern European Group but had simply wished to make known the position of the Western European Group. It was apparent that the views expressed on the question of membership had not related only to the Eastern European Group. He therefore proposed that the last sentence in paragraph 3 should begin as follows: "Views on the question of membership of the Committee were also expressed ...".
5. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway) supported the amendment. He agreed that his proposal did not preclude the adoption of other decisions on the size and composition of the Preparatory Committee by the General Assembly.
6. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland), although not objecting in principle to the Australian amendment, suggested that the sentence should start as follows: "Views to that effect and on other aspects of the question of membership of the Committee ...".
7. It was so decided.
8. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the word "that" in the penultimate line should read "this".
9. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) drew attention to an omission in the Spanish text. The fifth line of paragraph 25 should read as follows: "que podrían ser sustituidos por miembros de sus delegaciones o por ...".

10. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the draft report, as amended, was adopted by consensus.
11. It was so decided.
12. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.



21st meeting

Tuesday, 24 January 1978, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.21

OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The CHAIRMAN declared open the fourth session of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament.

ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA (A/AC.187/88)

2. The provisional agenda was adopted.

ELECTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR

3. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had to elect a Rapporteur to replace Mr. Alfarargi of Egypt, who had taken up a post with the United Nations Centre for Disarmament.

4. Mr. Bensmail (Algeria) was unanimously elected Rapporteur.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

5. The CHAIRMAN said the Committee would recall that its recommendations submitted to the General Assembly in document A/32/41 had been endorsed in resolution 32/88, which constituted the mandate for the Committee's work and for the special session itself. The Committee's current session would be its most difficult one. It would need to concentrate on trying to harmonize the positions of delegations in order to draft the various chapters of the final document or documents, the main elements of which would be an introduction or preamble, a declaration on disarmament, a programme of action and machinery for disarmament negotiations. The Committee's work would consist in trying on the basis of consensus to arrive at unified texts for submission to the Assembly at its special session. He hoped that the spirit of compromise, flexibility and desire to co-operate demonstrated by all delegations of the Committee's past sessions would continue to prevail.

6. He drew attention to documents A/AC.187/56, 60, 77, 81 and 87 submitted in connexion with the proposed declaration on disarmament, documents A/AC.187/78 and 82 on the proposed programme of action, and document A/AC.187/79 on the negotiating machinery. The following additional documents concerned other matters closely linked with those three topics: document A/AC.187/55, of which a revised version was being submitted; document A/AC.187/86; a draft final document being submitted by Mexico; and a working document on the declaration and the programme of action submitted by Pakistan. A number of other working documents were also being prepared by delegations or groups of delegations for submission as soon as possible.

7. Following consultations, he wished to suggest on behalf of the officers of the Committee that, as an initial step, the Secretariat should be requested to prepare

as soon as possible, on the basis of all documents submitted thus far, a comparative table of the views of delegations regarding the four main elements of the principal document or documents of the special session. That would enable the Committee to ascertain the areas of agreement among delegations and to establish the areas of possible disagreement with regard to which further negotiations would be needed in order to elaborate a consolidated text. The comparative table would, of course, be brought up to date as and when the need arose.

8. He also drew attention to paragraph 31 of the Committee's previous report (A/32/41), which referred to the Committee's decision to become an open-ended working group and to leave it to the latter to decide whether to meet formally or informally. The Committee would, of course, need to hold formal meetings from time to time in order to endorse decisions taken by the working group or to hear formal statements by delegations. He himself felt that that would be the most efficient way to proceed. If, in the course of the Committee's work, a sufficient degree of agreement had been reached, it would be possible to begin drafting the final document or documents. At the appropriate time, the Committee could decide whether the working group as a whole would undertake the drafting or whether a small drafting group would be set up. The Committee might also wish to decide at the appropriate time to divide its work between two working groups dealing, respectively, with the preamble and the declaration and with the programme of action and the negotiating machinery.

9. There was also some urgency with regard to adopting a decision concerning the time and duration of the general debate in the special session so as to enable the Secretariat to begin preparing the list of speakers. In view of the Committee's recommendation that Member States should be represented at the special session at the highest level possible, it was especially important that the representatives in question should know the time and duration of the general debate as soon as possible with a view to preparing their statements and making travel arrangements.

10. Lastly, delegations might at some stage wish to consider whether the committee of the whole would function simultaneously with the plenary throughout the period of the general debate.

11. Mr. DATCU (Romania) said that he fully supported the Chairman's suggestions. His delegation, which hoped that the Committee's fourth session would help to impart new vigour to disarmament negotiations, was ready to co-operate with all other delegations to that end. In order to make maximum use of the available time, it was important to proceed as soon as possible to the informal negotiating stage with a view to drafting the chapters of the principal document or documents, either simultaneously or successively.

12. He reminded members that all documents envisaged for the special session were of equal importance. The Committee should also give attention to other relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted at the thirty-second session. The Committee should always bear in mind that the final document or documents should not only include guiding principles in the disarmament field but should also revitalize the

negotiations process by adopting a programme of action and institutional measures. The work of drafting must also proceed in a democratic and efficient framework.

13. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the members of the Preparatory Committee had before them a wealth of material on the basis of which to draft decisions which were not only generally acceptable but also made it possible to move from negotiations to genuine action signifying the beginning of disarmament.

14. In the view of the delegation of the USSR, the declaration on disarmament must give an objective assessment of the current disarmament situation, summing up the achievements and formulating the principles on which to base discussions and decisions on slowing down the arms race. Such principles should be as universally applicable as possible and should remain their validity over a long period.

15. In the working documents before the Committee, it was proposed that the Committee should decide on the general lines of action to halt the arms race and on the fundamental tasks to be included in the programme of action for disarmament. There was general agreement on most of those issues, which was a positive sign. Biased priorities and the establishment of rigid deadlines for carrying out concrete tasks, were unlikely to contribute to success.

16. It was also proposed that decisions should be taken concerning the machinery for disarmament negotiations. That subject should be approached with caution and only taken up when the specific disarmament tasks had been defined. His delegation saw no need for abandoning or radically restructuring the existing machinery which, it felt, should be utilized as effectively as possible. Long experience showed that the mayor obstacle to the solution of disarmament problems was not the negotiating machinery but rather the powerful forces in a number of countries which sought to perpetuate the arms race and international tension. The United Nations was to play an important role in disarmament, and it was necessary that it should become a still more effective instrument in the struggle for peace, security and disarmament.

17. The agenda for the special session included discussion of the World Disarmament Conference, a topic to which the Soviet Union attached great importance. The Conference should mark an advance from General Assembly declarations and recommendations to the task of reaching effective agreements on measures in the field of disarmament. An important independent role in the progress towards complete elimination of the material basis for war was to be played by the special session on disarmament.

18. New initiatives were constantly needed to clear the way for disarmament, and the Soviet Union had recently taken a number of steps in that direction. It had launched an appeal for a simultaneous cessation by all States of the production of nuclear weapons, including atomic, hydrogen and neutron bombs and projectiles. At the same time, the nuclear Powers could agree to a gradual reduction of their existing arsenals as a step towards their complete elimination. That proposal had been embodied in General Assembly resolution 32/87. His delegation felt that the question of nuclear disarmament should rank high in the draft final documents being prepared by the Committee. Action to avert the threat of nuclear war could also hardly be ignored.

19. Another major step had been taken in the cessation of nuclear tests. The Soviet Union had expressed its willingness to declare a moratorium on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes as well as a complete ban for a limited period on nuclear-weapon testing. As a result, the way had been opened for drawing up a treaty imposing a complete and general ban on nuclear-weapon testing.

20. Unfortunately, plans had also recently been revealed for the development and deployment of the neutron bomb, which could lead to a new and dangerous spiral in the arms race. The documents to be drawn up by the Committee should impress upon States the need to avert that danger. The Soviet Union proposed to the countries of the West that agreement should be reached on mutual cessation of production of the neutron bomb.

21. It was essential to supplement political détente by military détente in Europe, where there had recently been certain changes for the better. At the Belgrade Conference in October 1977, the Soviet Union had introduced constructive proposals to that end, which called for an agreement among the participants at the Conference not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other, an agreement not to enlarge the existing antagonistic military and political groupings and alliances in Europe, consistent implementation of the confidence-building measures provided for in the Helsinki Final Act, and an agreement not to conduct military exercises involving more than 50,000-60,000 men.

22. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that the main purpose of his delegation's working paper entitled "Outline of a draft final document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament"\* was to facilitate the practical implementation of the recommendations made by the Preparatory Committee in paragraph 33 of the report which it had submitted to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session (A/32/41). In that paragraph, the Committee, after noting that there had been a trend in favour of the adoption of one final document at the special session, had stated that a consensus had been reached, in principle, regarding the contents of the final document, namely that it should contain the following four main elements: (a) introduction or preamble; (b) declaration on disarmament; (c) programme of action, and (d) machinery for disarmament negotiations.

23. His delegation believed that the most appropriate procedure would be to concentrate all conclusions and decisions reached at the special session into four separate sections of one final document. That procedure would make it easier to organize and co-ordinate future work on disarmament and would avoid the risk of dispersion of effort which had been so apparent in the case of the many resolutions on the subject which the General Assembly had adopted year after year; it would also provide world public opinion with convincing proof that a new approach to the whole question of disarmament had been adopted.

24. His delegation believed that all principles and rules for future action should be included in the final document, which should be self-contained. All instruments

---

\* Subsequently circulated as document A/AC.187/89.

to be adopted by the General Assembly should be included under one resolution, which, however, should be as brief as possible and should contain the following two paragraphs:

"The General Assembly,

"Convinced that it is imperative to put an end to the arms race, both because it entails a threat to the very survival of mankind and because it is incompatible with the new international economic order,

"Having resolved to lay the foundations of a new international disarmament strategy which, through co-ordinated and persevering efforts within the framework of the United Nations, can culminate in general and complete disarmament under effective international control,

"Adopts the following

'Final document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament:

- I. Introduction;
- II. Declaration on Disarmament;
- III. Programme of Action;
- IV. Guidelines for Disarmament Negotiations.'

25. His delegation concurred with the proposal of the Chairman that, before the Committee attempted to harmonize the substantive positions of delegations, it should request the Secretariat to produce an orderly compilation of the documents already available or to be submitted to the Committee under all four headings listed in paragraph 33 of its report. In the meantime, the Committee should begin its work by taking final decisions on paragraph 33. The time which had elapsed since that paragraph had been drafted should make it possible to move from a consensus in principle to a final decision without further delay.

26. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka) said that he agreed with the suggestion of the Chairman that the Secretariat should be asked to tabulate the common features of the documents submitted by groups and by individual countries and that the tabulation should be kept up to date by the addition of new contributions. The Committee must now decide whether it would function as one working group or as two. He felt that it might wish to consider starting as one open-ended working group and that it might later break up into two or more. On the question of substance, the proposed Declaration on Disarmament and Programme of Action would undoubtedly have common features, as they were closely related issues. Documents under one or the other heading might therefore contain much unavoidable repetition. If the Committee started with two working groups, they would tend to work in separate directions from the beginning and it would be difficult to co-ordinate their activities at a

later stage. On the other hand, if a start was made with one working group, additional groups could be formed once a certain degree of basic agreement had been reached.

27. His delegation did not wish to comment yet on the length of the general debate or on the appropriate level of representation. The Group of Non-Aligned Countries felt, however, that representation should be at the highest possible level.

28. Mr. ZACHMANN (German Democratic Republic) said that the main task of the Preparatory Committee at its fourth session was to elaborate drafts of the final documents of the special session. The results which might be achieved by the **special** session would to a large extent depend on the fulfilment of that task. His delegation was prepared to contribute to the best of its ability in conformity with the great significance attached to the question of disarmament by his Government and by those of the other socialist countries. The working papers contained in documents A/AC.187/81 and 82, which had been submitted to the third session by the delegation of the Soviet Union on behalf of seven socialist countries, including his own, constituted an essential contribution to the current task of the Committee.

29. In recent months, the peoples of many countries had noted with concern and indignation that the efforts for equipping the arsenals of certain States with the neutron bomb had been intensified. On the other hand, his delegation had noted with satisfaction that efforts to halt that dangerous development had recently been intensified. General Assembly resolution 32/155 had been adopted unanimously and represented the basic document on the question of continuing the process of détente and implementing disarmament; resolutions 32/77 and 32/78 reflected the hope that treaties on the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests and the prohibition of chemical weapons had come within the range of possibility; resolution 32/84 called for the prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction.

30. If positive results were achieved at the special session, they would represent an important contribution to the convening of a world disarmament conference; the General Assembly, at its thirty-second session, had reaffirmed the view of the overwhelming majority of States that such a conference was necessary in order to solve fundamental problems of disarmament in the interests of all States and peoples.

31. His delegation supported the important proposals made by the Soviet Union on the question of disarmament, which had called for a temporary agreement on the cessation of nuclear-weapon tests and a moratorium on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, for putting an end to the manufacture of nuclear weapons and proceeding to the reduction and final elimination of stockpiles of such weapons, and for an agreement under which the Soviet Union and the United States of America would renounce the manufacture and introduction of the neutron bomb. It was important to combine long-term objectives, such as that of general and complete disarmament, with partial measures like the prohibition of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and the reduction and elimination of their stockpiles, which would eliminate the danger of nuclear war.

32. His delegation supported the Chairman's proposals regarding the organization of work. World interest in the results of the special session was growing, as was evident from the meeting of European youth and student organizations on disarmament, held in Budapest, and the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations which was to be convened at the end of February.

33. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that in general his delegation agreed with the Chairman's suggestions regarding procedure. It shared the view of the Mexican delegation that the final document of the special session should consist of four main elements, namely, an introduction, a declaration on disarmament, a programme of action, and guidelines for disarmament negotiations.

34. He wished to stress the importance of ensuring that all the proposals submitted by various delegations were given equal weight in the comparative table suggested by the Chairman. The Secretariat must make every effort to reflect adequately both those ideas on which there was broad agreement and those on which differences of opinion still existed. While it would be fairly simple to prepare a comparative table of proposals regarding the four main elements of the final document, it would be more difficult to classify proposals regarding subitems, since there was no uniformity of format in the various papers submitted by delegations.

35. His delegation had submitted two proposals; they were not designed to provide a comprehensive answer to all the issues to be dealt with in the final document but merely to stress those areas which required greater attention.

36. It would be helpful if the Secretariat included references to the relevant General Assembly resolutions in the comparative table.

37. The CHAIRMAN explained that the Secretariat paper would not establish areas of agreement or disagreement but would merely present positions. It would be up to the Committee to decide where there was agreement and try to overcome the differences of opinion.

38. Mr. SCHLAICH (Federal Republic of Germany) suggested that the Secretariat paper should be distributed in parts, beginning with a comparison of positions regarding the preamble and the declaration. That would be the most practical course, since some groups had not yet presented their proposals concerning the programme of action and other points. The various sections of the Secretariat paper might later be combined into a single document if that was considered desirable.

39. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that he wished to make a few comments on the substantive question of disarmament. The special session would give the United Nations an opportunity to consider that very serious problem in a more relaxed manner, since it would not be under the same time pressures as during regular sessions.

40. The first concern of the special session and of the Preparatory Committee must be to seek a way to halt the arms race. That was the crux of the problem and the most difficult part of the Assembly's task. The arms race was ingrained in the current world situation because the security of nations was based on an outdated, nineteenth-century concept of the balance of power. It was believed that balance of power meant balance of weapons. A mere reduction of armaments would not halt the arms race.
41. The security of nations must come from the role played by the United Nations, which had been established to replace the system of security based on weapons and balance of power. It was absolutely essential to seek means of giving the United Nations the power and authority intended for it in the Charter. Every Member State, in joining the Organization, had undertaken to comply with the Charter, including Chapter VI on the pacific settlement of disputes. Unless the fundamental principles of the Charter were translated into reality, the efforts of the special session would produce no practical results.
42. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that his delegation agreed with the Chairman's suggestion regarding the comparative table to be prepared by the Secretariat. He was somewhat concerned, however, about the time factor. Could the Secretary or the Chairman give some indication when the paper might be available?
43. He agreed with the suggestion made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany that the Secretariat paper should be prepared and circulated in parts.
44. The CHAIRMAN informed members that in November 1977 he had consulted with the Secretariat on the possibility of preparing the comparative table. Thus, the Secretariat was now in a position to produce it in two or three days. The first part would concern the preamble and the declaration and would be followed shortly by sections on the programme of action and machinery. The working paper would be updated as necessary.
45. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to request the Secretariat to prepare a comparative table of proposals regarding the four main elements that had been suggested for the final document.
46. It was so decided.
47. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided that the main elements of the final document of the special session should be those set forth in paragraph 33 of the Committee's report to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session (A/32/41), namely: (a) introduction or preamble; (b) declaration on disarmament; (c) programme of action, and (d) machinery for disarmament negotiations.
48. It was so decided.



49. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a question put by Mr. JAY (Canada), said that the Secretariat paper would be prepared in four different sections, each of which would be circulated as it was completed. He appealed to delegations that still wished to submit proposals to do so as soon as possible.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.

22nd meeting

Wednesday, 25 January 1978, at 3.50 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.22

ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

1. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that, as reflected in its report to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly (A/32/41), the Committee had decided to recommend to the General Assembly a provisional agenda of 12 items for the special session. The Assembly had endorsed the Committee's report. It would be advisable to decide when the special session should begin its general debate so as to enable the Secretariat to make the necessary preparations for opening the list of speakers. It was his personal opinion that the special session could complete the first seven agenda items on the first day, 23 May, and that it could begin item 8, general debate, on the second day, 24 May. He urged members who might wish to make suggestions in that regard to do so as soon as possible so as to enable the Secretariat to begin its preparations at an early date.

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

2. Mr. LEPRETTE (France)\* said that in the view of his Government, the failure of recent efforts to solve the problems of disarmament was due not so much to a lack of sincerity as to a lack of clear thinking. That was why France had in some cases had reservations which, it felt, had been justified by events.

3. A new and positive approach was therefore required. Such an approach was not to be found in unilateral measures. France could not improve international security by renouncing its own security, nor could it commit itself to steps which, it was clear from experience, would lead to an impasse. On the contrary, goals must be defined, obstacles identified and specific steps outlined.

4. The goal could not be the Utopia of a totally disarmed world. The right of all nations to safeguard their security must be acknowledged and defined, but the limits of that right must be established in order to avoid abuse.

5. The obstacles to disarmament were the excesses brought about by the exercise of that right. The resulting instability gave rise to mistrust, the arms race and, finally, conflict. Disarmament efforts must therefore seek to deal with the elements of instability, which must be viewed in the proper geographic and strategic context.

6. Conditions had changed greatly in the past 10 or 20 years. The world no longer followed the lead of the super-Powers or even of the military blocs surrounding them. It had both a universal and a pluralistic dimension. The problem of nuclear weapons concerned everyone; it was posed in different terms in areas where nuclear weapons were an element of the over-all balance and in areas where their introduction would create a serious imbalance.

---

\* The full text of this statement will be issued as document A/AC.187/90.

7. The principles of disarmament were the same everywhere, but their practical application must be adjusted to specific situations. His Government proposed that action should be taken at three different but complementary levels, namely, at the world-wide level, at the level of non-nuclear regions, and at the level of nuclear regions.
8. At the world-wide level, disarmament must be carried out with the agreement, under the control and for the benefit of all. The forthcoming special session would provide an opportunity to seek agreement. A permanent smaller forum, equally representative and linked to the United Nations, would, however, be more effective. The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should be replaced by a new forum, with a different membership and different procedures. France would have proposals to make in that regard. On the question of control, his Government would propose the creation of a world observation satellite agency. To ensure that the measures taken would be beneficial to all, his Government would propose the establishment of a special fund financed by a tax levied on excessive armaments.
9. At the level of non-nuclear regions, the problem was twofold. Non-nuclear areas must remain so; at the same time, they must be prevented from engaging in a costly and dangerous conventional arms race. While the States of such regions were responsible for preventing nuclear proliferation, they must also be assured that they would not be discriminated against from the standpoint of progress and of security. A strict non-proliferation policy must nevertheless allow them access to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. France would actively work towards that end and set an example. With regard to security, the nuclear Powers must not seek to gain political or military advantage over the non-nuclear States. France would therefore take a positive position of principle with regard to the creation of denuclearized zones on continents or substantial portions of continents. His Government was prepared to consider entering into specific agreements in that regard. It hoped that States in the non-nuclear areas would take the initiative in seeking ways to prevent a conventional arms race in each of the major regions of the world. France was prepared to make its contribution to that end provided that the States in the region concerned unanimously desired to halt the arms race and provided that there was no discrimination among suppliers.
10. At the level of nuclear regions, the one extending from the Atlantic to the Urals was crucial to world peace and to the security of France; nowhere was it more necessary to take a new approach to disarmament. Under the conditions prevailing in that region, security meant for France the maintenance of an adequate level of credibility for nuclear deterrence. Nuclear weapons had become an element of balance, and the threat of instability lay in the factors that had upset that balance, i.e. a quantitative overstockpiling and qualitative imbalance in the field of nuclear weapons and an obvious disparity in the field of conventional weapons. The

responsibility for furthering progress with regard to nuclear weapons lay with the United States and the Soviet Union, and France viewed their efforts favourably. Nevertheless, the level at which they proposed to stabilize their nuclear stockpiles would still enable them to annihilate each other several times over. Efforts in the field of conventional weapons must not be limited to Central Europe but rather must be extended to all States concerned. Priority must be given to promoting trust and reducing the more unsettling elements in the present situation. Naturally, such efforts should be carried out jointly by all those States which, in signing the Final Act of Helsinki, had expressed their willingness to contribute to European security and co-operation. In that spirit, and after having made the necessary contacts, his Government would propose a European conference on disarmament whose sphere of competence would extend from the Atlantic to the Urals.

11. Mr. OGISO (Japan), introducing the working paper contained in document A/AC.187/86, said that the increasing transfer of conventional arms was one of the major factors contributing to international tensions. If that trend continued, it would intensify the potential for conflict. Four fifths of world military expenditures were for conventional weapons. If they continued at the present rate, efforts to assist the developing countries would be greatly weakened. The peoples of the world expected the special session to take up that vital question. His Government therefore proposed that a comprehensive study of the conventional arms race should be initiated as a preliminary step towards general and complete disarmament; that did not mean, of course, that attention should be diverted from nuclear disarmament, which deserved the highest priority. Many issues were involved in the international transfer of conventional weapons, including domestic production of weapons, global and regional security, and the security of recipient States. It was an important issue which must be dealt with.

12. Reading out paragraph 6 of document A/AC.187/86, he stressed three principles that must be recognized in a declaration on disarmament in order to emphasize the relevance and importance of conventional arms control and disarmament. In the first place, it must be recognized that most of the world's military expenditures were being devoted to the acquisition and maintenance of conventional military power. In the second place, the increasing build-up of conventional arms produced a potential risk of endangering international peace and security. In the third place, conventional arms control and disarmament would contribute to the achievement of general and complete disarmament.

13. Reading out paragraph 7 of the document, he outlined the measures which his Government suggested for incorporation within the framework of the programme of action on disarmament. Initially, comprehensive studies should be made of all aspects of conventional arms control and disarmament. At the same time, the General Assembly should request major arms-supplying countries to start consultations on voluntary restraint measures, regional conferences on arms limitation should be convened on the initiative of the States of the region, and a request should be made to the Secretary-General or a watch-dog committee to follow developments concerning

all related issues. As to future steps, after a certain time a review of the implementation of the initial steps should be conducted.

14. His Government held the conviction that, without conventional arms control, it would be very difficult to channel the resources currently being wasted for military purposes to aid for developing countries or to achieve general and complete disarmament.

15. The comments he had just made must be considered in the context of document A/AC.187/14, which set forth the views of the Japanese Government with regard to the five issues that should be given highest priority by the special session.

16. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka), introducing the non-aligned working document (A/AC 187/55/Add.1), said that paragraph 1 (a) on page 5 of the English text should read "renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons". In paragraph (e) on page 8 of the English text, the word "process" should read "processes". In that same paragraph, the "relevant provisions" referred to were Chapters VI and VII of the United Nations Charter.

17. Although the arms race had continued to intensify since the Second World War, the international atmosphere had changed in the past 10 to 15 years, with the cold war giving way to the acceptance of coexistence. Under the circumstances, it was difficult to understand why there had been so little progress on disarmament, and that was the starting point for the interest of the non-aligned group in the special session. Furthermore, it was generally agreed that the General Assembly was the body principally responsible for accelerating the pace of disarmament.

18. The non-aligned working document was an amalgam of the views that had emerged in the group, which was not always unanimous. It also took full account of other interests and views, as expressed in the First Committee. The document was a refinement of previously expressed views but was framed in language that was intended as a departure from the usual terminology of familiar United Nations resolutions. Reference to previous resolutions was deliberately omitted because those resolutions often had different meanings for different parties. The aim was to make the document easily accessible to a concerned audience outside the United Nations.

19. The Declaration on Disarmament sought to reflect the thinking of ordinary people and to include elements that would facilitate consensus both in the Preparatory Committee and at the special session. The word "alarmed" in the first preambular paragraph might seem strong, but it did reflect existing sentiment. However, the group was prepared to accept any term that the Committee deemed more suitable.

20. The Declaration briefly set forth disarmament priorities as the group saw them. It repeated to some extent the Programme of Action, but that seemed necessary in order to focus attention on certain basic matters which concerned both the Committee and the audience outside. The eight principles at the end of the

Declaration were not of course, definitive but merely intended as a working guide. After some discussion of the problem, the group felt that it had achieved a reasonable distinction between the notions of a "principle" and a "measure". Actual measures were provided for in the Programme of Action, which was the most important part of the document. The group had decided upon what it felt to be a very desirable order of priorities after an intensive discussion and hoped that it would be approved by consensus.

21. The concept of nuclear-free zones had met with limited enthusiasm but was, nevertheless, important to the whole process of disarmament. As to chemical weapons, incendiary weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, perhaps the group had been unrealistic in calling for the conclusion of treaties and agreements which still seemed a long way off. It would have been dishonest, however, simply to call such treaties and agreements desirable.

22. The importance of confidence-building measures was self-evident, and the group sought guidelines for remedying a situation which arose from a lack of understanding among States.

23. With respect to the channelling to development purposes of resources released through disarmament measures, the group was well aware of the controversial aspects of the issue. It appreciated the implications of disarmament for the countries most directly involved and realized that it would not be easy to channel to developing countries the resources which were released. The group also did not wish to create the impression that it was interested in disarmament only because of its interest in those resources.

24. The success of the special session would depend on what was achieved in the Preparatory Committee. The crucial factor was the collective willingness of Member States, especially those with heavy armaments, to depart from established positions and take account of the views of countries which did not themselves have large military establishments but were concerned with the problem. The non-aligned group welcomed suggestions regarding its working document and hoped that it would be adopted by consensus.

25. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) introduced his delegation's working paper entitled "Outline of a draft final document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament" (A/AC.187/89) and an accompanying "introductory note"\*. The two documents provided a detailed explanation of the proposals and fundamental concepts contained in the draft final document submitted by his delegation. Those proposals and concepts had been developed on the basis of prolonged study and his delegation had already brought many of them to the attention not only of the Preparatory Committee but also of the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee of the General Assembly.

---

\* Subsequently circulated as document A/AC.187/89/Add.1.

26. He welcomed the decision taken by the Committee at its 21st meeting that the main elements of the final document of the special session should be distributed under the four headings specified in paragraph 33 of the report of the Preparatory Committee (A/32/41). That would virtually eliminate the danger of repetition.
27. He felt that the introduction to the final document should be a summary and synthesis of all relevant facts and that the wording of its concluding paragraph might follow the lines of the text proposed in the paragraph marked "X" at the end of part I (Introduction) of the draft contained in document A/AC.187/89.
28. The Declaration on Disarmament, contained in part II of the draft final document, should be a statement of the fundamental principles underlying the Programme of Action contained in part III. The representative of Sri Lanka had referred to the difficulties encountered by the members of the non-aligned group in deciding whether the Programme of Action should consist of principles or measures. In the opinion of his delegation, the relevant principles had already been set out in the Declaration on Disarmament, so that the Programme of Action should stipulate the practical measures which should be taken.
29. It would be obvious to anyone with some experience of disarmament negotiations that, in the five months which remained before not only the opening but the closure of the special session, it would be utopian to think of completing the formulation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament that would obtain general approval. It was for that reason that his delegation had put forward the idea of making provision, in the Plan of Action included in the working paper, for a Three-year Disarmament Plan covering the period June 1978 to May 1981 as a purely transitional measure. In order to stress the transitional nature of that procedure and the fact that it in no way meant the abandonment of the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, the draft provided for another procedure which appeared best suited for ensuring that, within a period of roughly two and a half years, it would be possible to draft a comprehensive, thoroughly negotiated programme, the implementation of which should lead to the attainment of that goal. The Three-year Plan also included provisions that would enable the General Assembly to keep the manner in which the Plan was being implemented under periodic review and to consider and adopt, at a second special session devoted to disarmament that would be held in May-June or perhaps May-July 1981, the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament which would have been drafted.
30. His delegation had not thought it appropriate to suggest actual measures in the Three-year Disarmament Plan and accordingly had left three blank lines in part III of the working paper. Subsequently, however, a number of delegations had requested examples of such measures. His delegation had therefore prepared a list which would be circulated in the "introductory note". The list contained 15 possible measures but should not be regarded as exhaustive; it merely illustrated the type of measure which his delegation had in mind. He felt that all those measures should be preceded by a paragraph to the effect that all States participating in the first special session would undertake to do everything within their power to implement the measures during the period June 1978 to May 1981.

31. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the modest aims of the two documents which he had introduced would have a constructive impact on the work of the Committee in enabling it to reconcile the different substantive positions held by States on the question of disarmament.
32. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius) introduced document A/AC.187/60 and said that it was based on accepted concepts already expressed in United Nations documents and in authoritative statements by the Secretary-General. It was also consistent with views expressed by the developing and non-aligned States and should therefore be close to the common denominator which would eventually emerge from the work of the Committee. His delegation had probably been the first to suggest the structure of the final document to be adopted by the special session.
33. The introduction to document A/AC.187/60 contained a frank statement of the current situation, including the growing danger of the arms race and the limited progress in disarmament to date. The introduction to the final document should not be a mere statement of intent but should represent a strong moral commitment.
34. His delegation attached particular importance to the principles set out in the document because it felt that the special session should be the beginning, rather than the end, of a process. To be successful, the process must be governed by new principles, characterized by the need to democratize international relations. The failure of disarmament negotiations hitherto could be explained inter alia by the obsolescence of the principles which had governed those negotiations. His delegation's paper proposed two sets of principles: principles governing the process of negotiation, including the treaty-making initiative, and principles governing the disarmament process itself. Those principles had been inspired by the non-aligned draft disarmament programme of 1970 and by the Zorin-McCloy principles of 1961, which had been endorsed by the General Assembly. The document also dealt with questions of an environmental and institutional nature.
35. In view of the comprehensive character of the paper, which covered all the headings agreed upon for the final document to be adopted by the special session, he hoped that the Centre for Disarmament, in preparing the synoptic presentation of proposals, would include the elements contained in his delegation's paper under all relevant headings. He also expressed the hope that, during the drafting process, full account would be taken of the statement by the Secretary-General at the opening meeting of the Preparatory Committee (A/AC.187/62). The report of the Secretary-General on the economic and social consequences of the arms race (A/32/88) should also serve as valuable reference material.
36. Mr. LIENKHX (Austria) said that his delegation had not submitted a separate working paper because it was in agreement with so many of the ideas presented by others. Nevertheless, those documents did not set out all the ideas of his delegation on the question, and he would take an opportunity at a later stage to develop certain points. In the meantime, he wished to draw attention to several points to which Austria attached particular importance. His Government attached great importance to its status of permanent neutrality and to the obligation to defend it. At a later stage, his delegation would submit a text taking account of



that status. His Government was also concerned at the possibility of disequilibrium developing at either a world-wide or a regional level. He would like to know how the implementation procedure would be initiated and what criteria would be applied. Control and verification had proved to be a formidable barrier to progress in the past, and most of the papers presented had agreed that such control was indispensable. Measures in those fields must be made more concrete. In that connexion, he had taken note of the suggestion made by the representative of France for a control satellite. In general, he believed that less attention should be paid to the technical aspects of weapons and more to the consequences of their employment from a humanitarian standpoint. In conclusion, he wished to repeat that his Government's interests were deeply affected by the question of disarmament. His country's status of permanent neutrality obliged it to participate in the work of all bodies concerned with the question.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

23rd meeting

Thursday, 26 January 1978, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.23

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. Mr. NUNEZ (Cuba) said that his delegation attached great importance to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and particularly to the work of the Preparatory Committee. The ending of the arms race and the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective control represented a fundamental objective towards which the Committee must work in a realistic manner. The cause of the arms race was to be found in aggressive imperialism, which was attempting to maintain its hegemony through continued violations of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.
2. His delegation was in agreement with many of the ideas contained in the documents before the Committee but would reserve comment until a later meeting. He wished, however, to mention three points in the meantime. First, the question of a world disarmament conference - in which all States would participate on the basis of equality - must not be shunted aside at the special session and the Preparatory Committee must ensure that the idea was kept alive as a mechanism for negotiations. Second, the question of foreign military bases, which represented a permanent threat to international peace and security, must not be forgotten. The third question requiring urgent attention was the threat represented by the use of force in international relations, whether, in the military, economic or political field. The principles and proposals submitted by the socialist and non-aligned countries would provide valuable guidance in that connexion.
3. Mr. AKHUND (Pakistan) said that his delegation had listened with particular interest to the statement made by the representative of France and wished to place on record the great value which his Government attached to the role of France in the field of disarmament. His delegation believed that the views already expressed in the Committee indicated a broad identity of outlook and interest, which gave hope for the successful outcome of the special session.
4. He wished to introduce two working papers which had been submitted by his delegation in the form of a draft Declaration on Disarmament (A/AC.187/91) and a draft Programme of Action on Disarmament (A/AC.187/92). Those documents were not exhaustive but were intended to focus on issues of particular concern to developing countries, which must find ways to reconcile the demands of development with the imperatives of defence.
5. The draft Declaration on Disarmament began with a general introduction covering the various facets of the disarmament problem, such as the global strategic balance, nuclear proliferation, the relations between industrialized and developing countries and the diversion of scarce resources to arms expenditures. He did not expect the special session to deal conclusively with all those issues, but a beginning could be made if agreement was reached on the goals and principles which should guide disarmament negotiations and on a programme of action to be implemented in the relatively near future. The body of the draft Declaration consisted of two parts: first, a statement of generally accepted truths which sought to place

disarmament within the global perspective as an integral part of the effort to evolve a new, stable and just international order. The second part set out principles which should guide disarmament negotiations and goals which the world community should seek to attain in the coming years. The principal task of the special session should be to facilitate disarmament negotiations and to ensure that their results would promote the security and prosperity of all States. It was important that the use of nuclear weapons should be recognized to be indefensible; that non-nuclear-weapon States should be assured that their security was not jeopardized; that efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones should be initiated in various regions; that all States should have the right to develop and acquire peaceful nuclear technology without hindrance; that expenditure on conventional arms should, in the first instance, be restrained by the major Powers in a balanced and equitable manner; and, finally, that the savings from disarmament measures should be diverted to promote economic and social development, primarily in the developing countries.

6. The draft Programme of Action must take into account not only the comprehensive programme envisaged by the General Assembly, but also the agreements, decisions and resolutions which were already in existence as well as negotiations currently under way. He agreed with the representative of Mexico on the importance of aiming at practical results. The proposed Programme of Action would be realistic if it recommended measures which could be implemented in the next few years. The draft Programme of Action submitted by his delegation was based on the principle of exploring the limits of the possible and reflected what appeared to be the general consensus regarding the necessary steps in various important areas of disarmament.

7. In the nuclear field, the most urgent task was to prohibit the use, or threat of the use, of nuclear weapons. There was general agreement that the nuclear Powers should give binding assurances that they would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against States which were members of nuclear-weapon-free zones. That general agreement needed to be translated into practical action. It was also necessary that the nuclear Powers should respond positively to the recommendations contained in General Assembly resolution 31/189 C and give an undertaking, in a legally binding form, not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States which were not parties to the nuclear security arrangements of some of the nuclear Powers. Such negative guarantees had the support of the General Assembly and therefore stood the best chance, among alternative formulations, of practical realization. Such initial restraints on the use, or threat of the use, of nuclear weapons in non-nuclear regions would facilitate negotiations among the nuclear-weapon States for the total prohibition of the use, or threat of the use, of nuclear weapons.

8. The world expected practical action to reduce nuclear arsenals and to prevent further developments which might increase the lethal power of nuclear weapons or reduce inhibitions against their use. The primary responsibility rested on the two major nuclear Powers. His delegation believed that steps which should be taken in the near future included, first, an agreement for a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon tests and a second agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union for a quantitative reduction and qualitative restraints on strategic nuclear

weapons and their delivery systems. The second SALT agreement should be followed by a third which would translate into actual commitments the declaration made by the two major Powers of their willingness to achieve substantial reductions of up to 50 per cent in their stockpiles of nuclear weapons. At the same time, an international agreement was essential to prevent the continued diversion of the results of scientific research to warlike purposes: developments in the field of laser technology were one example. The question of tactical nuclear weapons had to be viewed in the context of the potential threat which they posed to world peace and security. If the major nuclear Powers gave positive indications that they were prepared to give up nuclear weapons as a military option, other nuclear Powers could be expected to join in the negotiations for the complete prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons.

9. In the field of nuclear proliferation, there was a tendency to overlook the large degree of consensus which had been attained through the adherence of the vast majority of States to the IAEA safeguards and of a smaller, but very important, number of countries to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The discussions during the thirty-second session of the General Assembly had shown that, while the majority of countries remained attached to the goal of non-proliferation, they were unwilling to accept the implication that the development of the peaceful use of nuclear energy, particularly in the developing countries, posed peculiar dangers. It was encouraging that the General Assembly had been able to adopt, by consensus, a set of guidelines on the transfer and development of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. His delegation was convinced that, if all concerned were inspired by those guidelines in the practical policies they followed, the goal of non-proliferation would be brought appreciably closer. He was, however, concerned at the 15 guidelines issued by the so-called London Club, in so far as they tended to conflict with the spirit of the principles adopted by the General Assembly. If non-proliferation was to be feasible, it was imperative that all nuclear facilities, including those which had been operating for years outside the IAEA safeguard system, should be brought under international control and inspection, on a universal and non-discriminatory basis.

10. On the question of the creation of nuclear-weapon-free zones and zones of peace, his delegation's working paper enumerated steps which needed to be taken and which reflected the provisions of the relevant resolutions adopted by the General Assembly.

11. The provisions of his delegation's draft Programme of Action regarding "other weapons of mass destruction" did not differ greatly from the ideas contained in other papers. In the area of conventional weapons, his delegation's suggestions reflected generally accepted propositions and emphasized the primary responsibility of the major Powers. His delegation shared the concern of the representative of Japan concerning the transfer of conventional arms. The quantity and type of arms transferred was relevant in the context of strengthening peace and reducing the danger of war in various regions of the world; no less important, however, was the question of the balance of forces among the countries of a given region. In that connexion, it was important to take account not only of the trade in weapons but also of the indigenous capacity for the production of armaments.

12. The special session represented perhaps the first concerted effort by the United Nations to evolve a unified approach to the problems of disarmament. Disarmament was a complex process involving difficulties of definition, balance, verification and conflicting political purposes. Those difficulties must be overcome in the common interest of easing the threat of destruction which hung over the whole world. All nations and peoples had a vital stake in disarmament, but the success of the forthcoming negotiations would ultimately depend on the political will of States, particularly the major Powers, to make progress towards that goal.

13. Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal) said that his delegation had noted with interest the proposals which had been submitted but did not wish to comment on them for the moment. He had, however, found great merit in the proposal by the representative of Mexico for a Three-Year Disarmament Plan, as a purely transitional measure, and for a second special session devoted to disarmament at which a comprehensive programme of disarmament would be adopted (A/AC.187/89). He also welcomed the statement by the representative of Japan that nuclear disarmament should be given the highest priority but that stress should also be laid on the need for a reduction in conventional arms and for a comprehensive study in that connexion as a first step. He also welcomed the statement by the representative of France.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

14. Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal) said he agreed with the Chairman that items 1 to 7 of the provisional agenda for the special session could be disposed of during the first day. He believed that 10 days would be needed to complete the general debate, so that 11 or 12 days would remain for other meetings. To expedite the work of the special session, he believed that it would be important that informal discussions should start during the general debate.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.

24th meeting

Monday, 30 January 1978, at 3.25 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.24

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico), commenting on the Secretariat working paper containing a tabulation of proposals (A/AC.187/93), noted that it dealt with only two of the four main elements of the final document. On the other hand, the working paper was very encouraging since it highlighted the identity of views contained in the various proposals. He felt that it was very important to decide on the format of the final document; although his delegation was ready to discuss alternative suggestions, it still believed that the Committee's recommendation to the Assembly on that matter was the best one.
2. One possible outline for the final document, which his delegation had proposed in document A/AC.187/89 and Add.1, took the form of a concise introductory draft resolution followed by the four sections of the final document itself, namely, an introduction, a declaration on disarmament, a programme of action and guidelines for disarmament negotiations. He hoped that a decision would be reached as soon as possible to the effect that there would be one final document, with four sections so entitled.
3. Mr. THUNBORG (Sweden), introducing a working paper which his delegation was submitting,\* explained that it contained some key elements concerning the programme of action and the machinery for disarmament negotiations. Thus, it should be regarded as complementary to other proposals before the Committee. The document was focused on subjects in which Sweden had long taken a special interest, including nuclear disarmament, disarmament and development, particularly inhuman weapons, the reduction of military budgets, reorganization of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and strengthening of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament. It also contained the Swedish proposal that a second special session should be convened in 1982, with a view to following up the decisions and recommendations of the first special session and ensuring that continuing attention was given at the highest political level to the need for concrete action. A decision on a second special session would greatly influence the character of the elements to be included in the draft programme of action; early agreement in principle would establish a clear time-frame for the implementation of a substantial part of the disarmament measures on which the special session would decide, and it would facilitate the drafting work. The question of the most appropriate date for the second special session could then be discussed.
4. Turning to the other measures proposed in the Swedish working paper, he said that nuclear disarmament was certainly the most important of the sets of measures in a programme of action. The points enumerated under the heading of nuclear disarmament followed very closely those suggested in document A/AC.187/55/Add.1.

---

\* Subsequently circulated as document A/AC.187/95.

5. The Nordic countries had already proposed that the special session should initiate a study on the relationship between disarmament and development, and the General Assembly, in resolution 32/88 A, had requested the Secretary-General to appoint an ad hoc group to elaborate a possible framework and terms of reference for the study and to report on its work in time for the special session. His delegation's present proposal was simply a follow-up to the Assembly's decision, and called for the special session to initiate an expert study, the terms of reference for which would be formulated by the Assembly on the basis of the report of the ad hoc group.

6. With regard to the question of particularly inhuman weapons, the Committee would recall that the Assembly had decided, in resolution 32/152, to convene in 1979 a United Nations conference on that question. It was essential that the special session should give an outline of what the conference should achieve, in particular by mentioning the kind of weapons on which the session should seek agreement.

7. Sweden's proposal for a reduction of military budgets, which logically derived from Assembly resolution 32/85, would have the Secretary-General organize a pilot test of a system for reporting military budgets, with the participation of States representing different geographical regions and different military budgeting and accounting systems; it would also have the Secretary-General appoint an ad hoc panel of budgetary experts to give guidance to States supplying the required data, to further refine the system and to develop recommendations for large-scale application. Despite the difficulties which many States would have in accepting even those modest proposals, his delegation believed that it was necessary to move ahead in order to find common ground for all States in their reporting of military budgets and thus promote confidence among States with a view to reducing military expenditure on a world-wide scale.

8. Turning to the question of machinery for disarmament negotiations, he reiterated Sweden's view that two different types of disarmament organs were required, on the one hand a negotiating body with limited membership and, on the other, a forum at the highest political level comprising all Members of the United Nations. While the existing institutional set-up roughly corresponded to that general concept, there was a strong need for some organizational improvements. His delegation also suggested that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, while continuing to negotiate with the highest priority in the nuclear disarmament field, should be reorganized. The United Nations should be kept fully informed of all bilateral and multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. All Members of the United Nations must be permitted to take an active part in the work of the Conference. Furthermore, the institution of co-chairmanship must be replaced by a system that more adequately reflected the present political situation. A possible model could be a bureau consisting of one chairman and three vice-chairmen; two members of the bureau would be selected from the States belonging to the military blocs and the other two from the group of neutral and non-aligned States. The chairmanship could rotate in alphabetical order on a monthly or sessional basis among all members of the Conference.

9. Finally, his delegation proposed a strengthening of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament in the light of the new tasks that would be entrusted to it, especially in the field of studies and of follow-up of disarmament agreements.
10. Mr. JAY (Canada) said he fully agreed with previous speakers that the aim in the Committee and at the special session itself should be to express important ideas in as clear-cut a fashion as possible and that delegations should remain free to make proposals as the work of the Committee proceeded. All Member States had a stake in ensuring that the final document was of the highest possible quality in terms of tone and credibility.
11. He would also like to know whether the Secretariat would be preparing a tabulation on the programme aspects of the final document and, at a later stage, a further tabulation on the question of machinery for disarmament negotiations.
12. The CHAIRMAN replied that that was his understanding.
13. Mr. MOHAJER (Iran) observed that the increasing interest of Governments was imparting new vigour to the Committee's deliberations and pointed to a more fruitful exchange of views during the coming months. His delegation fully shared the view regarding the need for a coherent, consistent and unambiguous text for the final document which would provide the framework for future disarmament negotiations. He felt that the structure of the final document needed to be further discussed. The multiplicity of working papers before the Committee suggested that some initial exchanges were needed in order to clarify the scope and meaning of the headings of the various sections of the final document and the orientation of each section.
14. His delegation also endorsed the view that the failure of disarmament efforts was due to the large number of ambiguous proposals, however well-intentioned. That also applied to the Committee's present undertaking. The results of the special session would be judged not by the number or length of documents but by the clarity and cohesiveness of goals and priorities. What was needed was a clear understanding of the practical measures aimed at overcoming obstacles.
15. A number of documents before the Committee suffered from a lack of clarity; the differing interpretations of the wide range of ideas put forward could be seen from the tabulation of proposals in document A/AC.187/93. While the variety of views was helpful in promoting a better understanding of the varying shades of opinion concerning the final document, there was a need for a clear notion of the titles and content of its various sections. It must be decided whether the introduction to the final document should be an exposé of the present situation in the disarmament field or whether it should highlight the principles governing the forthcoming negotiations.
16. Mr. STASHEVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) agreed that it would be useful for the Secretariat to prepare further tabulations of proposals concerning the programme of action and the negotiating machinery. He also felt that the Committee should take a formal decision to the effect that the final document or



documents would consist of four sections. In his delegation's view, however, it would be premature to decide now whether to have one, or more than one, final document; that would distract the Committee from the task of preparing the document itself.

17. The CHAIRMAN agreed that it was not the intention to take a decision on the latter point at the present stage.

18. With regard to the opening of the special session, he informed the Committee that, following consultations and in the light of experience, it was felt that the Assembly would be able to complete consideration of the initial, procedural items at two meetings, after which the General Committee would probably require only one meeting in order to consider the organization of work. On the assumption that the Assembly opened the special session in the afternoon of 23 May, the general debate could therefore begin in the afternoon of 24 May and end on or about 9 June. He suggested that delegations consider the matter so that the Committee could take a decision at its next formal meeting.

19. As to the list of speakers for the general debate, he pointed out that the Secretariat was aware of the disadvantages of the system followed during the past two sessions of the Assembly under which delegations had lost a great deal of time in trying to ascertain their position in the list. It was accordingly suggested that the Assembly revert to the former, well-tried system. In order to avoid an unseemly rush by delegations to include their names in the list, the Secretariat suggested that no date for the opening of the list should be mentioned. Instead, delegations would be requested to indicate a preferred date on which they wished to speak, together with two alternative dates. In the light of their stated preferences, the Secretariat felt that it would be able to satisfy delegations' wishes. When the dates of the opening and closing of the general debate had been fixed, the Secretariat would make an appropriate announcement to that effect and would request delegations to indicate their preferences.

20. In conclusion, he announced that the Committee would continue its discussions as a Working Group.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.

25th meeting

Wednesday, 1 February 1978, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.25

ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said it had been decided that the special session would begin item 8, general debate, on the afternoon of 24 May and would complete the item at the afternoon meeting on 9 June.

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

2. Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom) said that he had noted with satisfaction the importance attached by delegations to the enhancement of public awareness of disarmament issues. In that connexion, the Secretary-General, in his statement to the Preparatory Committee at its 1st meeting, had emphasized the role which both governmental and non-governmental organizations could play in mobilizing public opinion.

3. His Government had a high opinion of the valuable work done by non-governmental organizations in connexion with disarmament and had supported the Committee's decision to provide facilities for such organizations and for institutions concerned with disarmament to send observers to its meetings and to submit papers to it. His delegation had also proposed that the same facilities should be extended to non-governmental organizations at the special session itself. Those arrangements, however, did not go far enough, and his delegation believed that provision should be made for a more direct relationship between the special session and non-governmental organizations, both in recognition of the value of their work and as a means of promoting wider enlightenment about disarmament issues among the peoples of the world. Means should also be found to enable prominent experts from non-governmental organizations to give testimony before the special session. Such a direct relationship would be most clearly manifested if arrangements could be made for a day to be set aside during the special session for non-governmental organizations to address it; the most appropriate day might be the one immediately following the general debate. Should that proposal not commend itself to the Committee, he would suggest that the day before the special session opened, namely, Monday, 22 May, should be reserved for a meeting of the special session, outside its plenary programme, for hearing testimony from non-governmental organizations. A precedent for that procedure had been set on the occasion of the World Disarmament Conference in 1932. If the Committee decided that a day should be set aside for non-governmental organizations, it might perhaps be divided into two parts. During the morning, representatives of non-governmental organizations, perhaps limited to five speakers, would address the delegations assembled for the special session, and the afternoon might be devoted to hearing expert evidence from senior representatives of institutions concerned with disarmament, such as the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the International Institute of Strategic Studies and the appropriate Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union.

4. The choice of speakers to represent the very large number of non-governmental organizations which had a deep interest in disarmament must be left to the organizations themselves; the conference which such organizations were about to hold in Geneva, in preparation for the special session, could perhaps provide the opportunity for selecting speakers. The number of research institutes concerned

with disarmament was relatively small, and it might be sufficient to let it be known that the Preparatory Committee would be prepared to consider applications for an invitation to speak; the Committee could then, when it met in April, decide which, if any, invitations should be issued.

5. In conclusion, he wished to stress that his delegation's proposal was guided by the desire to promote the enlightenment of the peoples of the world about disarmament and by recognition of the valuable role which non-governmental organizations could play in that work.

6. The CHAIRMAN said that the role of non-governmental organizations would be discussed as part of the programme of work for the special session.

7. He wished to draw the attention of the Preparatory Committee to two additional working papers, namely the "Draft programme of action" submitted by Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom (A/AC.187/96) and the "Suggestions for a disarmament programme" submitted by Italy (A/AC.187/97).

8. Mr. OGISO (Japan) said that his delegation shared the desire to promote the enlightenment of the peoples of the world on the question of disarmament and fully acknowledged the valuable part which non-governmental organizations had played in peace movements and could play in mobilizing world opinion for the attainment of disarmament:-- He therefore welcomed the United Kingdom proposal, and hoped that the necessary consultations would be undertaken with a view to implementing those proposals, including the selection of a day for hearing testimony from non-governmental organizations.

9. Ms. LOPEZ (Venezuela) said that her delegation's working paper, entitled "Dissemination of information on the question of the armaments race and disarmament" (A/AC.187/94), contained elements which might be considered for inclusion in the Preamble, the Declaration and the Programme of Action. Both in the Preparatory Committee and in the First Committee of the General Assembly, the delegation of Venezuela had repeatedly stressed the need for mobilizing international public opinion in condemnation of the arms race. The steady improvement of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, was taking place at such a rapid pace that only technical experts could understand the implications and risks, while world public opinion was not aware of what such scientific progress meant in terms of the very survival of humanity. Notwithstanding the efforts of the United Nations to end the arms race, practical results had been minimal, and it had therefore become essential to find alternative means of reaching the goal of disarmament. Little could be accomplished without the necessary political will, particularly on the part of the nuclear Powers. In that connexion, she believed that an informed international public opinion could prove to be a valuable ally in the campaign against armaments. The United Nations should, by means of a systematic publicity campaign, stress not only the arms race but also the efforts which were being undertaken to put an end to it. What was needed was a continuing flow of information describing the steady improvement of the increasingly complex systems and means of destruction. Non-governmental organizations interested in disarmament could lend valuable support to such a campaign, and it was therefore

imperative that links between them and the United Nations Centre for Disarmament should be strengthened. She had listened with interest to the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom and hoped that others would stress the same theme. The working paper submitted by her delegation proposed certain concrete measures which might contribute to a better-informed world public opinion, which in turn might thus be encouraged to play an active and successful role in the field of disarmament. She hoped that the points mentioned in her delegation's working paper would be incorporated into the various drafts on which the Preparatory Committee was working.

10. Mr. BERG (Sweden) said that his delegation had supported the proposal made by the United Kingdom in September 1977 that facilities should be provided for non-governmental organizations to send special observers to the special session. His delegation would therefore take a very favourable attitude towards the proposal now made by the representative of the United Kingdom that a day should be set aside for non-governmental organizations at the special session.

11. His delegation welcomed the Venezuelan working paper on the dissemination of information (A/AC.187/94) and believed that it represented an excellent basis for discussions on the question.

12. Mr. WEILLER (United States of America) said that serious consideration should be given to the United Kingdom proposal. Non-governmental organizations could play a very important role in helping the special session to achieve its purposes, in particular by contributing to the thinking of their own Governments on the question. The United States Government had convened a conference of non-governmental organizations in Washington, to be held on 11 March 1978, for the purpose of submitting suggestions regarding points which might be considered during the special session and regarding ways in which non-governmental organizations could stimulate support for the goals of the special session. He believed that other Governments might wish to consider taking similar action with a view to encouraging a dialogue with public opinion on the issues involved.

13. He also welcomed the Venezuelan working paper on the dissemination of information.

14. Mr. COROIANU (Romania) said that his delegation fully agreed with the representative of Venezuela that it was the duty of Governments to reveal the dangers of the arms race to the peoples of the world. Security was diminished as the arms race escalated. The prime duty of the present generation was to spare no effort to institute resolute measures for disarmament through a treaty on general disarmament and a treaty for the elimination of the use of force in international relations. It was essential that all States should participate in disarmament negotiations and in the drafting of necessary measures. World public opinion must be kept fully informed on the question and periodic reports must be issued for that purpose.

15. He fully shared the view of the representative of Venezuela that elements of document A/AC.187/94 should be included in the Preamble and the Declaration on Disarmament.

16. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said that, while he was in basic agreement with the United Kingdom proposal, he did not feel that it would be appropriate for non-governmental organizations and research institutes to participate in the general debate on the same basis as Member States. They should, however, be given an opportunity to present their views, for example to the Committee of the Whole of the special session or on an even more informal basis. Non-governmental organizations should be asked to select enough speakers to fill not more than one day.

17. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said he agreed with the representative of Venezuela that elements from the Venezuelan working paper on dissemination of information (A/AC.187/94) could well be incorporated into the Preamble, the Declaration and the Programme of Action as well as into the Three-year Plan and Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament which his own delegation had proposed in document A/AC.187/89.

18. He was also in strong agreement with the representative of the United Kingdom that non-governmental organizations could contribute to the special session. The United Kingdom representative had suggested alternative means whereby non-governmental organizations could be accommodated at the special session. It was his understanding that the Preparatory Committee would consider those alternatives at a later stage. He thought it would be useful if the United Kingdom representative would consider distributing the text of his statement to members.

19. Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal) said that he agreed fully with those who believed that non-governmental organizations should be given the opportunity to participate actively in the special session. His delegation would have no difficulty in supporting any of the alternatives which had been suggested in that connexion, including the one proposed by the representative of Australia.

20. He welcomed the Venezuelan working paper and felt that the ideas which it set forth could be incorporated into the draft final document which the Committee was preparing.

21. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland) said that, as the Venezuelan initiative made clear, there was growing public interest in questions of disarmament and a need for the dissemination of objective information on that subject. The General Assembly had recognized that need in its resolution 32/154 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which was a subject closely related to that of disarmament.

22. Non-governmental organizations had an important role to play at the special session and in the disarmament process, and his delegation had always attached great importance to their work. The World Peace Council had recently met in his country in preparation for the special session of the General Assembly, and Poland had sent representatives to the special meeting of European youth and students held in Budapest to discuss the same issue. Other organizations, such as the World Federation of Trade Unions, the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the Women's International Democratic Federation, were also actively involved in making public opinion aware of the issues on the eve of the special session. If and when the

Committee proceeded to discuss the United Kingdom proposal, it should bear in mind that agreement had already been reached on the facilities to be accorded to non-governmental organizations, as indicated in the report of the Preparatory Committee (A/32/41, para. 29), which had been endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 32/83 B.

23. The CHAIRMAN said that one meeting of the Committee would be allotted to discussion of the United Kingdom proposal on non-governmental organizations and that delegations would be advised of the date in good time.

24. Replying to questions from the representatives of Brazil and Turkey, he said that he had had discussions with the Under-Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs with regard to the procedure for entering names on the speakers' list for the special session. In order to avoid the problems that had arisen at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, the Secretariat would advise Member States, through the Journal, of the opening of the list. In the meantime, delegations should contact their Governments so that they would be in a position to inform the Secretariat of their preferences. Each delegation would be asked to give its first choice of a date and two alternatives. The Secretariat had given every assurance that it would be able to satisfy all requests as long as delegations gave three alternative dates. In accordance with tradition, priority would be given to Heads of State and Government to speak on whatever date they chose. The Secretariat would probably make the relevant announcement through the Journal during the next week. In his opinion, the system was fair and would enable all those who wanted to speak to do so.

25. Mr. CAJDA (Hungary) said that his delegation supported the idea that representatives of non-governmental organizations and of public opinion should be permitted to take part in the special session. Recent activities, such as the meeting of European youth and students mentioned by the representative of Poland, the conference of non-governmental organizations to be held shortly in Geneva and the efforts of the World Federation of United Nations Associations to bring disarmament issues to the attention of public opinion, were evidence of the keen interest of such organizations in the issues of the special session, and a way had to be found to give them direct access to it.

26. He noted that the statement made by the representative of the Soviet Union at the first meeting of the current session had contained a number of very interesting points concerning the Programme of Action which, in the opinion of his delegation, merited further study. He suggested that, if possible, the Secretariat should be requested to reproduce that statement as a document of the Committee.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that if the Soviet delegation desired to have its statement, or extracts thereof, issued as an official working paper, it would be distributed and discussed with the others.

28. Mr. VRAALSEN (Norway) said that public opinion was undoubtedly very concerned about matters of disarmament and that further objective information was required. The special session could make an important contribution in that regard, and non-governmental organizations and other institutions dealing with disarmament could play their part. His delegation therefore associated itself with the views expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom and felt that some way should be found for such organizations to participate more directly at the special session than they had done at the preparatory stage. It was open to suggestions on how such participation could be arranged, either along the lines suggested by the United Kingdom and Australia or in accordance with some other suitable formula. The Committee would have to discuss the matter in detail at a later stage.

29. The CHAIRMAN reported on the consultations he had held concerning the organization of work. He suggested that a drafting group should be set up to prepare documents on the basis of the ideas that had been submitted. The group would be open-ended and would consist of the authors of the working papers and any others interested in participating. To speed up the work, he urged that groups of delegations that had presented documents should be represented by a limited number of people and that, where possible, a single spokesman should be appointed for each group. That would not, of course, prevent others from speaking if they wished. That system had been adopted with great success at the seventh special session. He suggested that the Committee's Rapporteur should chair the drafting group. Document A/AC.187/93/Rev.1 would be available the next day, and the drafting group would be able to proceed immediately. It should first draft texts on those points on which agreement already existed, then endeavour to resolve any difficulties. Where that proved impossible, it should submit texts with one or more alternative wordings in brackets in order not to paralyse the work. The Committee would meet three times a week in plenary session or in an informal working group, on Monday and Wednesday afternoons and Friday mornings, and the drafting group would hold at least seven meetings a week.

30. The Rapporteur would make a progress report to the Committee on Mondays and Wednesdays and would submit any texts on which a consensus had been reached. The Chairman's good offices would be made available whenever necessary in an effort to resolve any difficulties, and he would keep in constant touch with the drafting group. It was proposed that the drafting group should work on the Preamble, Introduction and Declaration from 2 to 13 February and on the sections dealing with the Programme of Action and Machinery governing disarmament negotiations from 14 to 23 February.

31. To obviate the need for a revised tabulation for the sections dealing with the Programme of Action and the Machinery, he would suggest various draft subtitles which would be distributed the following day. He stressed that those suggestions were merely intended to facilitate the work and could, of course, be rejected or amended if the Committee saw fit. He believed that, if agreement could be reached on the subtitles, the Secretariat would be able to submit the tabulation of proposals the following Monday. He urged any delegation that intended to submit a document to do so without delay.

32. Replying to a question from the representative of India, he said that, as soon as the drafting group reached agreement in principle on the wording of a particular text, it would transmit the text to the Committee at its next meeting. In that way it was hoped that the work would proceed smoothly with a view to completing the draft final document by the end of the current session. He suggested, however, that a pragmatic approach should be taken to the tentative programme of work which he had outlined, so that it could be revised if that proved necessary.
33. Mr. HARRY (Australia), speaking on behalf of the Western States that had submitted the proposals contained in document A/AC.187/87, said that they agreed with the suggestion to establish an open-ended drafting group under the chairmanship of the Rapporteur. They would respond to the Chairman's appeal to co-operate by restricting their participation in the drafting group to particularly interested delegations and would from time to time arrange for one or two spokesmen to present their views, on the understanding that individual Governments would be free to make statements when they so wished.
34. The Western States also agreed that the procedure should be flexible. For example, they felt that the full Committee should meet only when the text of a particular section was ready for its consideration.
35. The CHAIRMAN agreed that in other cases the time could be better employed by the drafting group.
36. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka), speaking on behalf of the group of non-aligned States, assured the Committee that they would co-operate in expediting the work of the drafting group by expressing their views through one or more spokesmen, except where individual Governments wished to express a particular viewpoint.
37. With regard to the use of subtitles for the purpose of facilitating the drafting work, he hoped that they would not have the effect of restricting the scope of the various sections.
38. Lastly, he hoped that the final draft text, when ready, would be made available to all Member States so as to enable them to formulate their views.
39. The CHAIRMAN gave his assurance regarding those two points.
40. As to the draft Programme of Action, he hoped that when the Committee took up the matter it would be able to reach agreement on a number of subtitles for the purpose of tabulating proposals along the lines of document A/AC.187/93/Rev.1.
41. Mr. MISTRAL (France) welcomed the proposed programme of work. He pointed out, however, that his Government had particular positions - as outlined in document A/AC.187/90 - which did not entirely correspond with the views expressed by the various geographical groups. His delegation therefore intended to participate in the open-ended drafting group.



42. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that his delegation fully agreed with the proposed programme of work.

43. With regard to the format of the final document, he drew attention to the fifth paragraph of the Mexican working paper (A/AC.187/89) concerning the need to keep the introductory draft resolution very short since all the relevant ideas, principles, purposes and rules must be included in the final document, which should be a complete and self-sufficient instrument. The draft resolution itself might consist of an amalgamation of the first two preambular paragraphs in document A/AC.187/93, followed by the second preambular paragraph in the outline proposed in the Mexican working paper. He intended to amplify his proposals at the first meeting of the drafting group.

44. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland), speaking on behalf of the socialist States that had submitted documents A/AC.187/81 and A/AC.187/82, assured the Chairman of their full support for the proposed programme of work.

45. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said that his delegation, too, supported the proposed programme of work.

46. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should decide to set up the drafting group, under the chairmanship of the Rapporteur, and to adopt the remaining points of the programme of work which he had put forward.

47. It was so decided.

48. The CHAIRMAN, replying to a request from the representative of Colombia, agreed to have the programme of work circulated as an informal paper for the convenience of delegations.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.

26th meeting

Friday, 3 February 1978, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.26

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. Mr. VELLODI (India)\* said that his Government attached great importance to the forthcoming special session. Everyone had a great responsibility to ensure that the special session would not be a wasted effort, a repetition of the work of the First Committee, a mere forum for expressing pious hopes and high-sounding platitudes, but would succeed in providing clear directives for what must be done in the field of disarmament. The decision to hold the special session had been very widely welcomed, and the peoples of the world expected the participants to produce at least some answers to the issues and situations which appeared to have overtaken them through no fault of their own. The participants could not, and should not, fail them.
2. The Government of India regarded the special session as important and hoped that it would prove a turning-point in the sad and frustrating history of the consideration of disarmament issues in the United Nations. It believed that the special session provided an excellent and timely opportunity to revive the momentum which had been clearly apparent in the late 1950s and early 1960s, leading up to the September 1961 United States-USSR joint statement of agreed principles. Unfortunately, that momentum had not been followed up with the vigour and determination the issues warranted. But Member States should not brood over past mistakes and the numerous opportunities they had missed; they should jointly resolve not to waste the present opportunity, when conditions appeared to be favourable for a significant break-through.
3. The purpose of the special session was not only to awaken and encourage world interest and mobilize public opinion, but also to produce a clear and precise indication of goals and priorities, a well-defined, time-bound and realistic programme of action, and to set up adequate and appropriate machinery for implementing both short- and long-term objectives.
4. Along with other non-aligned countries, India had submitted its views and suggestions. Several other delegations had done the same, either individually or jointly. He did not wish to single out any one of them, but his delegation had been particularly happy to hear the statement made by the representative of France the day before in which he had referred to his Government's conclusion that the time had come to seek a new and positive approach. It warmly welcomed that development and hoped that China would take a similar decision and join the Committee in its future disarmament deliberations so as to strengthen its efforts and make them more meaningful.
5. His delegation had no doubt that on the basis of, and with the help of, the many valuable ideas and suggestions contained in the documents before it, the Committee would succeed, in the coming days, in finalizing a document that would do justice to the efforts required for its preparation.

---

\* This statement has been given full coverage in the summary record in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee during the meeting.

6. The most important part of that document was the one concerning the machinery for future disarmament deliberations. Whatever the goals and short- or long-term programme of action that might be agreed upon, the success of future work would depend on the provision of the appropriate and adequate machinery for dealing with the problems at hand. While not denying that the political will of the nations of the world to achieve meaningful progress in disarmament was the most important prerequisite, his delegation was convinced that effective mechanisms were of great importance not only in making progress in disarmament negotiations but also in helping to generate that political will.

7. His delegation whole-heartedly agreed with the statement contained in the paper submitted by the delegation of Mexico that "the experience gained since the establishment of the United Nations shows that, for maximum effectiveness, two kinds of bodies are required - deliberative and negotiating" (A/AC.187/89, IV, para. 1). The deliberative body must necessarily be a comparatively large one and the negotiating body a comparatively small one. In effect, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament was the only such body available. The First Committee of the General Assembly was neither a negotiating nor a deliberative body. Its function, like that of the other Committees of the General Assembly, was really to review and to evaluate progress, or lack of it, during the previous 12 months and to provide appropriate directions for further action.

8. Much had been said about the inadequacies and short-comings of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament as a negotiating body. It had even been said that the Conference had failed as a negotiating body. His delegation did not subscribe to such outright condemnation of the Conference. It felt that that body, with all its inadequacies and imperfections, had been a useful forum and that it could continue to function even more effectively with some essential changes in its structure and working procedures. During the past two years, much effort had gone into improving those procedures. The reports of the Conference to the General Assembly were, compared to the early years, far more substantive and meaningful. The records of the discussions in the Conference were now available to all the Members of the United Nations and to the public at large, and its work programme followed a set calendar, which ensured the orderly conduct of business. Those were all positive elements and should be duly noted.

9. Much had been said about the practice of having co-chairmen at the Conference and it had been contended that practice should be changed. His delegation agreed, not because it felt that that in itself would make it easier for China and France to participate in the work of the Conference - it did not believe that to be the case, much as it would welcome such development - but because it felt that all the members of the Conference, or indeed of any international forum, should have the same rights and responsibilities. It was precisely for that reason that it saw no reason for denying the nuclear-weapon States the chairmanship of the Conference. It preferred the monthly rotation of that office among all the members.

10. It supported the suggestion that the Conference should establish a standing sub-committee of the whole which would essentially be the negotiating forum in the Conference.

11. It also supported the suggestion that States which were not members of the Conference should have the right to submit to it proposals or views they might have on disarmament measures that were the subject of negotiations in the Conference and to attend its meetings whenever such proposals were examined.
12. It felt that, as a rule, the plenary meetings of the Conference should not be closed but should be open to the press and to others who wished to attend them. There was absolutely no reason why the meetings should be closed. Statements made at the plenary meetings of the Conference were no different from those made in the First Committee. In any case, the verbatim records of the meetings were made available to all Member States and were also available to the public, as they should be. Where, then, was the need for closed meetings and the cryptic communiqués issued at the end of those meetings?
13. His delegation agreed with the suggestion that in addition to the report the Conference submitted to the General Assembly at the beginning of the General Assembly sessions, it should also submit periodic reports. In the light of the foregoing remarks it was obvious that his delegation did not share the view that the Conference should be replaced by some other negotiating body.
14. Returning to the premise that there was a need for a comparatively large deliberative forum and a comparatively small negotiating body, he said that the Conference, with appropriate modifications in its structure and working procedures, could function effectively as the negotiating body. At the same time, there was a strong case for a deliberative body to outline broad policies and, as had been suggested in the paper submitted by the non-aligned countries (A/AC.187/55/Add.1), for the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament measures. That programme had been correctly defined as a middle road between the current step-by-step approach and the ultimate goal of general and complete disarmament. General Assembly resolution 2602 E (XXIV), which declared the decade of the 1970s as a Disarmament Decade, requested the Conference to work out "a comprehensive programme, dealing with all aspects of the problem of the cessation of the arms race and general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which would provide the Conference with a guideline to chart the course of its further work and its negotiations". That resolution had been adopted more than eight years previously. The Disarmament Decade was now in its last two years, and although very useful suggestions in regard to the comprehensive programme had been submitted a long time before, there had been very little, if any, progress in that direction. The time had come to consider specifically the establishment of a body entrusted with the task of elaborating the comprehensive programme of disarmament measures. The non-aligned paper (A/AC.187/55/Add.1) suggested that a special committee of the United Nations should be established to perform that limited task within a specified time.
15. Some delegations had reservations regarding the establishment of a United Nations committee to deal with disarmament matters. Several arguments had been advanced against it, but none of them were very valid.
16. It had been said - and perhaps that was the argument most often made - that

such a committee would seriously undermine the importance and functions of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. His delegation totally disagreed with that view. The Conference and the United Nations committee would have different functions. It was not proposed that that committee should sit in judgement on the Conference or oversee its functions. The two bodies would report separately to the General Assembly on their progress in carrying out their mandates.

17. It had been said that the committee would have to operate under the rules of procedure applicable to United Nations bodies. That was bound to be so, but he did not see any reason why the committee could not operate the way the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space had succeeded in doing over the years, namely as far as possible on the basis of consensus.

18. It had also been said that if two separate bodies were to function independently, many Governments would have serious difficulty in providing the necessary expertise to both bodies. In his delegation's view, however, the proposed committee would not meet throughout the year but would probably have about two sessions. It should be possible to schedule its sessions so as not to conflict with those of the Conference.

19. Apart from the practical considerations already dealt with, there was also the fact that standing organs had been established for important issues in the economic and social fields, and world public opinion could not understand why on an issue such as disarmament, which affected the lives and destiny of all mankind, there should be reluctance to establish a similar body at the United Nations. His delegation sincerely hoped that that suggestion to set up a United Nation committee on disarmament would receive the endorsement of the Preparatory Committee.

20. Many speakers had stressed the need to keep world public opinion properly informed on matters relating to the arms race and disarmament. As had rightly been said, an aroused public opinion could become a global constituency for disarmament and no effort should be spared in alerting public opinion to the dangers of the arms race and the benefits that could accrue from disarmament. The suggestion that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should hold open meetings had been made in that context. His delegation was most grateful to the delegation of Venezuela for the very constructive and timely initiative it had taken in that regard and for the valuable and practical suggestions contained in the paper submitted to the Committee earlier that week. It supported them whole-heartedly and hoped they would be fully reflected in the Declaration and Programme of Action, and possibly even in the Preamble to the final document.

21. His delegation wished to place on record its profound gratitude and admiration for the continuing and dedicated efforts of the non-governmental organizations in the field of disarmament where they had a special contribution to make because world public opinion constituted a global constituency in that regard. They had an important and continuing role to perform in that connexion, and his delegation warmly welcomed the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom to set aside one day of the special session for selected representatives of non-governmental organizations to present their views to the special session.

22. In conclusion, he wished to say a few words about the United Nations Centre for Disarmament, which had been established following the recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in Disarmament (A/31/36). Proposal No. 9 in paragraph 18 of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee listed the functions to be entrusted to the Centre. They included committee and conference services, studies on disarmament matters, compilation and dissemination of information and the follow-up of disarmament resolutions and agreements - a heavy but essential mandate, the implementation of which would require adequate staff. His delegation had no doubt that the Secretary-General, whose interest in and dedication to the cause of disarmament was well known, would take the necessary action in that regard. The Yearbook produced by the Centre was an excellent reference book. His delegation understood that the Centre was planning to bring out a quarterly newsletter. It welcomed that development and hoped that the first issue would appear before the special session.

23. Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom), introducing document A/AC.187/96 on behalf of the sponsors, said that it took into account the views of other regional groups and focused on practical considerations, such as national security requirements, with a view to achieving a consensus. In drafting the proposals, the sponsors had had a limited time-frame in mind and had envisaged the possibility of convening a second special session on disarmament within a few years to review the progress already achieved and to draw up a further programme of action for the subsequent years. High priority was assigned to the conclusion of a second SALT agreement and a comprehensive test-ban treaty, the greatest importance was attached to control of horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the link between the need for such control and the need for control of vertical proliferation was recognized. The sponsors agreed on the need to control the increase of nuclear armaments and to prohibit other weapons of mass destruction, and strongly believed that those aims could not be achieved unless accompanied by progress towards a balanced programme of disarmament involving restraining the world-wide build-up of conventional weapons through regional agreements to reduce forces.

24. Although the confidence-building measures set forth in the document were derived in part from those applied in Europe under the Helsinki Agreement, the sponsors hoped that it would be generally agreed that the specific measures suggested would, if applied on the basis of regionally established criteria, significantly help to decrease regional tensions everywhere. The document also mentioned hot lines, which provided very important links between nuclear Powers, and could also link other countries in areas of tension. He drew particular attention to the proposals calling on States to publish detailed information on their armed forces and the total annual value of their arms production and their transfer of arms to other countries, as well as the appeal for a standard method for the reporting of military budgets.

25. The purpose of the proposals for new United Nations studies on disarmament was to explore and clarify problems which, although of great importance, might not yet be ripe for immediate negotiations. A further advantage of such studies was that they would help the United Nations Disarmament Centre to develop its expertise and thereby increase its ability to help and advise the United Nations. His own

Government regarded that as a particularly important aim in itself. One of the most important studies suggested was the one on limiting the build-up of conventional weapons throughout the world, which was a sensitive but crucial issue. A better understanding of the issues involved in the relationship between disarmament and development was also necessary, and that was also reflected in the programme. The programme recommended a study on the strengthening of the security role of the United Nations in peace-keeping and the peaceful settlement of disputes because there was an important relationship between disarmament and the security role of the United Nations; the sponsors therefore felt that the special session should give impetus to studies in that area. The proposed study on the possible contribution to confidence-building among States of certain technical measures was prompted by the experience of the United Nations and United States observer missions in Sinai, and the idea that what those missions had learned and the techniques that they had developed might be applicable in other areas of tension.

26. In conclusion, the sponsors had attempted to produce a programme of action which was comprehensive and which, while containing new ideas, was also balanced and practicable. It not only established priorities among existing negotiations but also called for specific new moves to promote disarmament, and its implementation could provide the initial momentum towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control to which all were committed.

27. Mr. MUJEZINOVIC (Yugoslavia) proposed that the statement made by the representative of India should be reported in extenso in the summary record.

28. It was so decided.

29. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) welcomed the United Kingdom representative's introduction of the draft programme of action as a constructive contribution to the Committee's work. His delegation would want to study the Indian statement carefully.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.

27th meeting

Wednesday, 8 February 1978, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.27

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that two new documents had been submitted to the Committee, namely the tabulation of proposals relating to the proposed programme of action (A/AC.187/100), which had been requested by the Committee, and a working paper on disarmament and verification, which had been submitted by Austria (A/AC.187/101).
2. He wished to point out that, in document A/AC.187/100, the title of heading IV should be "Implementation" and not "Studies to facilitate further measures".
3. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that his Government had repeatedly stressed the need for a comprehensive and balanced programme of action specifying the priorities and key steps of a gradual disarmament process. The practical contribution of Italy to the preparation of a comprehensive programme for general and complete disarmament dated back to the beginning of 1960 and had been continued over the years in the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament, the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and the General Assembly. His delegation was convinced more than ever of the need for a coherent, comprehensive programme which would be different from, and more inclusive than, a frame of priority measures. Together with nine other Western delegations, his delegation had co-sponsored document A/AC.187/96, which contained a number of practical measures of arms control and disarmament that could be carried out without unnecessary delays and would pave the way for further and wider measures. In introducing its own working paper (A/AC.187/97), his delegation wished to supplement the document of the 10 Western Powers. What his delegation had in mind was a clearer definition of an over-all programme of work, including suggested measures for both the short and the long term. Accordingly, the working paper had also been tabled with CCD in Geneva. Some of his delegation's suggestions were very similar to those which had appeared in document A/AC.187/96 and had been included so that the two or three consecutive stages through which a comprehensive programme of action could be carried out would be more readily understood. While favouring the adoption of short-term realistic measures, his delegation wished to give a sense of direction and purpose to the whole exercise. The ideas contained in his delegation's working paper had already been amplified in his statement in the First Committee on 20 October 1977 (A/32/C.1/PV.9).
4. The suggestions were based on the assumption that the fundamental role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security must be strengthened and that a disarmament strategy must be accompanied by greater and more sustained efforts aimed at putting an end to the present underlying causes of instability. The working paper was divided into three main parts. The first part pointed specifically to certain principles which should constitute the core of any well-articulated programme of action. Basically, those principles were: flexibility in the schedule and time-table for the consideration and negotiation of specific international instruments; a balance between the measures to be taken in the various disarmament sectors, namely those of nuclear and conventional arms; an appropriate co-ordination of global and regional initiatives in the field of



disarmament; a step-by-step approach in order to prevent imbalances and destabilization, and effective verification measures to ensure that disarmament obligations were being fully complied with by all parties.

5. The second part concerned itself with the main elements of the disarmament programme and was intended to offer a set of priority measures affecting not only nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction but also conventional and other weaponry systems. Those measures were intended to set in motion bilateral and multilateral initiatives capable of fostering a climate of confidence and trust. The measures also envisaged the setting up, under Article 29 of the United Nations Charter, of subsidiary bodies of the Security Council in which all interested parties could participate on an equal footing with a view to reducing the level of weapons and armed forces on both a global and a regional basis.

6. The third part dealt with the question of strengthening international peace and security and was intended to stress that, to be effective, any progress along the path to genuine disarmament must be coupled with adequate collective security measures. The starting point could be the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and, always in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, renewed efforts to supplement, by means of appropriate guidelines, the arrangements concerning the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations. Studies and/or negotiations should be undertaken with a view to recruiting a permanent United Nations police force, as provided for in Article 43 of the Charter, and to establishing an international organ to supervise the application of disarmament agreements in force. He hoped that his delegation's working paper would provide a positive contribution to the work of the Committee and to the studies which the Secretary-General had been requested to carry out in section IV of the working paper of the 10 Western Powers (A/AC.187/96).

7. Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria) said that he wished to introduce a working paper (A/AC.187/101) which concerned itself with the question of verification. That question was of fundamental significance, and indeed the inability to reach agreement on specific disarmament texts might to a large extent be attributed to a divergence of views on that point. The successful implementation of arms limitation or disarmament measures depended on the degree of confidence which each party had that all other parties were acting in compliance with the agreement. In that context, verification played an important role. In virtually all the papers which had been presented to the Committee, the need for adequate verification had been stressed in one way or another. There was as yet, however, no agreed understanding about the role which verification could and should play within the framework of disarmament negotiations. The problem therefore merited a thorough examination in the course of the preparations for the first special session; as a first step, he proposed that the Secretariat should be entrusted with the preparation of a background paper which would help to pinpoint different problem areas as well as possible ways of approaching them. Such a background paper should include the following elements: proposals for commonly agreed definitions; a listing of different functions of verification measures and a discussion of the corresponding requirements for verification measures; a discussion of the concept of adequacy of verification and the role of verification as a confidence-building measure; a survey

of various means, methods and types of verification, followed by an indication of their potential usefulness in relation to different disarmament agreements, and an outline of the impact of modern technology on verification. On the basis of the experience gained through such a background paper, the Committee might later wish to propose an in-depth study of those and related questions. In addition to the paragraphs on verification in the part of the draft declaration dealing with principles guiding disarmament negotiations, the Committee might wish to include in its draft programme of action a proposal for the preparation of such a study.

8. The second part of the Austrian working paper contained a preliminary list of areas in which, on the basis of such a study, principles concerning verification could be formulated. In that connexion, his Government attached great importance to confidence-building measures such as could be obtained from an understanding on what could be regarded as a reasonable degree of assurance about compliance with a given agreement. He believed that future discussions would be facilitated if Governments presenting new disarmament proposals were to provide indications about corresponding verification measures. Furthermore, all parties to an agreement must have the right to obtain full access to relevant data. That principle would have particular significance in relation to such agreements as a comprehensive test-ban treaty and a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons.

9. The third part of the working paper contained suggestions on verification for possible inclusion in the draft Declaration. The last paragraph contained a preliminary proposal for a paragraph to be included in the draft programme of action concerning studies to be carried out in order to facilitate future disarmament negotiations.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee approved the proposal of the representative of Austria that the Secretariat should prepare a background paper on the question of verification.

11. It was so decided.

12. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said that, while he welcomed the constructive progress which was being made by the Committee, quicker action was required if an adequate single working text was to be available in time for the special session. The drafting of the Declaration was already proving to be a major task, but the negotiation of a programme of action would be even more difficult. One clear problem which had emerged was that of reconciling action focusing on the short term with the longer-term goals of disarmament. A number of texts which had been submitted had concentrated on the short term. If agreement was to be achieved on a programme of action, it was essential that it should be generally understood that what was under discussion was guidelines for a limited period. Progress could be facilitated by annual reviews in the General Assembly and by a reappraisal, after an appropriate period, of the achievements flowing from the programme of action. His delegation was therefore prepared in principle to support the proposal that a second special session on disarmament

should be held, provided that the programme of action which was eventually adopted was specific and realistic and not of too general a nature. A second special session at too early a date, such as 1981, would, however, be unwise. Time must be allowed for progress to be made in the efforts to implement the programme of action. His delegation would prefer that a second special session should not be held before 1983.

13. Mr. HAMILTON (Sweden) said that his delegation agreed with the representative of Austria that verification must be an essential element in any agreement on disarmament. He therefore welcomed the Committee's decision that the Secretariat should be requested to produce a background paper on verification, as had been suggested by the representative of Austria.

14. He noted that his delegation's suggestion on the date of a second special session had been included in the Secretariat's tabulation (A/AC.187/100) under the heading of "Implementation", rather than, as had been suggested in document A/AC.187/95, under "Measures". He therefore asked that his delegation's suggestion should be placed under heading "III. Measures".

15. He supported the proposal of the United States representative concerning the second special session and hoped that the Committee would adopt a decision on that question as soon as possible.

16. Mr. PALMA (Peru) said that he welcomed the Committee's decision to ask the Secretariat to prepare a background paper on verification. That was an essential element which required clarification and must be included both in the Declaration and in the programme of action.

17. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that he welcomed the statement by the representative of the United States in favour of a second special session. His delegation had always regarded a second session as not only a means of monitoring compliance with the decisions taken at the first session but also as an instrument through which a comprehensive programme of action could be implemented. He continued to believe, however, that a period of three years between special sessions was sufficient, and he would therefore continue to support 1981 as the most appropriate date for the second special session.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.

28th meeting

Friday, 10 February 1978, at 11.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.28

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN said that no delegation had asked to speak at that meeting and noted that the substantive work of the Committee was currently being dealt with in the drafting subgroups. He would therefore adjourn the meeting.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

29th meeting

Monday, 13 February 1968, at 3.45 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.29

ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

1. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland) said that the Committee's current session was characterized by a constructive atmosphere, a spirit of co-operation and the desire of members to contribute to the elaboration of realistic and action-oriented drafts of the principal documents to be adopted at the special session. He felt, however, that the Committee should further accelerate its work in order to fulfil its mandate.
2. The Committee's discussions so far confirmed that the success of disarmament negotiations required goodwill and a readiness to compromise in seeking solutions which took account of the interests of all parties. The history of disarmament negotiations revealed that adherence to the principle of equal and undiminished security for all parties was essential to the conclusion of viable agreements. That was also true of current disarmament negotiations in various forums, where the main stumbling blocks hampering progress were obviously not some alleged inadequacies or shortcomings of the negotiating machinery, but precisely the lack of political will on the part of some participants seeking unilateral advantages.
3. As could be seen from document A/AC.187/75, the greatest number of initiatives designed to curb the arms race and promote genuine disarmament had been submitted by the socialist States. Today they continued to attach particular importance to such areas as nuclear disarmament and the emergence of new weapons of mass destruction, where continuation of the arms race might jeopardize mankind's very existence.
4. Poland supported the important disarmament proposals put forward by the Soviet Union on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. His delegation hoped that the documents of the special session would reflect those proposals, as well as those referred to in the Soviet working paper A/AC.187/98, especially the proposals for the simultaneous cessation by all States of the production of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction by the nuclear Powers of their accumulated stocks of weapons. Poland was deeply concerned over the plans to develop and deploy the neutron bomb, a particularly inhuman weapon of mass destruction. If implemented, those plans would escalate the arms race. His delegation therefore fully supported the Soviet proposal recently addressed to Western States to agree on a mutual renunciation of the production of the neutron bomb.
5. The importance which Poland attached to the successful outcome of the special session and its determination to take an active part in the preparations had recently been reiterated by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, Edward Gierek, and in talks held at the highest level between Poland and other socialist, non-aligned and Western States.
6. Poland would make every effort to ensure that the special session was productive. Yet, while recognizing the significance of the special session per se,

it strongly believed that the session should also become a major step towards convening a world disarmament conference. Such a conference, as the most universal and authoritative forum, vested with powers to take effective decisions, would be the best instrument to translate General Assembly resolutions into practical measures. A concerted decision should therefore be taken at the special session to convene a world disarmament conference on a specific, not too distant date, and a preparatory committee should be established for that purpose. Such a conference would be an extremely important element which could not be overlooked in any programme of action on disarmament or in documents on the machinery of disarmament negotiations.

7. Poland strongly believed that the political and material prerequisites existed for reversing the arms race and making decisive progress in disarmament. The pace of such progress would depend on many factors, especially the further consolidation of détente and the willingness of all States to display a constructive approach to disarmament negotiations.

8. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee would continue its discussions as a Working Group.

The meeting rose at 3.55 p.m.

30th meeting

Wednesday, 15 February 1978, at 3.40 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.30

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN said that he had had contacts with the delegations and consultations with the Secretariat which indicated that it would be advisable for the Secretariat to prepare as soon as possible a tabulation of proposals regarding machinery for disarmament negotiations analogous to the tabulations in documents A/AC.187/93/Rev.1 and A/AC.187/100, to be distributed to the drafting group in order to expedite completion of work on all four sections of the final document. Since some of the working papers relating to the Declaration and the Programme of Action also related to machinery for disarmament negotiations, he suggested that the relevant portions should be included in the tabulation on machinery so as to avoid cross-referencing and repetition. He further suggested that the most logical sequence for that tabulation would be an introduction, followed by sections on the rôle of the United Nations in disarmament and on the work of the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission, the Secretariat and the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva. Further contributions by delegations which had not yet submitted their views could, of course, be incorporated in a revised text, but it would facilitate the work of the drafting group if they would submit their views as soon as possible.

2. It was so decided.

PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR THE SPECIAL SESSION: ROLE OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS  
(continued)

3. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the General Assembly had already approved a Preparatory Committee recommendation that non-governmental organizations should be accorded the same facilities at the special session as they had in the Preparatory Committee itself. He then drew attention to the proposals regarding the role of non-governmental organizations which had been made by the United Kingdom representative at the 25th meeting and noted that, according to the Secretariat, there was no precedent for non-governmental organizations either to address or participate in plenary meetings. The decision already taken by the General Assembly did not, of course, bar the Committee from making other recommendations to the special session. Furthermore, the Committee could do no more than recommend that a special day should be set aside during the special session for non-governmental organizations to address it; the Assembly itself would have to approve such a recommendation. On the other hand, the proposal that the day before the special session opened should be reserved for a meeting of the special session outside its plenary programme (A/AC.187/SR.25, para. 3) presented complications of an administrative and legal nature, since the Preparatory Committee had no authority to convene a meeting one day before the General Assembly. Such a proposal also involved financial implications, and arrangements would have to be made to admit the representatives of the non-governmental organizations to the building. There would, of course, be no summary records of such a meeting, which would have to be considered by the Committee on Conferences as well as by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

4. Mr. BETTENCOURT BUENO (Brazil) said that his delegation had certain reservations regarding the United Kingdom proposals, which would imply reversing formal decisions previously taken by the Preparatory Committee and the General Assembly itself. In that connexion, he drew attention to paragraphs 9, 16 and 29 of the report of the Preparatory Committee to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly (A/32/41) regarding the role of non-governmental organizations at the Preparatory Committee and at the special session. Furthermore, the recommendation that non-governmental organizations should be accorded the same facilities at the special session as they had received at the Preparatory Committee had been adopted by consensus in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 32/88 B, endorsing the report. The Preparatory Committee was a body with limited participation and as such could not very well overrule a decision of the General Assembly. Also, it was hard to see what authority the Committee might have to issue invitations to non-governmental organizations; that would also leave unanswered the question as to how such invitations and meetings would be funded, since the existing financial provisions for the special session had been made on the basis of General Assembly resolution 32/88 B. Furthermore, Governments alone were responsible for the success or failure of the disarmament process and a true commitment to nuclear disarmament by the international community must obviously be governmental in nature.

5. He also felt that it would be extremely unwise to resurrect a precedent for the participation of non-governmental organizations in intergovernmental negotiations on disarmament which dated back to the World Disarmament Conference of 1932. It should be borne in mind that many other matters apart from disarmament would be on the agendas of the General Assembly at its future sessions which would also inevitably be of interest to certain non-governmental organizations. The interest of non-governmental organizations in the special session was justified and welcome, but the decisions already taken in that connexion were adequate and reasonable.

6. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) recalled that she had previously expressed regret at the limited facilities accorded at the meetings of the Preparatory Committee to non-governmental organizations and research institutes such as the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) and said that she supported the United Kingdom proposal (A/AC.187/SR.25, para. 3) that provision should be made for a more direct relationship between the special session and non-governmental organizations. The United Kingdom's reasons for making those proposals had been the desire to promote the enlightenment of the peoples of the world about disarmament and recognition of the valuable role which they could play. Many organizations working in that field were highly competent and experienced in the substance of disarmament questions and did excellent work in informing public opinion and enlisting public support for disarmament. Their experience and contribution should be welcomed. The Committee should not be unduly formalistic but should remain open to new approaches because it could learn a great deal from such bodies. If the Preparatory Committee could not reach a consensus on the United Kingdom proposals, it should at the very least accept the Australian suggestion (A/AC.187/SR.25, para. 16) which would allow organizations and research institutes to present their views to the Committee of the Whole.

7. Miss BEAGLE (Observer for New Zealand) said that non-governmental organizations and research institutes could make a distinctive contribution in the



form of research on disarmament and in increasing public awareness, promoting international activities and formulating disarmament proposals. She agreed whole-heartedly with the representative of Sweden that many valuable studies had come from such organizations, especially SIPRI. In her own country, for example, the National Consultative Committee on Disarmament provided an important and useful informal link between Governments and non-governmental organizations concerned with disarmament and facilitated an exchange of views between the two. Her delegation therefore favoured the United Kingdom proposal for setting aside a day during the special session to allow such organizations to present their views. It hoped that the special session would stimulate public awareness of the problems of disarmament and felt that such a day would be helpful in that connexion.

8. Mr. MORENO (Italy) said that his delegation had noted with interest the proposals made with respect to the role of non-governmental organizations. Greater awareness of progress on disarmament on the part of world public opinion was needed, and non-governmental organizations could contribute at both the national and international levels to enlightening it. They also provided useful expertise for carrying out studies on specific disarmament problems. His own country's organizations were prepared to contribute actively in that connexion. His delegation had welcomed the decision on the participation of non-governmental organizations and national research institutes in the Preparatory Committee, as well as the recommendation that the same facilities should be accorded them at the special session. Setting aside a special day outside the plenary programme was a possibility. For instance, the day immediately following the general debate might be assigned to the NGO's and to national research institutes for expressing their views before a committee. His delegation would welcome any other proposal, however, which was consistent with United Nations procedure and practice.

9. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) said that non-governmental organizations and research institutes undoubtedly made a very important contribution to disarmament efforts. On the other hand, their participation in the special session raised a delicate political problem. They should not be granted a hearing by way of rewarding them, as it were, for their work; rather, the United Nations should consider how it could benefit from what they had to offer.

10. Under those conditions, and having regard to the need to avoid setting a precedent or infringing the rules of procedure, he felt that they should be given the opportunity to express their views. In that respect the Australian proposal was more acceptable than the United Kingdom proposal. The Committee should therefore discuss what practical recommendations it could make to that end.

11. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) noted that, by providing information and ideas, non-governmental organizations supplemented the role of Governments and helped to mobilize the public support on which political will, so essential to progress in disarmament, depended. In his view, there should be an interchange between non-governmental organizations and Governments, both before and after the special session. Yet, despite the useful suggestions made for increasing public awareness, few ideas had been put forward as to the way in which the participation of non-governmental organizations in disarmament efforts after the special session could be enhanced.

12. As to the question of selection, he felt that perhaps there should be more communication between the Committees on Non-Governmental Organizations in New York and Geneva respectively so that specific arrangements could be made. The selection of research institutes were particularly difficult: in the United States alone, he knew of at least five major centres concerned with disarmament studies. He suggested that there should be further discussion and that a decision should be deferred until the Committee's fifth session.
13. Mr. JAY (Canada) said he was gratified at the broad recognition given by delegations to the contribution of an enlightened public opinion, and welcomed the reception given to the Venezuelan and United Kingdom proposals.
14. The non-governmental organizations and peace research institutes made an invaluable contribution to the work of the United Nations. He agreed with the Iranian representative that the United Nations should not seek to reward them, but rather to derive further advantage from their work. It needed all the help it could get in its disarmament efforts. By participating in the special session, the non-governmental organizations would gain a political audience, and their prestige and persuasiveness after the special session had ended would be enhanced.
15. The Committee should not be put off by the difficulties which enabling non-governmental organizations to present their views would entail; he felt sure it could find an appropriate way without setting a precedent. In his view the Australian proposal was the minimum position that the Committee could take.
16. Mr. VAERNØ (Norway) associated his delegation with the views of the previous speaker. The Norwegian authorities thought very highly of the United Kingdom initiative and hoped that it would receive broad support, given the important role played by public opinion in disarmament matters.
17. He felt that the special session would provide an excellent opportunity to recognize the work of the non-governmental organizations and that the forthcoming meeting of non-governmental organizations on disarmament to be held at Geneva should be invited to endorse the idea. He also agreed with the United States representative that the Committees on Non-Governmental Organizations in New York and Geneva should be asked to consider the problem and to work out some arrangement with the Secretariat.
18. He also welcomed the United Kingdom suggestion that representatives of the research institutes should likewise be given the opportunity to address the special session. Over the years they had contributed significantly to knowledge of arms control and disarmament, giving fresh impetus to governmental action and mobilizing public opinion. He felt that the International Peace Research Association, which was their own non-governmental organization, could be asked to help solve the problem of their representation.
19. In conclusion, he agreed that the Committee should avoid being too formalistic. Like the New Zealand representative, he felt that in considering the participation of the non-governmental organizations, the Committee would not be overruling its parent body.

20. Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia) said that the non-governmental organizations made a positive contribution to the understanding of disarmament issues and that their role at the special session should be regarded as complementary to that of Member States. They had been particularly instrumental in disseminating information across national boundaries. However, he expressed some concern about the selection of non-governmental organizations: it was important not to overlook those in the third world about which less might be known.
21. As to the question of setting a precedent, his delegation maintained that the special session was itself a precedent and that there was room for creating precedents in the way in which the deliberations were conducted. An open-minded approach was needed: Member States should feel free to solicit as much information as possible.
22. Mr. ENTERLEIN (German Democratic Republic) said that his country believed it was of great importance to support the social organizations and great international movements, including the world peace movement, which actively contributed to maintaining and securing peace and achieving disarmament. It looked forward with interest to the Geneva meeting of non-governmental organizations on disarmament and believed that the Committee should welcome and support any wish that might be expressed by that meeting to submit a report on its deliberations to the special session. As to the manner of transmission of such a report, his delegation considered that more time was required for consultations and consideration. It therefore favoured the deferment of a decision until the April session.
23. The possible participation of representatives of scientific institutes in the special session was quite another matter. Regardless of the prestige they might enjoy, his delegation had doubts as to whether it was advisable for them to be heard at the special session. It believed that some other way should be found for their submissions and expertise to be made available.
24. Mr. UPADHYAY (Nepal) said that he welcomed the United Kingdom proposal, in view of the important role played by such institutes as SIPRI and the USSR Academy of Sciences in mobilizing public opinion in favour of disarmament. He observed that, in earlier years when communications had been less developed, the role of non-governmental organizations in disseminating information had been particularly important in isolated countries such as Nepal.
25. If the Committee felt that the participation of the non-governmental organizations would be useful, it should not be afraid to set a precedent. Indeed, their role in such bodies as the Special Committee against Apartheid was taken for granted. While he agreed that they should not be accorded the same status as Governments, he felt confident that a way could be found to ensure their participation. It was not a question of rewarding them; rather, the information which they could provide would be of great benefit, especially to smaller delegations. It was also to be hoped that they would act as a catalyst, since they could be more objective than Governments.
26. Miss LOPEZ (Venezuela), noting that her delegation had already stressed the role of the non-governmental organizations in helping to disseminate information

about disarmament, said that their contribution to the special session would be very valuable. Although it was not in a position to make any specific proposal on how those organizations might participate, it was ready to work with other delegations to find a formula acceptable to the majority.

27. Mr. ERNEMANN (Belgium) said that the United Kingdom delegation had rightly stressed the role of public opinion and its relationship to the work of the special session. His delegation took a positive attitude towards the participation of non-governmental organizations, not least because the Association of International Non-Governmental Organizations was based in Brussels and headed by a Belgian.

28. There were, however, two provisos regarding the participation of non-governmental organizations. First, the principles of the Charter and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly should not be violated. The special session, like a regular session of the General Assembly, was restricted to participation by representatives of Member States. There was no precedent for the participation of non-governmental organizations and the special session should not create one. He supported the view expressed by a number of delegations that the non-governmental organizations should be heard at committee meetings or meetings of the Committee of the Whole, but not at plenary meetings.

29. Secondly, there was the problem of selection. It was obvious that not all non-governmental organizations concerned with disarmament would be able to speak. There had been a suggestion that non-governmental organizations should agree among themselves on their representatives. There might be some difficulties in that regard if they had to await the endorsement of the special session before holding such consultations. Some unofficial consultations with the non-governmental organizations during the forthcoming Geneva conference might help obviate those difficulties.

30. Non-governmental organizations in his own country were showing great interest in the special session. A press conference had already been held and a demonstration was planned for 7 May. There were plans afoot to organize an international demonstration outside United Nations Headquarters later that month.

31. Mr. MIHAJLOVIC (Yugoslavia) observed that there was obviously no disagreement about the value and the importance of non-governmental organizations presenting their views at the special session. Their valuable work in the field of disarmament was recognized. The research institutes too, particularly SIPRI at Stockholm, were providing many countries with extremely useful information on disarmament. A way must be found to give non-governmental organizations the opportunity to address the special session, without infringing the Charter and the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

32. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said it was only fitting that non-governmental organizations devoted to the promotion of disarmament should participate more directly in the special session. The achievement of disarmament was a difficult matter. It was logical that any stimulus non-governmental organizations could give in attaining that goal should be welcomed and could be expected to bear fruit.

33. One of the obstacles to efforts in favour of disarmament was scepticism in the world at large. Unfortunately, such scepticism was justified to some extent, but if the non-governmental organizations were convinced that their proposals would be given due attention they might have greater motivation to enlarge their field of action, especially by disseminating information on disarmament, which was, after all, an issue crucial to mankind's survival.

34. He agreed with the representative of Iran that it was not a matter of distributing prizes to non-governmental organizations. The idea was to open the door to their wider participation in the special session, not so that they could compete with Member States or arrogate rights to which they were not entitled, but so that they could bring to the special session the best of their talents and their devotion to peace. No subject dealt with by the United Nations merited the participation of non-governmental organizations more than disarmament.

35. His delegation believed that the Committee was authorized to take decisions to enable non-governmental organizations to play a greater role in the special session. He did not doubt that there would be a good response from such organizations.

36. Mrs. NOWOTNY (Austria) stated that the merits of non-governmental organizations were not in question and there was no doubt that their contribution to the work of the special session would be extremely valuable and important. There was much benefit to be drawn from their knowledge and experience and she supported the proposal made by Australia with regard to their participation in the special session.

37. Mr. HARRY (Australia) explained that his delegation's wish to see facilities for non-governmental organizations slightly extended was based on the experience of the past year and the response from such organizations during the preparations for the special session. No doubt all delegations had been receiving the useful documents prepared by them, especially by SIPRI. There was great merit in the United Kingdom proposal that non-governmental organizations and peace research institutes should be able to make oral presentations at the special session, provided they could agree among themselves on a panel.

38. The Preparatory Committee obviously had no mandate, nor the organizational or financial resources necessary, to organize a non-governmental organizations day. However, there could be no objection if those organizations themselves decided to organize such an event.

39. It would be inappropriate under the rules of procedure of the General Assembly for non-governmental organizations to be heard during the general debate, but they should be allowed to speak in the Committee of the Whole. Since their submissions could be useful in drawing up the final documents, it would be appropriate if they spoke after the general debate but before the Committee of the Whole began its final negotiations. Rather than making lengthy statements, it should be suggested that they submit documents, merely summarizing their views in their oral submissions.

40. The CHAIRMAN, summing up the debate, said that it was clear that everyone agreed on the importance of the role of non-governmental organizations and the valuable contribution they could make to the special session. There appeared to be certain reservations, however, with regard to the manner or extent of their participation. Many delegations had supported the idea of selecting a day on which non-governmental organizations could be heard, while it had also been felt that a suitable formula should be sought, without infringing the rules of procedure, to enable them to appear before the Committee of the Whole. Some delegations had sounded a note of warning against setting a precedent in that respect.

41. A good number of delegations had expressed the view that it was somewhat premature to take a decision immediately and that consultations should be pursued. At that stage the best procedure would appear to be to defer a decision and entrust him with the task of consulting the officers and the various delegations and groups, with a view to arriving at a consensus which would take account of all the views that had been expressed.

42. In his opinion, the second alternative proposed by the United Kingdom, namely, to set aside the day prior to the opening of the special session, would create financial, organizational and other difficulties and he proposed that consultations should focus on the first alternative. He would also hold consultations to see if a consensus could be reached on the selection of non-governmental organizations and on the participation of peace research institutes, including the possibility of adding some of the institutes that had been mentioned by various delegations.

43. He hoped that it would be possible to reach a satisfactory solution and would report to the Committee on the results of his consultations in due course. If agreement could not be reached by the conclusion of the current session, the decision could be taken at the fifth session in April. He pointed out that whatever formula was agreed upon would be in the nature of a recommendation to be considered by the special session when it convened.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

Friday, 17 February 1978, at 11.20 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.31

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. Mr. VAERNO (Norway), introducing the working paper on international machinery for disarmament (A/AC.187/103) prepared by his delegation and those of Australia, Canada, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, observed that, as stated in the first paragraph, a large number of countries favoured increased involvement on the part of the United Nations in the work on disarmament and all countries had a role to play in the disarmament process. The special session would provide an opportunity for greater participation in that process.
2. Although there was little doubt that political will on the part of Governments was the major prerequisite for achieving progress in the field of disarmament, the need for appropriate machinery for the conduct of disarmament negotiations had also been clearly demonstrated. The existing disarmament machinery, both within and outside the United Nations, had certain short-comings; hence the decision to review that subject at the special session.
3. The working paper had been drawn up against that background. It made no attempt to outline a comprehensive solution, but recommended some steps which the sponsors were convinced would facilitate the disarmament process.
4. Section II underlined the importance of having one deliberative body comprising all United Nations Member States meeting annually to consider the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments and suggested that that might involve a restructuring of the First Committee to deal exclusively with disarmament and related questions in future. It called for the prompt implementation of the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament and for follow-up to the programme of action. It also recommended that the question of convening a further special session devoted to disarmament should be dealt with at the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly.
5. Under section III, concerning the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), the sponsors sought, firstly, to facilitate the participation of all nuclear-weapon States in the work of that body and, secondly, to encourage further participation of non-nuclear-weapon States by a limited increase in its size and by arrangements for non-CCD member States to attend plenary meetings as observers and to participate fully in other meetings when their particular concerns were under discussion. However, there would be no change in CCD's consensus procedures or in its function as the principal multilateral negotiating body. The sponsors believed that the link between CCD and the United Nations should be strengthened and that a greater role should be considered for the Secretary-General's representative. Another important step was the improvement of opportunities for the public to follow CCD activities.
6. Section IV suggested that the Disarmament Centre should be strengthened so as to enable it to implement the decisions taken at the special session and should be

provided with sufficient capacity to enable it to prepare reports and expert studies, produce information material and increase its contacts with Member States, non-governmental organizations and research institutions.

7. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that although his delegation had not been in a position to sponsor the document, it found some of the basic ideas contained in it to be of considerable interest. It supported the demand for wider and more active participation of all States Members of the United Nations in the study of the general principles governing disarmament and arms control, in some appropriate forum such as the General Assembly. The principle of the special responsibility of the nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States must be stressed. Furthermore, it was essential that disarmament negotiations should be conducted in a forum which would be of a size conducive to the effectiveness of its deliberations, would have the requisite expertise at its disposal, would be geographically and politically balanced and would take decisions by consensus.

8. The Italian Government had accordingly reacted very favourably to the recent remarks made by the President of the French Republic and to the statement and documents submitted by the representative of France to the Preparatory Committee, all of which were evidence of that country's will to continue contributing to the activities of the international community in the field of disarmament. His Government would be paying close attention to those and any other proposals submitted to the Committee, particularly by certain non-aligned countries.

9. The effectiveness of the machinery for disarmament was no less important than the content of the declaration and the programme of action and his delegation intended to take an active role in the preparation of the draft document on that subject.

10. Mr. de LAIGLESIA (Spain) expressed the view that machinery for disarmament negotiations was one of the most important items to be discussed by the special session. He believed it was generally agreed that the role of the United Nations should be considerably strengthened; the establishment of a deliberative body comprising all Member States was one way of achieving that purpose. He did not think it would be helpful, however, for the First Committee to deal exclusively with disarmament.

11. It was important that the achievements of the special session should be followed up in the future; the inclusion of the programme of action on the agenda of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly would be a step in that direction. The possibility of holding further special sessions devoted to disarmament should not be excluded. The question of negotiations raised serious problems. So far, the major responsibility had rested with CCD. Although that body had been enlarged over the years, its modus operandi still did not take due account of the desires of a large sector of the international community. In recent years steps had been taken to enable United Nations Member States to keep abreast of CCD activities and the points of view of non-CCD members had been taken into account on various occasions. However, a way had to be found to permit all States which could contribute to its work to join CCD. Only by involving all interested States in the negotiations could progress be made.



12. Mr. ELLERY (Australia), speaking on behalf of his own delegation and the delegations of Bangladesh, India, Malaysia and Sri Lanka, drew attention to the communiqué issued by the Commonwealth Heads of Government of the Asian and Pacific Region meeting in Sydney from 13 to 16 February 1978, in which they had welcomed the forthcoming special session as a positive step towards world peace and security, expressed their deep appreciation of the initiative taken by the non-aligned movement and other countries to secure the convening of the special session, and voiced the hope that it would lead to concrete action promoting the objective of genuine and complete disarmament and the application of the resources thus released to ensure a better life for the peoples of the world.

13. Mr. BERG (Belgium) said that his delegation supported the working paper (A/AC.187/103) as a useful starting-point for discussions on the negotiating machinery. The reference to CCD was most welcome but the document did not seem to deal adequately with the concerns of some States whose participation in the work of CCD would seem to be desirable. His Government would consider any proposals for changes in CCD likely to improve its efficiency.

14. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that the working paper included many valuable and highly constructive ideas, a number of which were identical with those set forth in his own delegation's working paper (A/AC.187/89).

15. It was not clear from section II whether the sponsors intended the First Committee to become the deliberative body on disarmament or whether, like his own delegation, they favoured the establishment of a new body. If a new body was intended, further details would be required. The working paper spoke of participation of all nuclear-weapon States in CCD, (sect. III, para. 1). He sought clarification from the sponsors as to whether they considered such participation possible and whether their proposal involved retaining the present co-chairmanship of CCD.

16. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden) said that the working paper included a number of excellent ideas which could provide a useful basis for the work of the drafting group. While she fully endorsed the Introduction as a whole, she could not agree with its last two sentences. Sweden was one of many States which had stressed that disarmament negotiations were the concern of all States and that therefore all States should have an opportunity to participate in them. She was particularly disturbed by the sentence "Some important questions can better be handled on a bilateral or regional basis.". Much depended on the definition of "some important questions". The comprehensive test-ban treaty under discussion in Geneva, for example, must be made multilateral as soon as possible.

17. The guidelines proposed in the working paper included many useful ideas which she hoped would be accepted by consensus in the drafting group. However, she could not agree with paragraph 4 of section II. The question of convening a further special session must be decided at the special session itself. It should under no circumstances be left until the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly. The aim should be an action-oriented programme of work to begin immediately after the special session. Furthermore, it was important that the guidelines should reflect the request made by her country, Mexico and others that the system of

co-chairmanship of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should be changed. That request should be taken up at the special session, where she hoped it would obtain wide support.

18. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland) said that his delegation's statement before the Preparatory Committee and document A/AC.187/82 submitted by the socialist States had made his country's position clear. States should make effective use of all channels for the conduct of negotiations in order to achieve disarmament. The question of machinery, which came under agenda item 12 of the special session, was also referred to in paragraph 18 of the Preparatory Committee's report to the General Assembly (A/32/41), which the Assembly had endorsed in its resolution 32/88 B. The Preparatory Committee was somewhat handicapped as long as it did not have the two important reports - those of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and of the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference - referred to in that paragraph. Under the circumstances, the Preparatory Committee's work and its deliberations on machinery for disarmament would not fully reflect the existing situation, and that might present some difficulty, which he hoped could be solved through co-operation.

19. Mr. DATCU (Romania) said that equal attention should not be paid to all the documents to be adopted by the special session. Priority should be given to stressing the integrated nature of the decisions to be taken. An over-all view of the tasks and problems should emerge from the session. He agreed with the view that the drafting group must discuss structural problems, and, with respect to principles, he expressed the conviction that in view of the close link between disarmament and the national security of all States, all States must participate in negotiations on the basis of complete equality. There were no major and minor interests. All States had an equal interest in security and therefore all should participate as a matter of principle.

20. Mr. MULYE (India) recalled that the non-aligned States had previously called for the establishment of a special committee of the United Nations for the elaboration of a comprehensive programme of disarmament measures to be submitted to the thirty-fifth session of the General Assembly at the latest. His delegation would, nevertheless, give careful consideration to the proposals in working paper A/AC.187/103.

21. Mr. FALASE (Nigeria) said that his delegation agreed with the spirit of the proposal in working paper A/AC.187/103. The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament seemed to be the principal multilateral negotiating body on disarmament, but as such it must undergo fundamental reform. The drafting group must address the fundamental aspects of that reform, i.e., that of structure and procedures, including specifically the institution of co-chairmen, so as to make it a more effective body. The Conference should establish a permanent working group to ensure that all Members could take effective part in negotiations.

22. His delegation also favoured any procedures which might be devised to strengthen the link between the Conference and the General Assembly. The Assembly

had requested the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to submit a draft comprehensive negotiating programme to the special session, but the Committee did not yet know whether it would succeed in doing so. It would be the task of the special session to consider, on the basis of the report submitted by the Conference, whether it would be worth while to ask the Conference, through its standing committee, to continue preparation of a programme if it had not yet completed one, or whether the General Assembly itself should proceed to appoint a committee to look into that matter. It was important to keep an open mind on the issue because much depended on the kind of report received from the Conference.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.

32nd meeting

Wednesday, 22 February 1978, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.32

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that, as agreed by the members of the Committee, the film entitled Nuclear Countdown, produced by the Office of Public Information, would be projected. The OPI representative would then make a statement on the work being done by OPI in connexion with the special session and would reply to any questions which representatives wished to put concerning the film.
2. The film entitled "Nuclear Countdown" was projected.
3. Mr. GRIBKOV (Office of Public Information) said that OPI continued to give extensive publicity to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and had undertaken or would undertake the following programmes in that respect.
4. With regard to press and publications, two brochures, entitled Special Session on Disarmament and Economic and Social Consequences of the Arms Race and of Military Expenditures, had been produced. Detailed press coverage would be provided during the session, and immediately before the opening of the session a background press release would be issued and a roundtable for senior editors of the mass media from developing countries would be held, at which the main emphasis would be placed on disarmament.
5. With regard to radio and visual services, the film entitled Nuclear Countdown, which had just been projected for the members of the Committee, had been produced. Language versions of that film were being produced, which was currently available in English only. The film would be distributed to all the Information Centres, and to interested non-governmental organizations and information media. The Radio Service continued to provide news coverage of the proceedings of the Preparatory Committee and the preparations for the special session. Developments at the session itself would be highlighted within the framework of the regular news and feature programming of the Radio Service. A special photo exhibit would be displayed in the General Assembly lobby, starting early in May and continuing throughout the special session. A similar exhibit would be displayed at the Palais des Nations in Geneva.
6. Through the Information Centres, the External Relations Division of OPI had been giving all possible publicity to the special session. Guidelines and instructions and all available information material were being sent to the Centres. The information material was distributed to the local news media, non-governmental organizations and educational institutions. The Triangular Fellowship Programme which was scheduled to take place in July and August in Paris would pay special attention to the disarmament question. The Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the External Relations Divisions of OPI had given considerable assistance to the non-governmental organization conference on disarmament held in Geneva from 27 February to 2 March and would provide similar assistance to the annual

non-governmental organizations/OPI conference to be held on 6 and 7 April 1978, at which some 500 representatives of various non-governmental organizations affiliated with OPI at Headquarters would devote most of their programme to various aspects of disarmament. An information notice on the special session had been sent to the 58 Information Centres suggesting that non-governmental organizations should hold special meetings devoted to the special session both before and after the session.

7. The Centre for Economic and Social Information was producing for the special session an article on disarmament which would be published in various languages, together with a booklet which would be available in all the official languages before the special session.

8. Post-session information activities would include a round-up press release of the decisions of the session and a brochure summarizing its results, issued by the Press and Publications Division. The Radio Service would prepare a variety of programmes reflecting the discussions and results of the session.

9. With regard to the financial implications of those activities, the working paper prepared by the Secretariat (A/AC.187/83) indicated that the Office of Public Information could absorb most of the costs involved. However, additional funding would be required for some of the projects included in the programme, namely the production of a brochure on the special session in languages other than the official languages (\$15,000), the production of a colour poster in several languages (\$12,000), external services in connexion with a photographic exhibit during the special session (\$2,000), the reproduction of photographic and other display material and its shipment to Information Centres (\$10,000), and the production of a post-session brochure in languages other than the working languages (\$26,000). The items mentioned came to a total of \$65,000. That figure had been mentioned at the previous session of the Committee, but no decision had been taken in that connexion. If the Committee considered that OPI should proceed with the planned programme of activities it might wish to recommend that those expenses should be defrayed from the resources allocated for the special session.

10. Lastly, he wished to refer to the question of the financing of the services to be provided by OPI during the special session. In considering the OPI estimates for those services, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions had recommended that they should be reduced from \$84,800 to \$54,800, since it had felt that most of OPI's requirements could be met from within the resources already approved for the Office. The Fifth Committee and subsequently the General Assembly had approved that reduction. Consequently, OPI had revised its requirements downwards to \$15,400 for press services, \$9,400 for radio and visual services and \$30,000 for communications engineers, making a total of \$54,800.

11. Although those estimates had been calculated on the basis of two meetings a day, OPI would be prepared to undertake full coverage of the special session on the assumption that no more than two meetings would be held simultaneously and that there would be no night meetings. However, if it was decided to have three simultaneous meetings and/or night meetings, OPI would have to request additional

staff for a period of two to three weeks, which would cost \$11,800. Without that additional amount, OPI would not be able to provide press or radio coverage of the third simultaneous or night meeting, the typing pool would be unable to produce the releases on the same day, and long delays would be experienced in relaying cables to the Information Centres.

12. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said that the figures concerning the provision of services for the special session which had just been presented were new. He presumed that the figures would be presented in written form, but wondered what the Committee could do in that connexion, since it was his understanding that it was not empowered to authorize expenditures.

13. The CHAIRMAN replied that the Committee was indeed not empowered to authorize the expenditures in question, but it could make a recommendation to the General Assembly, which would take a decision on the matter.

14. Mr. BARTON (Canada) observed that in 1977 a programme had been submitted to the Assembly indicating the funds allocated to public information activities. According to the OPI representative, however, additional funds were required, since otherwise the scope of the information activities would have to be limited. He therefore wished to know whether the OPI representative wanted the Preparatory Committee to recommend that the General Assembly should provide additional funds.

15. Mr. GRIBKOV (Office of Public Information) said that OPI felt additional funds would be needed if during the special session more than two meetings were held simultaneously, or if the special session continued after the set closing date. Furthermore, in connexion with the long-term programme and bearing in mind the fact that the question had been left pending, OPI would like to know whether it should proceed with that programme or confine itself to what was currently being done.

16. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that he could not support the proposal to recommend that the Assembly should allocate additional resources to cover the expenditures in question. Both public opinion and Governments were fully aware of the problem of disarmament and excessive publicity on the special session and related activities would only create expectations which perhaps could not be realized.

17. The CHAIRMAN suggested that a paper should be prepared for the following Friday indicating the necessary additional expenditures and summarizing the reasons justifying the allocation of additional resources so that the Committee could make the appropriate recommendations to the Assembly if it deemed it necessary. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee accepted that suggestion.

18. It was so decided.

19. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said he was surprised that in the film which had been shown no reference was made to the special session devoted to disarmament.

20. Mr. GRIBKOV (Office of Public Information) said that reference to the special session had not been deliberately omitted. Preparations on the film had begun two years earlier and its primary purpose was to create greater awareness on the part of the public of the problem of the arms race. To mention the special session would have limited its scope, since once the session was over the film would then have been obsolete.
21. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) considered that explanation unacceptable, since in the film reference was made to other historic events and in any case the film would be obsolete once the special session had been held since it did not mention the session.
22. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) said that there was always criticism after a film had been shown. He therefore found that the proposals which had arisen in the Committee were quite natural but he felt that if the film was exhibited after the special session the public would want to know the results obtained, and those results were impossible to foresee. Consequently, he did not think it would be advisable to include in the film any reference to the special session.
23. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico), supported by Mr. MUJEZINOVIC (Yugoslavia), said that everyone was interested in having the greatest possible publicity given to the holding of the special session and that mention of it should therefore be made in the film.
24. Mr. GRIBKOV (Office of Public Information) said that he did not think it would be possible to make a correction in the film at that stage but, in any case, he would like to be given some time to consider the problem.
25. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the representative of OPI should give a reply on the matter on Friday, 24 February. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee agreed to that suggestion.
26. It was so decided.
27. Mr. RIOS (Panama) said that the film shown during the meeting was a simple one compared to others which he had had occasion to see and he thought that the two super-Powers could be asked to co-operate by sending material which would make a greater impression.
28. Mr. FALASE (Nigeria) requested the representative of OPI to evaluate the impact which the information activities in general had on the public. He would like in particular to know whether those activities had been successful at the world level.
29. Mr. GRIBKOV (Office of Public Information) said that OPI used every means at its command to reach the public but its possibilities were limited. Nevertheless, it was doing and would do everything possible to disseminate fully information on the problem of disarmament.

## MACHINERY FOR DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS (continued)

30. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria), referring to the question of machinery for future disarmament negotiations, said his delegation subscribed to the view that the main prerequisite for achieving progress in the field of disarmament was the political will and determination of Governments to seek agreements which would be as far-reaching as possible. There was no question that appropriate machinery was required for that purpose, for whatever the documents adopted at the special session might be, the success of the work on disarmament would depend to a large extent on the organizational framework decided upon during the session.
31. In the view of his delegation, if the United Nations was to be able to play its central role in the field of disarmament it must have at its disposal three different bodies with distinct functions and responsibilities. Firstly, the main task of the General Assembly's First Committee should be to review and assess the progress achieved during the previous 12 months and, in co-operation with all Members of the United Nations, formulate appropriate directives for future action. To that end, its working procedures should be improved and in that connexion the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of the Role of the United Nations in the Field of Disarmament should be taken into account. Many delegations had proposed that in future the First Committee should deal exclusively with disarmament and related questions. His delegation would like to modify or interpret those proposals in such a way as basically to ensure that the First Committee would continue to deal with all the items allocated to it during the past two sessions of the General Assembly, whereas other political issues examined in the past by the First Committee and any new items of political significance which might arise should be allocated exclusively to the Special Political Committee, the name of which could be changed accordingly. That would ensure the necessary continuity.
32. Secondly, all delegations agreed on the need for an effective negotiating body with limited membership. In the past that had been the main task of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, which however, suffered from a number of short-comings. In spite of that, his delegation did not consider that CCD had failed completely as a negotiating body. On the contrary, it was convinced that CCD should be allowed to continue carrying out its important functions, provided that a number of essential changes in its structure and working procedure were made. It felt that CCD should have the character of a United Nations body, although with certain characteristics of its own such as the rule of consensus for decision-making. Also, the co-chairmanship of CCD should be replaced by more democratic procedural arrangements, such as rotation of the chairmanship among all its members on a monthly or sessional basis, as was done in certain high-level political bodies such as the Security Council. In that connexion he expressed his gratitude to the delegation of France which, by its active participation in the Committee, had given ample proof of its interest in the success of the common effort to promote disarmament in general.
33. Austria, as a State which was not a member of CCD, would support all measures



aimed at providing possibilities for wider participation of all interested States Members of the United Nations in its work. Those measures could comprise arrangements for non-CCD members to attend meetings of CCD as observers, submit proposals or views and take part in the relevant deliberations. Also, the possibility of introducing the principle of rotation for membership in CCD should be considered. In its view, it should be possible to establish the principle of rotation, not excluding the possibility of re-election, without jeopardizing the element of continuity which was necessary for the successful work of such a negotiating body. His delegation wished to make clear that it preferred a system of rotation to increasing the number of members of CCD.

34. Thirdly, his delegation considered it necessary to establish a body which would be truly deliberative. In that connexion, he referred to the statement made at an earlier meeting of the Committee by Mr. Vellodi, Secretary to the Government of India, and totally supported his reasoning. The body in question should have approximately the same size as the Preparatory Committee and should be entrusted with the task of outlining broad policies in the disarmament field. That task could take the form of elaborating a comprehensive programme of disarmament measures which might in due time be submitted to a possible second special session devoted to disarmament. The First Committee could not take on that important function nor could CCD, which should concentrate on negotiating concrete agreements in the field of disarmament and arms limitation. It should be noted, in addition, that the three-tier structure which he had just outlined would not be something new in the United Nations system, since in the social and economic fields a similar system had been successfully developed.

35. His delegation would like to consider the proposals made by a number of delegations regarding the convening of a second special session devoted to disarmament within the larger framework of adequate follow-up mechanisms to be established by the special session. For instance, it could be envisaged that the new deliberative body that had been discussed could act as a preparatory committee for a possible second special session. The interval between the two sessions could be determined when a clearer picture had emerged of the time framework in which the immediate and/or short-term measures to be included in the Programme of Action would be carried out.

36. With regard to the future role of the United Nations Secretariat in the field of disarmament, his delegation supported measures aimed at strengthening and reorganizing the United Nations Centre for Disarmament. It was important to ensure that the Centre had sufficient capacity to prepare the relevant reports and expert studies, and consideration should also be given to the possibility of setting up an advisory board, elected on a basis of rotation, which would provide the necessary guidance.

37. Finally, his delegation considered that the role of the United Nations in the implementation of disarmament agreements could and should be further strengthened and that the United Nations, together with its specialized agencies and IAEA, could in the future play an increasingly important role in that field.

38. Mr. ULUCEVIK (Turkey) said that effective mechanisms relating to disarmament negotiations not only contributed to the generation of the necessary political will of nations, but would also help to translate such political will into concrete disarmament measures.

39. In his delegation's view, all nations of the world had a positive role to play in the field of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, and the United Nations was the most suitable forum to draw up guidelines for disarmament negotiations and to watch over and review all disarmament efforts in general. However, his Government had not lost sight of the fact that the chances for success would be greater if negotiations were carried out through bodies set up for specific purposes, such as the CCD. Such bodies, which should be of a manageable size, should provide balanced political and geographical representation and reflect a wide range of interests. It was of particular importance that the disarmament negotiating machinery should include all nuclear-weapon States and all militarily significant countries. Consequently, his Government fully supported the proposals designed to facilitate the participation of all such States in the existing negotiating body or in bodies which might be created by decision of the special session devoted to disarmament.

40. In that context, of particular importance was a possible system providing for a number of rotating memberships in the CCD, or in other appropriate bodies that might be set up in the future. A limited system of rotation would make it possible for all States, and particularly those whose co-operation was necessary for progress in the field of disarmament, to acquire membership at certain intervals in the relevant body and, at the same time, would forestall constant increases in the number of members, which would inevitably reduce its effectiveness. Furthermore, such a system would stimulate the interest of many countries in disarmament matters.

41. There was no need to stress that disarmament questions were related as a whole to the national security of all States, so that it was essential that disarmament measures should reflect the broadest possible consensus and that the negotiating body should function on the basis of consensus procedures.

42. His delegation considered favourably the proposals providing for a limited increase in the size of the CCD and for the active participation of non-member States in its work. It was also essential to improve opportunities for the public to follow the activities of disarmament bodies, in order to generate wider public interest in disarmament questions.

43. The consensus reached on the convening of the forthcoming special session devoted to disarmament demonstrated the willingness of a large number of countries to play a direct and more active role in the policy-making and negotiating process on disarmament. The success of the special session devoted to disarmament would be measured, to an important degree, by the effectiveness of the negotiating machinery it established to respond to the demands of the international community and the current political and military realities of the world.

44. Mr. WEJLER (United States of America) said that, at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General had been requested to compile the recommendations contained in the 1974, 1976 and 1977 reports of the group of experts on military expenditures, to ascertain which States had been willing to participate in a field trial of the model military expenditures reporting instrument proposed in the recommendations of the 1976 and 1977 reports and to report on the results of that inquiry to the special session devoted to disarmament. He wished to take the opportunity to announce United States willingness to participate in such a field trial, to submit data on its national military expenditures and to assist actively in the effort to develop a more effective mechanism for reporting.

45. Increasingly widespread reporting of military expenditure data would be an important contribution to the building of confidence among countries and to the possibility of effective military expenditure limitation agreements. Such agreements, although they were not a near-term prospect, were undoubtedly an objective worthy to be pursued, since they would permit the releasing of resources for economic and social development, to the benefit of the developing countries.

46. Mr. OGISO (Japan) said that, in order to halt the arms race and to proceed with the gradual reduction of nuclear weapons until their ultimate elimination, the following immediate measures should be adopted within the framework of the Programme of Action: immediate cessation of nuclear explosions in all environments and immediate conclusion of a complete nuclear test ban treaty to that effect; the earliest possible conclusion of an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union with regard to the strategic arms limitation negotiations; the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes and the utilization of natural and enriched uranium for peaceful purposes; further strengthening of international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, based primarily on adherence of States to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the system of safeguards of the IAEA, assuring, at the same time, the inalienable rights of the non-nuclear weapons States to develop nuclear energy for peaceful uses.

47. With regard to the question of disarmament in the field of conventional weapons, he said that the international community was confronted with a tremendous arms build-up in many parts of the world. If the conventional arms race continued at its current rate, the prospect of using the resources absorbed in military expenditures for the improvement of economic and social conditions throughout the world, particularly in the developing countries, would be further diminished. In addition, there was the danger that the conventional arms race would develop into conflicts which would lead to the involvement of the nuclear Powers, touching off the outbreak of a nuclear war before the United Nations could reach agreement on the necessary measures for nuclear disarmament.

48. Consequently, his delegation proposed the control and reduction of stocks of conventional weapons and that attention should be turned to the control of the arms trade, which was a crucial problem in the arms race. His delegation wished to make it clear that to take up the question of conventional arms did not mean diverting attention from the question of nuclear disarmament. Japan had experienced

the ravages of nuclear weapons and had therefore always insisted that nuclear disarmament was the most urgent and important task of the current time, which should be accorded the highest priority, and that the nuclear weapon States had grave responsibilities in furthering nuclear disarmament measures.

49. In conclusion, his delegation wished to submit an additional working paper concerning nuclear disarmament.

50. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would continue its deliberations in the Working Group.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.

Friday, 24 February 1978, at 3.40 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.33

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. Mr. LEPRETTE (France), said that his country had always been deeply committed to the cause of disarmament and recalled that the President of France would himself address the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament as proof of his desire to contribute towards achieving genuine and realistic disarmament which satisfied man's aspiration to greater security.
2. His delegation had participated actively in the work of the fourth session of the Preparatory Committee, which had given rise to numerous proposals and very imaginative suggestions. Numerous working papers had been submitted not only by powerful nuclear-weapon States but also by poorer countries which were less at risk but equally concerned to preserve international peace. Clearly, all countries were deeply interested in preparations for the special session.
3. The Preparatory Committee had not only recorded the numerous proposals before it but also tried to classify and simplify them so that they could be incorporated more easily into the final document to be submitted to the special session. However, it had not had sufficient time and resources to complete that task at the current session. His delegation would do all it could to help the Committee to complete it at its fifth session.
4. In response to numerous requests for a working paper which would expand on the views put forward by the French Government at the beginning of the session, his delegation was now submitting a further working paper (A/AC.187/105) to the Committee. That paper did not claim to be exhaustive or to constitute a declaration, programme of action and outline of machinery for disarmament negotiations all in one. Nor was it a counter project. It simply clarified his Government's views on a number of points. First of all, it commented on the negotiating machinery which the special session would be required to set in motion in order to involve the entire international community in the disarmament process. Secondly, it proposed the establishment of an observation satellite agency to control compliance with disarmament agreements. Thirdly, it proposed the establishment of an international fund for disarmament for development to enable the most heavily armed and richer countries to signify their willingness to devote to the purposes of peace and progress a growing proportion of the considerable resources which they had in the past deemed it necessary to devote to military expenditures. Finally, it proposed the establishment of an international institute for research on disarmament which would make available to the international community the necessary technical studies on disarmament problems. He hoped that those proposals would be given full consideration and would be incorporated in the documents to be drafted at the fifth session of the Preparatory Committee.
5. Mr. BLOMBERG (Observer for Finland) said that his delegation was not discouraged by the relatively slow progress being made by the Committee. The

latter could not have been expected to reach agreement on all questions related to disarmament in such a short time. The work of the Committee had shown a definite sense of purpose, and it was to be hoped that that sense of purpose would prevail during the special session and beyond. The relationship between the proliferation of nuclear explosives and peaceful uses of nuclear energy seemed to be emerging as one of the central questions in the deliberations of the Preparatory Committee. In that connexion, universal adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons would undoubtedly promote the security of all States and would remove obstacles to broader international co-operation in the nuclear field. The resolution on the proliferation of nuclear weapons and peaceful uses of nuclear energy adopted at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly was an authoritative statement on those questions and should be adequately reflected in the documents of the special session.

6. Appropriate and efficient machinery, though no substitute for imaginative approaches or political will, was clearly a prerequisite for any progress in respect of disarmament. Proposals had been made to reform existing disarmament mechanisms, but there was little evidence to suggest that greater progress in arms control and disarmament would have been achieved using a different kind of machinery. The present system and its division into deliberative and negotiating bodies had proved its viability. There might be room for streamlining and revision, but the procedural and structural arrangements of CCD had not impeded progress in disarmament negotiations. On the contrary, CCD had produced the drafts of all multilateral arms control agreements that had been concluded since the Second World War. CCD was able to function firstly because it operated on the principle of consensus, secondly because of its basically political composition and procedural arrangements and thirdly because of its special relationship with the main deliberative body, the General Assembly of the United Nations. A fundamental modification of those characteristics would not help the work of CCD. A thorough discussion of disarmament machinery was obviously called for, particularly as far as the deliberative elements of that machinery were concerned, but it should be borne in mind that mere organizational reform could not generate political will nor could it simplify the intricacies of disarmament questions.

7. There seemed to be broad agreement that some kind of follow-up was essential if the special session was to be meaningful. It should be borne in mind that the more successful the special session was in its substantive deliberations the greater would be the possibility that it would give rise to other assemblies on disarmament, and in particular a world disarmament conference. In that connexion, it was essential to ensure the widest possible participation of the world community in all disarmament efforts.

8. Mr. FLORIN (German Democratic Republic) said that the view that the fourth session of the Preparatory Committee was particularly significant for the outcome of the special session had been fully justified. Intensive work had been carried out in the Committee, in the Drafting Group and in the subgroups. The results of that work required attentive study and analysis. However, the value of what had been achieved should not be judged by how many passages in the various texts were or were not enclosed in brackets, but by the agreed intention to draw far-reaching

conclusions on basic disarmament questions. Such questions included the dangers arising from the arms race, particularly from weapons of mass destruction; the growth of efforts to avert the dangers of nuclear war and end the arms race; the increased influence of the United Nations in the field of disarmament; and the increased use of the resources released by disarmament for economic development. Another basic question related to the principle that disarmament measures should not be prejudicial to the security interests of any State. All Members knew how complicated disarmament questions were, for they affected the security of States. Disarmament could be achieved only if the principle of the equal security of States was accepted as fundamental.

9. A certain equilibrium had been reached in military technology and to upset that equilibrium by developing new weapons could only reactivate the arms race. The socialist States were in favour of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international control. They had no illusions and were prepared to accept agreed partial steps in that direction. The fourth session of the Committee bore witness to the effort to widen the general basis for the disarmament efforts which were required of all States, whether large or small, nuclear or non-nuclear. Upon that effort depended the attainment of the goal of ending the arms race and proceeding to disarmament.

10. In spite of his positive assessment of the Committee's work, he noted that disagreement remained on many important questions. Consensus represented progress wherever it enabled existing disagreements to be overcome. The Committee's work was still partly at the stage where positions had to be compared in order to find an acceptable compromise. The process of comparing views and becoming familiar with the arguments expressed in support of one position or another was itself an essential and important stage of the Committee's work. The time remaining before the fifth session should be used for realistic and responsible reflection on all the problems involved. The sole criterion of success would be the facilitation of effective disarmament measures. That goal could be reached if the Committee continued to be guided by the desire for mutual understanding, constructive effort and respect for the legitimate interests of all participants.

11. Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria) recalled that at its 27th meeting the Committee, on the proposal of the Austrian delegation, had decided to request the Secretariat to prepare a background paper on verification of compliance with disarmament agreements. He hoped that that paper would be ready very soon, as delegations would need to study it fully before the fifth session.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that the document in question would be ready within a week.

13. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said that he was aware that some delegations were disappointed at the scant achievements of the current session. Naturally, all delegations would have preferred to see greater progress, but the Committee was, after all, completing its first substantive session, at which many working papers had been submitted, and it was hardly surprising, therefore, that drafting had not progressed significantly. His delegation, for its part, would have preferred to see more progress in removing the square brackets from the draft Declaration, but it realized that its expectations were perhaps premature.

14. His delegation had decided not to submit any working papers to the fourth session, so that it could contribute more flexibly to the Committee's work, for it had realized that as soon as the various national or group papers had been submitted the process of consolidation and conciliation would have to begin. However, its decision did not seem to have promoted the spirit of conciliation which it had intended, as was clear, for instance, from the diversity of opinions expressed in the papers on the draft Declaration. If all parties were prepared to forego their preferences and to work instead for a solution to all the disarmament questions raised in the Declaration, the Committee's final document would be somewhat easier to draft.

15. With regard to the Declaration, the Committee must agree on the principle that the fact that a certain view of a given country was not reflected in the final document did not mean that that view was invalid, as long as the opposite view was not reflected in that document either, but simply meant that as yet no broad consensus had been reached on it. When the Committee resumed its drafting exercise in April, it should also take care to describe matters as they really were. For instance, it could hardly describe as fundamental guiding principles for disarmament negotiations principles which were still shown in square brackets because no agreement had been reached on them.

16. There was an even more difficult problem with the Programme of Action, as work had begun on its drafting immediately after some papers had been submitted and before Governments had completed any serious review of the issue in preparation for the special session. It was easier for some countries to put forward proposals and conclusions than it was for others, as different countries had different responsibilities, but it would be useful if the views put forward at the current session were also taken into account. The final version of the Programme of Action should be drafted only at the special session itself, when Governments' views on how to increase the impetus of disarmament would be known.

17. The Programme of Action could, however, be improved upon at the fifth session if all delegations realized that disarmament agreements as such could not be negotiated at that session. Detailed descriptions of the measures to be achieved tended to reflect a significant part of the negotiations themselves and in the end the Programme of Action would have to generalize if negotiations were ever to begin. When negotiations could actually be described in detail that meant that a large part of the negotiating task had already been carried out. If the Programme of Action was to provide a realistic outline of how the momentum of disarmament was to be increased and how that increased effort was to be channelled, the Committee would have to choose between certain elements rather than attempt to cover all elements at once, and would have to gain a clearer understanding of the function and purpose of the Programme of Action as compared to work in the longer term on a comprehensive negotiating programme.

18. A number of proposals had also been made at the current session on the role of the United Nations in disarmament and the role of negotiating machinery. Those proposals would have to be discussed very fully and a choice would have to be made among them, as some of them conflicted with others. His delegation would keep an open mind with regard to those proposals, as its prime concern was to ensure that the prospects for effective disarmament were increased and that the integrity of existing machinery was maintained.



19. Mr. FONSEKA (Sri Lanka) said that, while his delegation was aware that relatively little had been achieved at the current session, it was not overly pessimistic. Considerable work had been done and the current session was only a beginning. Conference Room Paper No. 15 did not raise major difficulties. There was a measure of agreement on its content and all that was needed now was agreement on its language.

20. Agreement had been reached on the structure of the draft Declaration. Considerable clarification and negotiation were still required, but there had been a useful exchange of views. The section on review and appraisal had raised certain problems, as anticipated, but it had been discussed fully so that all delegations were now aware of each other's views and he was optimistic that further agreement could be reached.

21. His delegation believed that goals and priorities should be spelt out in full in the relevant section of the Declaration. As to the section on principles, agreement had been reached on 19 principles, although there was still disagreement as to what should constitute principles, since each country had different priorities. He therefore suggested that all countries should consider those principles objectively before the fifth session so that they could at least agree on the set of principles to be included in the final Declaration.

22. There had been substantial agreement at the outset on the Programme of Action, but since then a number of new suggestions had been made. As a result, the Committee's work had been slowed down and all that was now available was a report on all the programmes of action which countries thought should be included in the final document. Document A/AC.187/100 probably gave a better account of the work on the Programme of Action, therefore, than Conference Room Paper No. 15.

23. The question of negotiating machinery had not been covered fully because of lack of time. It had been said that the Committee should not go beyond generalization at that stage, but his delegation believed that there was no point in producing a document that was full of generalizations. Accordingly, although it realized that its suggestion might be premature, it believed that more specific proposals should be put forward. There was enough time before the fifth session for Governments to consider Conference Room Paper No. 15 and to reach a broader consensus. The most recent suggestions for negotiating machinery made by the delegation of France were welcome and could also be considered.

24. When he had introduced the working paper drawn up by the non-aligned countries, he had said that what the Committee needed was not so much working documents and a final declaration as a change in the collective will of its members, in particular the most heavily armed States. He now reiterated that such a change of political will was vital if the Declaration and Programme of Action were to have any force whatsoever and were to reflect the aspirations not only of those countries which had called for a special session devoted to disarmament but also of the general public, which placed such hopes in that session. The Committee should not be satisfied with what it had achieved so far. Informal contacts among delegations at the current session had contributed far more to

greater mutual understanding than had contacts within the Committee itself and his delegation hoped that some of that understanding would be reflected in the work and the achievements of the Committee at its fifth session.

25. Mr. JAIPAL (India) said that the time had come for taking stock and evaluating the work done by the Committee in relation to its over-all objectives. The Committee had heard the conflicting views of several regional and other groups and the drafting groups had striven to weld the various elements into a Declaration and a Programme of Action. His delegation wished to congratulate the drafting groups for the work which they had accomplished, for although the preliminary draft bristled with references to unresolved issues in the form of passages in square brackets, that was because it was perhaps too early to expect compromises. Agreed formulas might be expected to emerge in some cases at the fifth session and in others during the special session itself. Much remained to be done and there were certainly no grounds for complacency.

26. What separated delegations were differences in approach, for there was clearly a large measure of agreement on ultimate objectives. There were fortunately no advocates of nuclear warfare as a means of settling disputes; furthermore, there was general agreement that nuclear weapons should eventually be eliminated and that nuclear disarmament should therefore be given high priority. Differences existed regarding the steps to be taken, and the order in which they should be taken, in the direction of nuclear disarmament. The non-aligned countries had indicated their concerns and priorities but it was really for those Powers which had nuclear weapons to come forward with their own programme of action, which should be sufficiently realistic and meaningful to assure the rest of the world that its survival was no longer in danger. He therefore hoped that the principal nuclear-weapon States would work out agreed immediate steps towards the goal of nuclear disarmament and also outline the further steps which would be taken within a foreseeable time-frame. If the super-Powers had faith in nuclear disarmament, then they should provide concrete evidence on which to base the hope of mankind's survival in conditions of security rather than in conditions of a balance of terror. Mankind could not derive the sense of security to which it was entitled from nuclear-weapon-free zones, from assurances of security to non-nuclear-weapon States, from a comprehensive test-ban treaty or from limitations on nuclear weapons. A nuclear holocaust would not respect the non-combatant States. Some other rational basis had to be found for maintaining equilibrium and peace in the world.

27. If, for the sake of argument, the principle of mutual deterrence through nuclear weapons was accepted, one was entitled to ask what would be the minimum level of deterrence that was adequate to ensure peace and security. If the level of deterrence in 1960 had been adequate to prevent war, one was entitled to ask why the level had increased since then. The fact that the nuclear arms race was continuing apace was proof enough that levels of deterrence did not in fact deter but, on the contrary, intensified the arms race. The validity of the principle of deterrence was thus not acceptable. A progressive reduction in deterrence levels was essential as a first step for reducing the risk of nuclear war. There was no reason why mankind should not be given solemn pledges, possibly unilaterally, of

non-use of nuclear weapons by those States which had them, pending their final elimination. It might well be necessary to include in such pledges a provision on the non-use of force to change the status quo, or to guarantee that the threat or use of conventional weapons would not be escalated to the point where they might provoke the use of nuclear weapons.

28. World public opinion expected a major break-through towards nuclear disarmament and the responsibility for that lay mainly with the super-Powers. There was no doubt that if the two super-Powers were to provide the right lead, either together or even unilaterally, the other nuclear-weapon States would provide similar assurances. Success therefore depended largely on what the two super-Powers did in the interval before the special session in the way of entering into direct talks, bearing in mind the views and aspirations of others.

29. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that the accomplishments of the Committee during its fourth session had been sufficient to justify the efforts made. It was generally recognized that disarmament and arms limitation, particularly in regard to nuclear weapons, were essential for international peace and security and for the economic progress which was to be expected from the new international economic order. In the international strategy of disarmament, it had been generally recognized that the United Nations must occupy the first place.

30. It was clear that the principal difficulties lay in the development of a Programme of Action and in the necessary machinery for its implementation. Notwithstanding the many divergencies of view which had become apparent and which it had not been possible to resolve during the session, he felt confident that a number of the alternatives which appeared in square brackets in Conference Room Paper No. 15 could be eliminated by negotiation. Even then a considerable number would remain. It was essential, therefore, that countries should accelerate their efforts during the next few weeks to reduce the number of alternatives in square brackets. He had no illusions as to the problems involved in the Programme of Action. He continued to believe, however, that the most realistic solution might still be found along the lines of document A/AC.187/89, which had suggested a three-year disarmament plan as a purely transitional measure. That plan contained a short and non-exhaustive list of disarmament measures. Those measures represented only a selection chosen from among the most urgent ones which might realistically be considered capable of being transformed into reality during the three-year period from June 1978 to May 1981. The adoption of such an immediate plan did not, however, mean the abandonment of the long-term goals of the Committee. Provision had been made in document A/AC.187/89 for the development of a more comprehensive, thoroughly negotiated programme within a period of approximately two and a half years.

31. In conclusion he would like to make a twofold recommendation. First, all States in the Committee should try to eliminate the maximum number of alternatives in square brackets. Second, it was clearly impossible in the present context to produce a draft Programme of Action which would meet with universal acceptance; efforts should therefore be made to achieve more modest goals in the shorter term by concentrating on recommendations which would have a wider degree of acceptance.

32. Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria), Rapporteur, introducing Conference Room Paper No. 15 containing the draft final document, said that, in part I of the document, relating to the Preamble, the use of brackets reflected the positions of different groups, but it was to be hoped that many of those brackets could be eliminated at the following session of the Preparatory Committee. With respect to part III of the document, relating to the Programme of Action, not much progress had been achieved because of the lack of time, but a useful exchange of views had taken place. It should be noted that the drafting group had not been able to consider the question of the order in which the various sections of part III should be included in the final document, and the order in which they were included in Conference Room Paper No. 15 should not be regarded as a recommendation by the working group as to the order or importance of the sections in question. In sections I-III of part III the brackets indicated passages that had given rise to problems, whereas in sections IV-VIII they indicated merely that parallel versions existed. Part IV of the document had not been examined in depth because of the lack of time and was therefore largely a compilation of the proposals that had been submitted. It should also be noted that in parts II and III of the document, the titles and subtitles used in Conference Room Paper No. 15 were intended merely to help the Preparatory Committee in its discussions.

33. With respect to part IV, in paragraph 10 (iii) (c), the words "interested non-CCD members to participate /, including arrangements for" should be inserted after the words "other arrangements for". In the same paragraph, the last sentence should be enclosed in double brackets. In paragraph 10 (vii), the sentence "/The CCD should carry on discussions and development of a comprehensive programme of disarmament./" should be inserted at the end of the paragraph. In paragraph 13, the brackets in the third and fourth lines should be deleted.

34. Several delegations had requested that Conference Room Paper No. 15 should be translated into the other working languages of the United Nations.

35. The CHAIRMAN said that conference room papers were not official United Nations documents and were not normally translated. However, because of the importance of Conference Room Paper No. 15, he was sure that the Secretary-General would be prepared to authorize the translation, although the document's unofficial status would remain unchanged. The translations, if authorized, might be available in the course of the following week.

#### STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION

36. Mr. MARTIN (Director, Radio and Visual Services Division), in reply to a question raised by the representative of the United States at the 32nd meeting, said that the film in question was a project of the Office of Public Information within the terms of its general mandate from the General Assembly to increase public awareness of the issue of nuclear disarmament. Production of the film had involved lengthy research for suitable material. It was timely in relation to the special session although it had not originally been intended to be part of the promotional effort for that session. Events preceding the special session would be given full informational coverage. Normally OPI documentaries were kept available for a number of years. The film in question might, however, require revision if its lifetime was to extend beyond the special session. Perhaps a trailer could be added at the end of the film to inform the audience regarding the special session.

37. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said he understood that the producer of the film had at one time included a reference to the special session but that it had been subsequently struck from the film. He requested that a reference to the special session should be spliced into the film.
38. Mr. MARTIN (Director, Radio and Visual Services Division) said that no material had been included in the film and subsequently withdrawn. The Office of Public Information would consider the request of the representative of the United States but he could not announce a decision at that meeting.
39. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said that he would pursue the question through other channels.
40. Mr. FALASE (Nigeria) said that, if there was agreement that the special session represented the culmination of the hopes and fears of world public opinion on the question of nuclear war, then clearly that special session should be the theme of the film.
41. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said that his delegation shared the concern of the representative of the United States that any film issued by the United Nations on the question of disarmament should include a reference to the special session. His delegation thought that a solution could be found by adding a leader or trailer to the film. While he appreciated the difficulty of the Office of Public Information, there was clearly a need for a fine film to be shown in connexion with the special session and subsequently distributed for general use.
42. Mr. MARTIN (Director, Radio and Visual Services Division) said that what was involved was not a technical but a cost problem. The film had been planned for completion a year earlier and was to have covered the period from the first atomic bomb until the present day. After the special session, another film would probably be necessary. He would be glad to pursue discussions with representatives and would therefore delay distribution of the film until a decision had been reached.
43. The CHAIRMAN said that he agreed with the suggestion which had been made by the representative of the Office of Public Information. The film could be used during the special session and subsequently, with an appropriate trailer added, in different United Nations Information Centres throughout the world.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

44. The CHAIRMAN said that 29 May, Memorial Day, was an official United Nations holiday, but since such a large number of delegations wished to speak in the general debate, he suggested that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly that it should hold a morning meeting on that day to be devoted to the general debate.
45. Mr. JAY (Canada), supported by Mr. MOHAJER (Iran), said that delegations which had already asked to inscribe their names on the list of speakers for 29 May should be given priority.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that the point raised by the representatives of Canada and Iran would be taken into account. If he heard no objections, he would take it the Committee agreed to recommend to the General Assembly that it hold a morning meeting on 29 May 1978.

47. It was so decided.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE AT ITS FIFTH SESSION

48. The CHAIRMAN said that the Bureau had met to discuss the organization of work of the Preparatory Committee at its fifth session, and had reached a consensus on several points. Firstly, it recommended that the fifth session should begin on 4 April instead of 10 April 1978. The closing date should remain unchanged in order to ensure that Governments had enough time to study the relevant documents before the special session. Secondly, the Bureau had decided that the method of work used at the fourth session should be retained for the fifth session. In other words, plenary meetings would be limited to three per week, whereas the drafting group would have seven meetings per week. The number of plenary meetings could be further reduced if necessary. Thirdly, the Bureau thought it important that delegations to the fifth session should be represented at the negotiating level so that agreement could be reached on most of the various texts. In that connexion, he appealed to delegations involved in the drafting process to be flexible so that as many brackets as possible could be removed from the texts. Fourthly, the Bureau recommended that delegations should enter into informal negotiations before the fifth session in order to try to reach agreement on the texts.

49. If he heard no objection, he would take it the Committee agreed to advance the opening date of its fifth session to 4 April 1978.

50. It was so decided.

51. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said that his delegation did not believe that, at the present stage, a drafting group exercise was necessarily the best way to achieve progress on the Programme of Action and on machinery for negotiations. While he agreed that the group should work at the negotiating level, it would be best to begin with contact group activity on a smaller scale before involving everyone in drafting group meetings. He agreed that it would be desirable to have government contacts in the interim period.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that the view of the representative of the United States was not incompatible with his own. The holding of drafting group meetings was not a barrier to smaller contact group meetings among delegations, which were, indeed, desirable. When outlining the programme of work, he had meant to make clear that efforts should be concentrated on negotiation before drafting began. General debate in plenary meetings should be avoided, as the different views were already well known. By emphasizing the negotiating nature of work in the drafting group and its subgroups, progress could be made towards the drafting of actual texts.

53. The Bureau had considered the matter of the role of the non-governmental organizations in the work of the special session. Its majority recommendation was that the participation of the non-governmental organizations should be considered and decided at the April session. The present view of the Bureau was that, should it be decided to assign one day to representatives of non-governmental organizations, they should not be heard in a plenary meeting. Because of the time constraints and the large number of non-governmental organizations involved, it would be desirable for them to select their representatives in advance, and report to the Preparatory Committee at its April session which representatives had been chosen. The Secretariat was already making arrangements to assign places to the non-governmental organizations at plenary and committee meetings of the special session, and an announcement on those arrangements would be made at the April session when the item on non-governmental organizations was considered. He therefore assumed that it was agreed to take up the item further at that time.

54. It was so decided.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that the Preparatory Committee had decided to recommend that the special session should set up a single plenary Committee, with as many subsidiary organs as were considered appropriate. There had been no recommendation on the other powers of the Committee, but if the rules of procedure of General Assembly committees were adhered to, the Committee would require one Chairman, two Vice-Chairmen and one Rapporteur. The Bureau considered that there were two alternatives: at the special session, the Committee could select one Chairman, three Vice-Chairmen and one Rapporteur, to ensure representation from all geographical regions, or it could adhere to the present composition of the Bureau of the Preparatory Committee by electing one Chairman, eight Vice-Chairmen and one Rapporteur. The Bureau did not expect to be re-elected in full with its present composition, but he wished to point out that in the Preparatory Committee it had functioned well, its number enabling all geographical regions to be represented. The members of the Committee could consider both alternatives before deciding the matter at the April session.

56. It had been suggested that the Secretariat, either alone or in consultation with the Chairman, should prepare an initial introductory draft to be used as a guide for debate. The draft could be presented to the Committee during the first days of the April session.

#### CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

57. After expressing his gratitude to the officers and members of the Committee, and to others concerned, the Chairman declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

Tuesday, 4 April 1978, at 11.05 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.34

OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The CHAIRMAN declared open the fifth session of the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

2. The agenda was adopted.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

3. The CHAIRMAN\* said his preliminary contacts with various delegations had shown that there was general agreement on the importance of the current session of the Preparatory Committee, which he hoped would be a good sign for the future course of the Committee's work. It was now essential to continue to work with the spirit that had prevailed at previous sessions and, most of all, to carry out the mission entrusted to the Committee by the General Assembly. It was clear that the short time remaining necessitated special efforts on the part of all delegations, the officers of the Committee and the Secretariat in order to reach that goal. As Chairman, he had the duty to serve the Committee as best he could with a view to facilitating its deliberations, and with that in mind, he felt it appropriate to make a statement on various outstanding problems, so as to assist the Committee in determining the progress it had made so far. His statement would deal partly with the work of the Committee, partly with the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and partly with the main document or documents which needed to be prepared.
4. The first priority item before the Committee was the organization of its work. Delegations would no doubt remember that at the 33rd meeting of the Committee at the end of the fourth session he had stated that the officers of the Committee had decided to recommend that the method of work used during the fourth session should also be adopted at the fifth session. In other words, the Committee would meet in plenary or as a working group three times a week, on Monday and Wednesday afternoons and on Friday mornings, to consider the reports of the drafting group and other outstanding matters. If necessary, those meetings could be reduced in number in order to give the drafting group more time, since under the existing schedule that group would have seven meetings each week. The Committee should also consider the possibility that one or more drafting groups should meet even when the Committee was meeting in plenary. He would make a suggestion on the matter at the appropriate time, depending on the progress made in the plenary.
5. The drafting group would have to decide how to apportion the substantive items between the two subgroups which it had established. He felt, however, that it would be useful for the group to study means for giving more attention to questions relating to the machinery of disarmament, since up to the present time the Committee had concentrated its work mainly on the declaration and the programme of action. He

---

\* This statement has been given full coverage in the summary record in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee during the meeting.



also felt that the drafting subgroup dealing with the declaration should complete its work by the end of the week, so as to begin the following Monday to study the machinery.

6. The current stage of the work of the Committee and its subsidiary bodies could be called one of negotiation, and in that connexion he wished to make a special appeal to all delegations to limit their substantive statements to points which related to the negotiations under way. The general positions were already well known to everyone, and it did not seem necessary or appropriate to renew a general debate at the present stage of the Committee's work.

7. As members of the Committee would recall, the Office of Public Information had been requested at the fourth session to study the possibility of including a reference to the special session in the final portion of the film Nuclear Countdown. He was pleased to announce that, following consultations with the delegations directly concerned, OPI had now incorporated that addition. He also drew attention to the OPI paper of 23 February 1978, submitted at the request of the Committee, concerning the expenditures for various activities of OPI which could not be covered by its regular budget. At a future meeting the Committee would request the presence of representatives of OPI with a view to taking a decision on that paper.

8. Another question relating to the Committee's work during the fifth session was the adoption of the Committee's final report to the General Assembly. In view of the fact that the Rapporteur would have to submit a draft early enough for the Committee to study it carefully, it was only fair that he should receive guidelines as soon as possible from the plenary concerning the approach he should follow in preparing the draft. He therefore intended to revert to the question very soon. For the moment he felt that it would be useful to keep in mind the precedent established by the Committee's report to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session, namely, an account of facts presented objectively and a list of specific recommendations.

9. There still remained the question whether the Plenary Committee of the General Assembly would meet after or simultaneously with the general debate and, in the latter case, what would be the most appropriate date for it to begin its work. It would be useful if delegations which had expressed opinions in the matter would intensify their informal consultations, so that the Preparatory Committee could decide the question without an extensive debate which would distract attention from substantive work. Also in connexion with the Plenary Committee members of the Preparatory Committee would doubtless remember that at the 33rd meeting he had presented the opinion of the officers of the Preparatory Committee concerning the composition of the Bureau of the Plenary Committee of the General Assembly. He had said at that time that there were two alternatives. One would be for the Plenary Committee to elect a chairman, three vice-chairmen and a rapporteur, so that every geographical region would be represented. The other alternative, following the precedent of the Preparatory Committee, would be to have a chairman, eight vice-chairmen and a rapporteur as officers of the Plenary Committee. The officers

of the Preparatory Committee had expressed their preference for the second alternative, with the understanding that that would not prejudice the election of officers of the Plenary Committee during the special session. The Preparatory Committee should, in his view, prepare a recommendation on the subject.

10. Also in connexion with the special session of the General assembly, the Centre for Disarmament had informed the Under-Secretary-General for Administration and Management that there might be financial implications during the session which would require the convening of the Fifth Committee and the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

11. The Committee should also consider and decide as soon as possible on arrangements for the participation of non-governmental organizations in the special session. As members would recall, he had informed the Committee of the opinion of the officers on the question. They had felt that if a day was set aside for statements by representatives of those organizations, those statements, following firmly established practice, should not be made in plenary. Furthermore, the officers had felt that it would be desirable for non-governmental organizations to choose their own representatives ahead of time, so that their names could be communicated to the Committee. In that connexion, he pointed out that the Committee had before it a proposal, submitted by the representative of the United Kingdom and supported by various delegations, concerning the desirability of allowing representatives of those organizations and of institutions connected with disarmament to speak at the special session.

12. With regard to the facilities which would be available, he said that, pursuant to the Committee's recommendations, which had been endorsed by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session, the Secretariat had informed him of the provisional arrangements it was making to facilitate access to the building and to assign a certain number of seats to non-governmental organizations during the special session. Copies of the Secretariat's communication had been distributed to the officers of the Committee for their information.

13. Lastly, he wished to deal with the question of the final document or documents of the special session. As he had said, the Committee was in a stage of negotiation. Negotiation meant, in the specific case of the Committee, making the necessary efforts to remove as many square brackets as possible. The Committee could begin, in the interest of facilitating its task, by deciding whether there was to be one main document or several. In its report to the General Assembly at its thirty-second session, the Committee had stated that it tended to favour the preparation of a single final document. The question had been discussed in plenary and in informal negotiations from September 1977 to the present time. He therefore felt that the Committee was in a position to take a decision in the matter.

14. Turning to substantive matters, he reminded members of the Committee that he had been entrusted with preparing a draft introduction for the main document or documents as part of the work to be done during the fifth session. He hoped to be able in a few days to submit that personal contribution to the Committee for its consideration.

15. Noting that he had repeatedly stressed the negotiatory nature of the current stage of the Committee's work, he reminded members that the officers of the Committee had made a point of recommending at the end of the preceding session that delegations should be represented at a negotiating level at the current session in order to reach agreement on as many texts as possible. In view of the importance of the matter, the Committee should constantly bear in mind that it was entering a critical stage in its deliberations.

16. In conclusion, with regard to the method for reaching decisions on matters of substance, which was to decide on the basis of consensus, wherever possible, he reminded delegations that that method had been one of the first points of agreement in the Committee and had been followed in its work up to the present. However, the Committee would soon have to take important decisions; in the interest of preserving consensus, all delegations without exception would have to act with flexibility and in a spirit of compromise. No one could seriously claim that consensus could be reached on rigid positions which were held only by a limited number of delegations. Those who had laid particular stress on the rule of consensus had thereby implicitly declared their readiness to adopt compromise formulas. Now was the time to demonstrate that willingness to compromise, so that the Committee could advance in its work. If the Committee wished to submit to the special session texts which would merit general approval, it was essential that at the current final session all members should endeavour to make concessions which, without detracting from the essential core of their views, would make it possible to harmonize those views with the views held by others. He therefore appealed to the members of the Committee for reflection and co-operation.

17. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico), supported by Mr. DATCU (Romania), proposed that the Chairman's statement should be given full coverage in the summary record of the meeting.

18. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.

ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The CHAIRMAN said that he had received a telegram from the Chairman of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute requesting that a representative of the Institute should have an opportunity to make a substantive statement at the forthcoming special session. He intended to take that request into account in his consultations regarding the participation of non-governmental organizations and research institutes in the work of the special session and would subsequently make a statement to the Committee on the subject.

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT(S) OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

2. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to document A/AC.187/29/Add.1, dated 24 March 1978, which contained the disarmament resolutions adopted by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session.

3. Mr. SCHELTEMA (Observer for the Netherlands), introducing the working paper entitled "Study on the establishment of an international disarmament organization" (A/AC.187/108), which had been prepared by his delegation, said that the interest a number of countries had recently shown in a disarmament organization and the fact that a number of important disarmament treaties were approaching conclusion and would require elaborate permanent machinery seemed to justify renewed consideration of a proposal which his Government had initially made in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) in July 1973. An international disarmament organization could be given the necessary functions to implement, for example, a chemical-weapons-ban treaty or a nuclear-test-ban treaty and to provide a framework for consultations between the parties. Such an organization could also be entrusted with organizing review conferences provided for in disarmament treaties and could assume further functions as it gained experience.

4. As more and more disarmament measures were adopted in the future, the need for an impartial body to oversee the implementation of agreements would become greater. In that connexion, his delegation agreed with the premise on which the French proposal to establish an international observation-satellite agency (A/AC.187/105) was based, namely, that the present situation, in which only two countries possessed the means to observe the globe, was undesirable from the standpoint of the verification of multilateral disarmament treaties. At the same time, the internationalization of satellite information could not provide all the answers to the problem of verification, which, at least with regard to chemical weapons, must employ a number of different methods. Thus, the French proposal should be combined with the idea of an international organization which would be able to discharge a variety of functions in connexion with implementation.

5. Realizing that much careful consideration would be required before a decision could be taken on the establishment of an international disarmament organization, his Government, in the final paragraph of document A/AC.187/108, was simply proposing that the Secretary-General should seek the views of Member States on the

possible functions and structure of such an organization and that the final document of the special session should include a request to that effect. If the response warranted any further steps, a special committee could be set up to continue work on the subject.

6. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that his delegation, which had been giving much thought to the question of the implementation of international arms-control and disarmament treaties, found the working paper introduced by the representative of the Netherlands most interesting and timely. The United Nations, besides setting disarmament goals, should also devote attention to their attainment. In document A/AC.187/97 Italy had proposed, inter alia, the establishment of an international body to supervise the implementation of the disarmament agreements in force. His delegation trusted that the Italian, French and Netherlands proposals (A/AC.187/97, 105 and 108, respectively) and the constructive ideas submitted by the Austrian delegation in document A/AC.187/101 would be given careful consideration.

7. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that document A/AC.187/107 had originally been submitted to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) by the members of the Group of 15 in document CCD/530 and was being resubmitted at the present time on behalf of the same States because the Preparatory Committee had been called upon to consider issues relating to international negotiating machinery.

8. Introducing the working paper, he said that the measures which it proposed were designed to enhance the effectiveness of CCD and to help establish conditions conducive to the participation of all nuclear-weapon States in its work.

9. The first proposal was designed to strengthen the link between the General Assembly and CCD by ensuring that all States Members of the United Nations would be able to participate in the work of CCD and by enhancing the role played in CCD by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the United Nations Centre for Disarmament. With respect to the second proposal, there was no need to dwell on the advantages of replacing the system of co-chairmanship, since they had been sufficiently emphasized in CCD and the First Committee of the General Assembly and were self-evident to any objective observer of the international situation. He merely wished to stress that, in the opinion of the sponsors of the working paper, the introduction of a new system would in no way hamper the legitimate interests of the United States and the Soviet Union, particularly in a body like CCD, where decisions must necessarily be taken by consensus; on the contrary, such an action would considerably enhance the moral stature of the two super-Powers in the eyes of all the Members of the United Nations. The purpose of the third proposal was to enable CCD to embody in rules of procedure the customary practices which had developed during its 16 years of existence and to give it greater flexibility. In the fourth and fifth proposals the sponsors suggested that CCD should establish a standing sub-committee of the whole and that the plenary meetings of CCD should be public.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.

36th meeting

Monday, 10 April 1978, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.36

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT(S) OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. Mr. ULUCEVIK (Turkey) said experience showed that verification was one of the main factors necessary for success in negotiations on arms control and disarmament. It also showed that for the application of specific measures in the sphere of disarmament to be successful, there must exist a truly effective system of verification. Consequently, he supported the ideas expressed thus far in the Preparatory Committee with regard to that question. In particular, he welcomed the Netherlands proposal to establish an international disarmament organization which would act mainly in the sphere of verification (A/AC.187/108). He hoped that the Preparatory Committee would take favourable action on that proposal.
2. In view of the need for practical and effective systems that would strengthen mutual trust among States, France's proposal to establish an International Observation Satellite Agency (A/AC.187/105) was interesting. The working paper submitted by Austria under the title "Disarmament and verification" (A/AC.187/101) was also useful in again drawing attention to that subject as a matter of the first importance.
3. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee would continue its deliberations as a Working Group.

The meeting rose at 3.40 p.m.

37th meeting

Wednesday, 12 April 1978, at 3.40 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.37

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT(S) OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. Mrs. THORSSON (Sweden), referring to the working paper submitted by the Netherlands (A/AC.187/108), welcomed the initiative to revive the idea of a considerable strengthening of resources for international disarmament efforts. When, in 1973, the Dutch Government and the Swedish Government had presented suggestions to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament concerning the possible establishment of an international disarmament organization, they had recognized the need for adequate base resources, as well as for co-ordination of follow-up measures accompanying disarmament treaties. It was to be hoped that the Dutch initiative would lead to more long-term fundamental consideration of the need for effective machinery to achieve the objectives of disarmament.
2. Although no glaring successes had been experienced in the field of disarmament since 1973, some new approaches had been tried to the problem of effective follow-ups of present and future treaties, including verification of compliance, consultative committees and review conferences. Those and other possible measures had become an integral part of international disarmament control arrangements.
3. New emphasis was being placed on truly multilateral disarmament negotiations, the widening interest in disarmament among States Members of the United Nations and, consequently, on the importance of the role of the United Nations in that field and the need to strengthen the resources of the United Nations Secretariat. In that respect, certain measures had been acted upon and proposed. The Swedish Government considered those measures of urgent importance and would contribute to promoting their approval.
4. In its working paper, the Netherlands recommended the initial setting up of an organization for the implementation of a particular disarmament treaty. Recalling what had already been said to the effect that both consultative committees and review conferences were considered as ingredient parts of disarmament treaties, she said that any future international disarmament organization had to be considered as the machinery for organizing and administering all relevant implementation measures, including verification, complaint and review arrangements.
5. The question of the relationship between any future international disarmament organization and the United Nations would present a problem of duplication of effort at both the intergovernmental and Secretariat levels, if the proposed organ was not completely integrated with the United Nations. As in 1973, the Swedish Government considered that that organ should certainly be placed within the framework of the United Nations, but should not be politically loaded with any veto rights.

6. As early as 1973, the Swedish delegation had envisaged the possibility of a reporting system within the framework of the United Nations similar to the body currently being proposed by the delegation of India, for which various models could be considered. In that connexion, and with reference to the working paper submitted by France (A/AC.187/105) on future international disarmament machinery, her delegation proposed the establishment of an observation satellite agency, in accordance with the established Swedish view on the need to internationalize satellite information and communication systems. It would be advisable for such an agency to be closely integrated with the United Nations in order to establish effective disarmament verification activities within the framework of the United Nations.

7. In conclusion, emphasis should be placed on the need not to allow any longer-term aspects of the international disarmament machinery to stand in the way of immediate measures necessary to give the international community the resources to implement effectively decisions presumably to be taken at the special session devoted to disarmament.

8. In working paper A/AC.187/95, her delegation had proposed an increase in the resources of the United Nations Centre for Disarmament corresponding to suggested increased responsibilities, and continued to attach considerable importance to the approval of that proposal.

FINAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE TO THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continued)

9. Mr. MISTRAL (France), speaking on behalf of the group of Western European and other States, said that, in his view, the Bureau of the Committee of the Whole of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should consist of 10 members, namely, a Chairman, eight Vice-Chairmen and a Rapporteur. He reserved the right to submit nominations for those offices later, with due regard to the principle of equitable geographical distribution.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that the opinion of the group of Western European and other States, as stated by the representative of France gave an over-all view of the question, so that a decision could be taken on the matter. If there was no objection, he would take it that, in its final report the Committee would recommend to the General Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament that the Bureau of the Committee of the Whole should consist of 10 members, namely, a Chairman, eight Vice-Chairmen and a Rapporteur.

11. It was so decided.

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT(S) OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

12. The CHAIRMAN pointed out the necessity of confirming the decision taken in principle by the Committee meeting as the Working Group held on Monday, 10 April. If he heard no objection, he would take it that there was a consensus regarding



the preparation of a single principal document of the special session consisting of four sections (preamble, declaration, programme of action and machinery). In its final report, the Preparatory Committee would include a recommendation on the matter and the draft principal document would follow the guidelines indicated.

13. It was so decided.

#### STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION

14. The CHAIRMAN drew the attention of the Committee to the note by the Secretariat dated 23 February 1978 showing certain items for which the Office of Public Information had requested additional funds, and invited the representative of OPI to address the Committee on the question.

15. Mr. GRIBKOV (Office of Public Information) said that the programme of public information activities in connexion with the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament was still as described in document A/AC.187/83. However, in that document were described certain expenditures which could not be absorbed by the regular budget of OPI. The pre-session information activities included the translation and publication of a brochure in a number of unofficial languages, for which the over-all cost of \$15,000 could be reduced if the Committee felt that one of those versions could be dispensed with. Work had already begun on the special display on disarmament and, as anticipated, the cost of external services amounted to \$2,000. With regard to the production of a poster in two to three colours, printed in several languages, the Office of Public Information would be prepared to undertake the project with a budget of \$6,000 if some languages were eliminated and if, as was expected, use was made of one of the posters offered without charge by one delegation. Although, for technical reasons, it would not be possible to have the poster ready in time for the special session, it could be used not only immediately following the special session, but over a number of years, since the Decade for Disarmament was as yet only half over.

16. Referring to the post-session information activities, he said that the funds needed for the publication of the relevant brochure in the unofficial languages would amount to \$26,000, twice as much as for the brochure to be published prior to the session. For the reproduction of copies of photographs and other display materials, for the provision of captions in various languages and for the shipment of the materials to United Nations Information Centres in various countries, additional funding of \$US 5,000 was now being sought, instead of the anticipated \$10,000, since it was hoped to make use of technical equipment which would enable costs to be reduced.

17. With regard to the dissemination of information relating to the special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly, at its thirty-second session, had approved an amount of \$54,800 to cover the additional needs of OPI. In the event of more than two meetings being held simultaneously, or of night meetings,

OPI would require additional resources of some \$11,000, and he understood that the Committee would have the relevant recommendations to proceed accordingly.

18. Mr. HARRY (Australia) emphasized the importance of the work being done by the Office of Public Information (OPI) in connexion with the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and expressed agreement with the changes in the programme of information activities suggested at the current meeting. In the interest of reflecting the progress made, it was proper and balanced to spend on the post-session brochure double the money which would be spent on the pre-session brochure. Likewise, it was important that the brochures should be prepared in various non-official languages.

19. He had no objection either to the suggestion to restrict the poster production project, since that method of attracting public attention was more ephemeral than the brochures. He was therefore in favour of reducing to \$6,000 the funds allocated to the production of a poster.

20. His delegation considered that the activities which OPI planned to carry out were appropriate and would therefore support the recommendation that the funds required should be granted.

21. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland) said that there was no need to discuss one by one the information activities suggested by OPI. Having examined them separately, he found that they were all acceptable, provided that the funds for their implementation were available. If that was not the case, it was necessary to determine which was the most rational and economic way of using the funds at OPI's disposal. The Office had three sources of funds: its regular budget, the amount of \$54,800 approved by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session, and the possibility, referred to in the Secretariat note dated 23 February 1978, of redeploying or reallocating the resources at its disposal. OPI should make the fullest possible use of those three sources. However, the aforementioned amount of \$54,800 had not been assigned to information activities but, as was stated in the Secretariat note of 23 February 1978, to the recruitment of additional personnel. He had grave doubts as to whether that was a proper use of the funds. At least half of the amount should be spent on genuine information activities. Since the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) was currently meeting in New York, its opinion on the subject should be sought.

22. It should be borne in mind also that a large part of the public information related to the special session should be the responsibility of the different Governments and the mass information media. The latter should emphasize the positive aspects of United Nations activity instead of merely criticizing its negative aspects.

23. Mr. VINCI (Italy) endorsed the opinion expressed by the representative of Australia on the value of publishing a brochure in several unofficial languages and asked which languages it was thought necessary to eliminate. He also drew attention to the questions put by the representative of Poland.

24. Mr. FOKINE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had already stated on other occasions its desire that the information relating to the special session and the subject of disarmament in general should be disseminated as widely as possible. On the other hand, the questions raised by the representative of Poland were extremely important, since it was a matter not simply of eliminating or expanding programmes but of determining the proper administrative course and the correct way of financing the activities, bearing in mind that the special session had as its aim the strengthening of the economic base of United Nations activities in the field of disarmament.

25. In that connexion, it would be recalled that the General Assembly, in resolution 32/201, of 21 December 1977, which had been adopted unanimously, had urged the Secretary-General to draw attention to activities that were obsolete, of marginal usefulness or ineffective, indicating the resources which could be released. Activities corresponding to that description were indeed to be found, and the work to be undertaken by OPI in pursuance of the aforementioned General Assembly resolution would permit resources in the current regular budget to be released for information activities related to the special session. That point must be emphasized because of the serious situation whereby, at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly, the United Nations budget had failed to secure the support of the States which bore 57 per cent of its cost.

26. His delegation reiterated its support for the information programmes, but, at the same time, it opposed the easy solution of requesting additional funds instead of seeking available resources within the regular budget. It therefore supported the suggestion made by the representative of Poland that ACABQ should be asked to submit to the Preparatory Committee its view, or at least its comments, on the subject.

27. Mr. GRIBKOV (Office of Public Information) said that he would endeavour to reply to all the questions put by the representative of Poland, to the extent that the information available at the current session permitted. It should be emphasized, above all, that the OPI activities in connexion with the special session went beyond those described in the Secretariat note of 23 February 1978. That note merely covered the activities which could not be financed from the United Nations regular budget. As to the suggestion that the existing allocation of resources should be changed, that was an important question which would have to be carefully considered by all the divisions of OPI. OPI had already made a preliminary attempt to absorb all the planned activities within the regular budget and had been unsuccessful. It would be necessary to redouble efforts to find new resources or to eliminate or prune some activities. The fact that, for the current year, the United Nations had planned new activities which required information support should not be overlooked.

28. The additional funds approved by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session should be used solely for the information coverage of the meetings of committees and of the General Assembly itself at the special session. OPI had therefore assigned those funds to the three categories of activities described in paragraph 2 of the Secretariat note of 23 February 1978 (Press and publications,

audio and visual services, and communications engineers). OPI did not consider itself empowered to reassign those funds approved by the General Assembly to activities which did not pertain to the information coverage of the special session.

29. There could be no doubt that it was necessary to rely on the additional efforts of Governments and the national mass information media. OPI was not a mass communication agency and, in order to attain its goals, it depended on its relations with those media and the support of the Governments of Member States.

30. With respect to the question put by the representative of Italy concerning the languages in which it was intended to publish the brochure on the progress made at the special session, he drew attention to the enumeration in paragraph A.1 (b) of document A/AC.187/83.

31. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland) welcomed the statement by the representative of OPI that new efforts would be made to redeploy or reassign existing resources. With respect to the additional funds allocated by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session, the Preparatory Committee could request ACABQ to advise it regarding the possibility of their use for activities other than the information coverage of the special session, instead of requesting additional funds for those activities. Furthermore, consideration should be given to the possibility that OPI officials normally assigned to other functions should concentrate on the tasks which it had been intended to assign to additional staff to be recruited for that purpose.

32. Mr. SIMARD (Canada) suggested that the Controller, not ACABQ, should be consulted regarding the financial implications of the proposals made by OPI.

33. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the request for additional funds submitted by OPI, said that the Committee was faced with three alternatives: it could approve the additional funds requested, which appeared to amount to \$65,000, or \$59,000 if the figure for the special poster was halved; it could recommend that no additional funds be approved and request OPI to use the funds in its regular budget; or it could approve the recommendation with the proviso that the fullest possible use should be made of the funds in the regular budget and that the additional funds should be assigned to information activities and not to the recruitment of additional staff.

34. Mr. CONGDON (United States) requested that the decision should be deferred until he was able to receive instructions from his Government and that, in the meantime, more information on the implications of the decision should be obtained.

35. Mr. SIMARD (Canada) asked whether the decision involved immediate expenditures or was merely a recommendation to the General Assembly, and whether the expenditures would be made before or after the special session, since the latter case raised a procedural question regarding the Committee's competence to adopt a decision which would seem to rest with the General Assembly.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that the decision would merely be a recommendation which would then have to be approved by the relevant bodies. Regarding the timing of the expenditures, he said that the request submitted by OPI clearly referred to expenditures prior to and following the special session.

37. Mr. VINCI (Italy), referring to the question of the publication of the OPI brochure in non-official languages, endorsed the view that the advice of the competent Secretariat officials should be sought before a decision was taken.

38. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the decision regarding OPI's request for additional funds should be postponed and that, in the meantime, more information clarifying the implications of the decision should be obtained.

39. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.

38th meeting

Friday, 14 April 1978, at 11.10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.38

FINAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE TO THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that a decision had yet to be taken on the proposal of the representative of Mexico (A/AC.187/SR.W8) that all documents submitted to the Committee should appear as annexes to the Committee's final report to the special session of the Assembly. With regard to the financial implications of the decision, the Secretariat had reported that many of the documents in question were out of stock and would have to be reprinted. The cost of producing the documents and compiling them into several volumes would be greater if translation into Arabic was included; there was also the possibility that the Arabic version would not be ready in time for the opening of the special session.
2. Mr. DURANT (Office of Financial Services) said that the existing documentation in five languages (approximately 1,000 pages) would now have to be reproduced in six languages, including Arabic. The Department of Conference Services had indicated that, in view of the present workload, it would probably be necessary to use an outside printer. The cost of translation into Arabic, revision, typing and preparation for external printing would be \$98,000; if an outside printer was employed to produce all the documents, including the series in Arabic, that would bring the amount to \$144,700; lastly, when the cost of distributing the documents was added, the total figure would be \$222,000.
3. It would not be known until the end of the current biennium whether those costs could be absorbed under existing budget appropriations, or whether a supplementary appropriation would have to be requested of the General Assembly. If such a request proved necessary, it would have to be made when the budget performance report was submitted.
4. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) pointed out that Arabic was an official language of the General Assembly and that the necessary action should therefore be taken to provide translation into Arabic. As it was quite some time since the decision to hold a special session devoted to disarmament had been adopted, the necessary action should already have been taken to cover the cost of translation into Arabic with funds from the regular budget.
5. Mr. LENNUYEUX-COMNENE (France) said that the financial obstacles were not insurmountable, particularly if, as seemed likely, the costs of production could be absorbed within the regular budget for the biennium. He therefore supported the Mexican proposal that the report should contain as annexes all the documents prepared as a result of the Committee's work.
6. Mr. BARTON (Canada) said that the provisions of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly applied to the question under discussion, and all existing documentation should therefore be available in all the official languages at the beginning of the special session.

7. If there was a time problem, the matter could be dealt with in two stages by concentrating first on the preparation of basic documents (contributions by the Secretariat, conclusions of the Committee, etc.) and leaving until later the publication of a separate annex which could contain earlier documentation of historical value.

8. Mr. WEILER (United States of America) said that he agreed in principle with the Mexican delegation's proposal, but requested that a decision should be postponed until the next meeting to allow time for consideration of the financial information presented by the Secretariat.

9. Replying to a question put by Mr. WEILER (United States of America), the CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was competent to take such a decision, which would be a recommendation that would then have to pass through the competent financial organs of the Secretariat.

10. He urged the Committee to take an affirmative decision as soon as possible. Speaking personally, he pointed out that world expenditure on armaments amounted to \$40 million an hour.

11. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that any delegation which had voted in favour of convening, for the first time, a special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament had ipso facto voted to incur whatever costs might be necessary to meet "customary" obligations. The list of documents prepared by the Secretariat (Conference Room Paper 16) was not too lengthy, and the whole of the documentation could probably be issued in four volumes, which was not much in comparison with the six volumes that had been issued for the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In the view of his delegation, there was an inescapable obligation to provide the General Assembly with all the documents referred to in Conference Room Paper 16; the fact that one or another of them was not available in one of the official languages was no reason for failing in that obligation. Moreover, as the representative of the Office of Financial Services and the Chairman had noted, some of the documents were out of stock and would have to be reprinted. Although it was not possible at the moment to determine whether the cost of reproducing those documents would be partly or wholly absorbed within the approved budget, the additional costs would at worst amount to \$222,000, a sum only slightly larger than what the world spent on armaments in 18 seconds.

12. Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany) said the fact that the Committee could only make recommendations to the competent United Nations organs with respect to the funds needed to finance the documentation should make it easier to take an immediate decision. In his view, the documents should be ready before the opening of the special session, so as to facilitate the work not only of delegations but also of the information media.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

13. Replying to a question put by Mr. BARTON (Canada) concerning the request for additional funds submitted by the Office of Public Information (note by the

Secretariat of 23 February 1978), the CHAIRMAN said that, even if the Committee approved the additional funds, their use would require the approval of the relevant organs of the General Assembly.

14. Mr. BARTON (Canada) asked whether, in that case, it would not be reasonable to use the funds available to the Secretary-General for unforeseen expenses, which would be approved subsequently in accordance with the usual budgetary procedure.

15. Mr. DURANT (Office of Financial Services) said that, as stated in the Secretariat note of 23 February 1978, the funds available to the Office of Public Information would not cover the activities envisaged. Consequently, if the Committee decided to recommend that those activities should be carried out, the prior approval of ACABQ would have to be sought before they could be initiated. The Advisory Committee was at present in session, but only until early in the following week.

16. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) said that he was in favour of giving the widest possible dissemination to the proposed brochures before and after the special session, although he appreciated the restrictions imposed by the limited funds available for producing them in non-official languages. Judging by the document of 23 February 1978, the range of non-official languages did not seem to reflect an equitable geographical distribution, and his delegation would therefore like to know from the representative of OPI whether any specific criteria had been used in selecting the languages.

17. Mr. GRIKOV (Office of Public Information) said that the languages mentioned in the Secretariat note of 23 February 1978 were only an indicative listing. In the first place, the list of non-official languages was incomplete; in addition, there was the possibility that some Member States would arrange for their own services, official or other, to help with the translation. Generally speaking, the criteria used to determine the need for translations of the brochures would be mainly numerical; in other words, the decision would depend on the number of people who used a language. It should be borne in mind that the system of United Nations information centres covered only some languages, and Swahili and other African languages should certainly have priority if agreement was reached on the provision of additional funds.

18. Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany) observed that the number of languages into which the brochures were translated would affect the final cost, and it would therefore be necessary to have a list before a decision was taken.

19. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) said that, even if the list of non-official languages was indicative and not exhaustive, it should take into account the purpose of producing the brochures and the resources available. In his view, the basic criterion should be the number of people whom the various language versions would reach.

20. He was glad that the representative of ILO had pointed out the omission of Swahili from the list of non-official languages, which he hoped would include Swahili and possibly another language that was widely used in West Africa, Hausa;



otherwise, one or perhaps two integral parts of the African continent would be excluded from the public information activities.

21. Replying to a question put by Mr. VINCI (Italy), Mr. DURANT (Office of Financial Services) said that the activities could begin as soon as the approval of ACABQ was obtained.

22. Mr. GRIBKOV (Office of Public Information) said that, in carrying out the proposed activities, the Office of Public Information would be guided by the decisions or recommendations of the Committee. As for the reallocation of resources, that was in accordance with the decisions taken at the thirty-second session of the General Assembly.

23. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland) said that he had no objections to the activities planned by OPI in connexion with the special session, which should be an important event from the standpoint of public information as well as in other respects. However, it should be borne in mind that the Preparatory Committee had no authority to make recommendations or decisions on financial questions. It could only recommend that the programme of activities should be approved, on the understanding that ACABQ and the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly would have to give thorough consideration to the financial implications of the programmes in question.

24. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of Poland was correct. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee agreed to recommend approval of the public information activities in connexion with the special session, which would have additional financial implications as described in the note by the Secretariat of 23 February 1978 and in document A/AC.187/83, except that the cost of item B.6 would be reduced from \$12,000 to \$6,000 and that of item (e) from \$10,000 to \$5,000, on the understanding that OPI would take due account of the comments made on the subject by various members of the Preparatory Committee.

25. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

39th meeting

Monday, 17 April 1978, at 3.45 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.39

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT(S) OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that one of the basic questions to be tackled was the adequacy of the existing multilateral disarmament machinery. His delegation shared the view that effective multilateral forums for the consideration and negotiation of arms limitation and disarmament measures were of great importance to counter and reverse the ever-expanding arms race. A good negotiating structure was admittedly no substitute for political will, but the latter could be stimulated by better understanding resulting from constructive dialogue in an appropriate body. In its latest proposal for a comprehensive disarmament programme, his delegation had emphasized that, although nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States bore a special responsibility in the disarmament process, all nations had a vital interest in the outcome of disarmament negotiations. Consequently, the active participation and support of all States was required. His Government therefore considered the General Assembly to be the most qualified forum to consider the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and was ready to support any constructive step which could strengthen the role of the United Nations and implement the relevant provisions of the Charter.
2. The special session would be a suitable occasion for the Security Council to review its achievements in regulating armaments in accordance with Article 26 of the Charter. It might also consider the establishment, under Article 29 of the Charter, of subsidiary organs for specific disarmament purposes, starting with a committee to control the international transfer of conventional weapons which would be divided into regional sub-committees. An international organ could also be established to supervise the application of disarmament agreements.
3. The range and complexity of disarmament issues made an effective negotiating body essential, and CCD, despite some unavoidable short-comings, had undeniably played a significant part in the elaboration of most of the treaties concluded thus far and had acquired considerable skill and experience. It should therefore continue to function as the main multilateral negotiating body for disarmament measures. Although it had been suggested that CCD might be enlarged in order to ensure a better geographical and political representation of Member States, his Government was convinced that a restricted forum was essential to ensure businesslike negotiations. While it would not oppose a small increase in the membership of CCD, it maintained that the principle of selected membership should be respected, and that in recruiting new members, careful attention should be paid to their ability to make a consistent contribution to disarmament negotiations. Consideration might also be given to the possibility of opening the meetings of CCD to other interested Members of the United Nations. While some Governments had recommended strengthening the link between CCD and others had recommended incorporating CCD into the United Nations structure, his delegation considered that CCD should preserve a degree of autonomy and flexibility, although the General Assembly might be called up to give broader guidance to disarmament negotiations. The principle of consensus must be maintained in all deliberations involving so vital an issue as the security of individual nations. To achieve closer liaison

between CCD and the General Assembly, CCD might be asked to send the Assembly a periodic progress report after the spring session, together with special reports on particular topics. At the beginning of its annual activities, CCD should seek to plan its negotiating work for the spring and summer sessions. It could also set up functional working groups to negotiate draft treaties or to consider specific items. In addition, steps could be taken to facilitate the presence in CCD of the nuclear-weapon States which currently did not participate in its deliberations.

4. His delegation was anxious to end the stalemate between those Members of the United Nations wishing to preserve the current CCD co-chairmanship and those seeking to replace it by the principle of rotation. However, little progress had been achieved thus far, and his delegation's views on the matter had therefore been omitted from its working paper on international mechanisms for disarmament, to be circulated shortly. It was, however, hoped that a compromise solution could be found.

5. Mr. DIENNE (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) said that the past and present activities of UNESCO in the field of disarmament had already been described to the Committee at its third session in September 1977, and in UNESCO's contribution to the 1977 United Nations Disarmament Yearbook. However, the Committee should be informed about UNESCO's most recent activities.

6. At its eleventh session, the General Conference of UNESCO had defined as one of its essential tasks the creation of a climate of public opinion favourable to the attainment of the disarmament objectives set by the United Nations. At the seventeenth session, a decision had been taken to mobilize public opinion in favour of disarmament by more intensive use of the mass media and the encouragement of relevant activities by non-governmental organizations. At its eighteenth session the General Conference had adopted an intersectoral programme on human rights and peace, intended inter alia to promote education on disarmament problems.

7. Among its current activities, the General Conference at its nineteenth session, in 1976, had adopted resolution 13.1, which stated that UNESCO by virtue of its experience and its world-wide authority, could and should make an effective contribution to the problem by generating a climate of public opinion conducive to the halting of the arms race. Relevant articles on disarmament were disseminated by means of UNESCO publications, and the Director-General had been asked to conduct some preliminary work on disarmament research, bearing particularly on illiteracy and cultural progress, and to plan for future symposia on disarmament topics for educators, scientists and cultural workers. At its nineteenth session, the General Conference had also approved the medium-term plan for 1977-1982, which included a number of objectives relating to the strengthening of peace. In 1977, UNESCO had intensified its activities in the field of disarmament in order to contribute to the preparation of the special session of the General Assembly. The report submitted to the Committee in September 1977 had indicated current UNESCO activities likely to make a particular contribution to the special session: the publication of a document on the role of the international organizations in disarmament; radio programmes; the publication of a brochure containing articles

on disarmament topics; two annotated bibliographies and a study of recent trends in research on the social and economic aspects of the arms race; a world survey of disarmament education; and a study of the pedagogical aspects of disarmament education.

8. A meeting of experts on obstacles to disarmament had been held at UNESCO headquarters from 3 to 7 April 1978 and had been attended by experts from Cameroon, Colombia, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, India, Ireland, Norway, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States. The experts had concluded that the peoples of the world had a key role to play in creating the social and cultural conditions, the political climate and the will on the part of States needed for progress towards disarmament. They had also concluded that the special session should recognize the existence of a human right to a disarmed world as an essential corollary to the right to development and the right to peace. They had stated that there was a need to develop the study of disarmament law as an integral part of international law. The inclusion of a reference to disarmament law in the preamble and declaration of the final document of the special session would stimulate study of the topic by lawyers, scholars and governmental and non-governmental organizations. In order to promote a favourable climate of public opinion, the programme of action should be addressed not only to Member States, but also to international organizations such as UNESCO, which were well equipped to influence those aspects of disarmament that were related to education and culture. The experts had therefore requested UNESCO, as provided in the draft programme and budget for 1979-1980, to give special emphasis to the development of education for disarmament. However, special recommendations in the programme of action of the special session would help to intensify the efforts already being made by UNESCO in the field of disarmament. In its draft programme for 1979-1980, UNESCO was planning an international congress on education for disarmament. It hoped that the special session would recommend the continuation of its activities in fostering a favourable climate for disarmament, which in fact was rooted in the disarming of men's minds. The constitution of UNESCO stated that peace must be based on the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind, and not exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of Governments.

#### ORGANIZATION OF WORK

9. The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the Preparatory Committee that a decision was still pending on the Mexican proposal to publish all the relevant documentation prepared for the Committee's work in an annex or annexes to its final report. A statement on the financial implications was before the Committee in Conference Room Paper 17.

10. Mr. FISHER (United States of America) said that, if a consensus should emerge to adopt the Mexican proposal, his delegation would have no objection. However, personally, he believed that to produce an annex as lengthy as 2,000 pages would be a sure way of keeping the material secret; no one would read it. Presumably, any request for appropriation would have to be submitted to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Although there was provision in General Assembly resolution 32/214 for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses, he did

not believe that supplementary appropriations for the special session came into that category. The expenditure should be absorbed within existing appropriations for the biennium, even though the need to have the documents printed outside would make that difficult.

11. Mr. BARTON (Canada) said that he found it somewhat difficult to accept the idea contained in Conference Room Paper 17 that the proposed annex should be circulated before it was ready in all six languages. If the Arabic version was not ready in time, he would prefer to see the final report circulated in all official languages and then all language versions of the annex circulated simultaneously at a later stage.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that it was only the Arabic language version which posed certain practical problems, but he understood that every effort would be made to have all the documents ready in Arabic as soon as possible. There was no question that all documentation would have to be made available in all six languages.

13. Mr. BARUNI (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the second paragraph of Conference Room Paper 17 stated clearly that the documentation should be reproduced in six languages and he could not understand why Arabic had been singled out in the statement of financial implications, since the problems involved were practical rather than financial. His delegation would like to make it known that there could not be a special session without documentation and interpretation in all six languages...The Preparatory Committee could not advise or recommend the General Assembly or its subsidiary bodies to take measures which would be in violation of General Assembly resolutions which called for all documents to be made available in all official languages. Extraneous considerations could not be taken into account and the Department of Conference Services should be prevailed upon, in the few weeks remaining before the special session, to do its utmost to have the documentation translated and made available in all languages. He supported the view expressed by the representative of Canada that documents should be distributed simultaneously in all languages.

14. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland) said it was sometimes difficult to be consistent, but the Preparatory Committee should bear in mind General Assembly resolution 2837 (XXVI) which, in its annex II, paragraph 107 (c), stated that "as a rule, no previously issued material should be incorporated in or appended to reports".

15. His delegation would only agree to support the Mexican proposal on the understanding that any expenditure would be absorbed within existing appropriations.

16. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) stated that the problem of the Arabic language version was a separate question. It seemed that the Secretariat did not consider Arabic as an official language, otherwise, the work would already have been put in hand. He appreciated the suggestion made by the representative of Canada regarding document distribution.

17. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said that, since the material produced in connexion with the activities of the Preparatory Committee had not been made available for general distribution, it was important that the basic documentation should be provided for

all Member States before or during the special session. It was assumed that documentation would be available in all languages, even if some of the earlier documentation, for reasons beyond the control of the Secretariat, could not be made available in Arabic. He wondered if it had been intended to include the three tabulations drawn up by the Secretariat. It might be possible to save some money by omitting them, since they were of a somewhat transitory nature.

16. The CHAIRMAN said it was his impression that the three tabulations were to be included. Due note would be taken of the comments made regarding the preparation of documentation in Arabic. As Conference Room Paper 17 made clear, the Secretariat would do everything possible to make the Arabic documentation available in time for the special session. If, for lack of time, that proved to be impossible, it would be circulated at a later stage as soon as it was available. He pointed out that the Secretariat was not able to state at the current stage whether the expenditure could be absorbed or not, but if it proved necessary to request supplementary appropriations, then that would be done through the competent bodies. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to annex the documentation to its final report in all six official languages.

19. It was so decided.

20. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) said he hoped that the Chairman's remarks with regard to the preparation of the documentation in Arabic would be included in the decision.

21. The CHAIRMAN announced that the draft of the introduction to the final document, which he had prepared, would be circulated the following day. It was non-controversial and he hoped that it would be possible to adopt it for inclusion in the final report, subject to any necessary amendments. On the question of non-governmental organizations and research institutes, the officers were requesting some additional information and hoped to be able to make a recommendation to the Preparatory Committee at its next meeting. The documents that had been received from non-governmental organizations were available to all members of the Committee.

22. The Drafting Groups and Sub-Drafting Groups were proposing to complete their work by 19 April and it was hoped that by 20 April, at the latest, it would be possible to circulate the draft of the final document. The draft of the final report would be circulated on 19 April. Obviously, any decisions taken between then and the end of the session, such as a recommendation with regard to non-governmental organizations and research institutes, would have to be incorporated into that draft. He suggested that the Committee should either hold two meetings on 20 April and two on 21 April, or, alternatively, leave the morning of 20 April free for delegations to study all the drafts.

23. Replying to a question put by Mr. PFEIFFER (Federal Republic of Germany), he said that the list of delegates and summary records of the plenary meetings would be circulated shortly.

24. Mr. LENUYEUX-COMNENE (France) asked whether the Preparatory Committee would be meeting as an informal working group or in plenary on 20 and 21 April.

25. Mr. BARTON (Canada) proposed that the Committee should meet as an informal working group on the morning of 20 April and endeavour to complete its work in two plenary meetings, on the afternoon of 20 April and the morning of 21 April..

26. The CHAIRMAN said he was in the Committee's hands. He did not foresee many difficulties in adopting the final report. Members would recall that the Preparatory Committee's report to the thirty-second session of the General Assembly had been adopted without a single amendment. In any case, the amendments were more likely to be of a drafting nature. Where the draft final document was concerned, although there were many square brackets to be removed in some sections, he did not believe there would be any need for renegotiation; it would only be needed to check that the documents fully reflected the discussions in the Drafting Group and Sub-Drafting Groups.

27. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that the Committee should follow the method which had so far given good results, namely to begin the meeting in formal session and then to reconvene as an informal working group should further negotiation prove necessary.

28. Mr. LENUYEUX-COMÈNE (France) said that, in the case of the draft final document, many delegations had not been able to participate directly in the work of the Drafting Group and Sub-Drafting Groups and he foresaw that some of them might wish to introduce substantive amendments. When the Committee met as an informal working group every delegation should be free to give its comments or even to make new proposals. Logically, the Sub-Drafting Groups should report to the Drafting Group which would, in turn, report to the plenary, through the informal working group. However, there would not be time to do that within the space of four meetings.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that the Chairman of the Drafting Group would be making his final report at the Committee's meeting on 19 April and would inform members of the whole conduct of negotiations in the Drafting Group and Sub-Drafting Groups. Delegations would obviously be given an opportunity to comment on the drafts. As a compromise, he suggested that the Committee should meet on the morning of 20 April with a view to holding another meeting in the afternoon and then try, if possible, to complete its work on the morning of 21 April. However, provision could be made for a further meeting on the afternoon of that day, if necessary. He agreed with the method of work proposed by the representative of Mexico.

30. Replying to a question put by Mr. YANGO (Philippines), he said that the draft of the final report should have been distributed by the time the Chairman of the Drafting Group made his report on 19 April and the draft final document would be circulated, at the latest, on the morning of 20 April.

31. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee agreed to the proposed organization of work.

32. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.

40th meeting

Wednesday, 19 April 1978, at 3.45 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.40

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to the issue of document A/AC.187/109, containing a background paper on disarmament and verification prepared by the Secretariat; A/AC.187/110, containing a working paper on international mechanisms for disarmament submitted by Italy; Conference Room Paper No. 18, containing the draft final report of the Preparatory Committee; and Conference Room Paper No. 19, containing the Chairman's draft introduction to the draft final document for the special session.

FINAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE TO THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (continued)

2. Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria), Rapporteur, introducing Conference Room Paper No. 18, said that the draft final report provided a full account of the work done by the Committee at all its five sessions. It was concise, objective and factual and similar to the Committee's earlier report (A/32/41) endorsed by the General Assembly at its thirty-second session (resolution 32/88 B). The first five sections of the draft final report reproduced the earlier report in full. Section VI reproduced the operative part of resolution 32/88 B. Section VII described the organization of the Committee's work in 1978. Section VIII listed the documents submitted by Member States in 1978 and also the summary records for the meetings held in plenary and in the Working Group in 1978. Section IX referred to the Committee's decision to annex all its official documents to the draft final report in separate volumes. Section X contained the recommendations prepared by the Committee in 1978 for submission to the special session and noted that both the recommendations regarding non-governmental organizations and the Committee's draft final document for submission to the special session would be annexed to the draft final report once they had been approved by the Preparatory Committee. He drew attention to the fact that in paragraph 17 (3), the word "eighth" should be replaced by "tenth".

3. In the drafting groups, negotiations on the drafts for the declaration, disarmament negotiating machinery and programme of action to be submitted to the special session had been concluded, and the documents in question would be ready for consideration in their final form on 21 April.

4. Mr. VINCI (Italy) pointed out that document A/AC.187/110 submitted by his delegation would have to be included in the list of documents contained in paragraph 41 of Conference Room Paper No. 18.

5. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) pointed out that document A/AC.187/55/Add.1 submitted by the Group of Non-aligned Countries should also be included in that list.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (continued)

6. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the course of consultations, a number of delegations had asked how many sub-committees or working groups the Committee of the Whole of the special session would have. Any decision in that respect would have to be left to the Committee of the Whole itself. However, as delegations needed to know how



many representatives to send to the session and the level of such representation, he thought that the Preparatory Committee would be safe in assuming that the Committee of the Whole of the special session would have two working groups, one of which would work on the programme of action and the other on disarmament negotiating machinery. Considerable progress had been made on the declaration, so that all it would require would be a few final touches.

7. A number of delegations had also asked when the Committee of the Whole of the special session would begin its work. Some had suggested that it should not meet during the general debate, while others had held the opposite view. As considerable work remained to be done with regard to the programme of action and disarmament negotiating machinery, he wished to suggest, as a compromise, that the Committee of the Whole should begin its work on 1 June 1978, by which time the general debate, due to begin on 24 May, would be already well under way. The Committee of the Whole would then have until 26 June to complete its work and produce a final document. He recommended, however, that the Committee of the Whole should not meet when Heads of State or Government were speaking in the general debate, which was due to end on 9 June.

8. Mr. YANGO (Philippines) asked how many Heads of State or Government were expected to attend the special session and when they were to speak.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that thus far 14 Heads of State or Government were due to attend the special session and would be free to speak at any time during the general debate.

10. If there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee decided to endorse his recommendation that the Committee of the Whole of the special session should begin its work on 1 June 1978 and should not meet when Heads of State or Government were speaking in the general debate.

11. It was so decided.

12. The CHAIRMAN recalled that, at the fourth session of the Committee, it had been suggested that non-governmental organizations should draw up a list of organizations to represent them at the special session. The Committee had also decided that non-governmental organizations should participate in the session at the level of the Committee of the Whole and that two meetings of that Committee should be allocated to statements by such organizations. In that connexion, he drew attention to a telegram received from Edith Ballantyne, President of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council and Convener of the Co-ordinating Group, and to a memorandum from the Speaker's Committee of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations (CONGO), both of which had been circulated. He drew particular attention to the guidelines set out in the third and fourth paragraphs on page 2 of the CONGO memorandum, which read as follows:

"Guidelines for carrying through the plan that has developed in the consultations thus far include: (1) each organization will select its own speaker, keeping in mind the coordination necessary for the total group to

be balanced in geographic region, nationality, sex, and age; (2) each speaker will be limited in time, probably to 12 minutes, with the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole asked to enforce these time limits strictly; (3) each speaker, while representing his or her own organization, also will speak in ways to enhance the contribution of the entire NGO community to disarmament; (4) each speaker will attack no State or group of States; (5) organizations and their speakers are to follow the general debate and the special session so that their statements are well informed on United Nations disarmament work.

"On the basis of further consultations with the Chairman of the Preparatory Committee and during the special session with the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, specific provisions will need to be made for: (1) setting the date for a group meeting of all speakers with the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to confer on detailed plans and understandings for the programme of addresses; (2) setting the date required for submission of names of speakers; (3) establishing a simplified and effective liaison and coordinating process for completing the plans for the programme of NGO speakers and accompanying activities."

13. The Bureau had subsequently discussed the whole issue of participation by non-governmental organizations and research institutes in the work of the special session and had reached agreement on the following points by consensus: that each representative of a non-governmental organization or research institute should speak for not more than 12 minutes in the Committee of the Whole so that a total of 25 speakers could be heard at the two meetings allocated to such organizations and institutes; and that the list of non-governmental organizations submitted by Edith Ballantyne was incomplete and should include non-governmental organizations from developing countries. In that connexion, the Chairman had received from the President of the World Peace Council a copy of a telegram sent to Edith Ballantyne indicating that the list she had drawn up was neither balanced nor representative. Accordingly, the Bureau had decided that the list should also include a representative of Japanese non-governmental organizations and the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in view of the special nature of their case. The Bureau had also discussed a request for permission to address the special session from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), which was very active in favour of disarmament, and had decided that that request should be dealt with at the same time as similar requests from other research institutes.

14. Accordingly, he suggested that the Committee should recommend to the special session that non-governmental organizations and research institutes should be represented by 25 speakers and be allocated a total of five working hours at the special session, and that the list of such organizations and institutes should be approved in final form by the Committee of the Whole at its first meeting. He also recommended that the day allocated to non-governmental organizations and research institutes should be 12 June, the first available day after the end of the general debate.

15. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said he presumed that the non-governmental organizations listed by Edith Ballantyne would not have to wait until the special session to hear whether they would be participating in the session. He therefore suggested that, subject to any additions which might make the list more balanced, those organizations already listed should be able to assume that they would be participating in the special session and would be able to start preparing their statements accordingly.
16. The CHAIRMAN endorsed the suggestion made by the representative of Australia and said that it would also cover the representatives of Japanese non-governmental organizations and the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and any non-governmental organizations from developing countries which might be added to the list.
17. Mr. SOKALSKI (Poland) said that, if the list was to be more balanced geographically, more socialist countries would also have to be represented. The World Peace Council telegram referred to by the Chairman had in fact indicated that the list was politically and geographically unrepresentative in that it failed to give adequate representation to non-governmental organizations from Latin America, Africa, Asia and the socialist countries.
18. Mr. MUTUKWA (Zambia) pointed out that at the previous session, a number of delegations had already drawn attention to the lack of balance in the representation of non-governmental organizations. He was surprised that the non-governmental organizations had not tried to rectify that situation, and he hoped that they would do so before the special session.
19. The CHAIRMAN said it was only fair to point out that the non-governmental organizations had to face many problems, including shortage of time, and would have difficulty in submitting an agreed list quickly. However, the interval before the meeting of the Committee of the Whole on 1 June would be long enough for them to make additions to their list on the basis of the Committee's recommendations.
20. Mr. KUBBA (Iraq) and Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt) agreed with the representative of Zambia that the present list was insufficiently balanced, and that more speakers from the developing countries were needed.
21. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria), speaking on a related issue, referred to the statement by the representative of UNESCO at the preceding meeting concerning the programme on disarmament questions launched by UNESCO and suggested that the Committee should consider inviting the Director-General of UNESCO to describe the programme to the special session.
22. Mr. MISTRAL (France) supported the proposal of the representative of Nigeria.
23. The CHAIRMAN said that the matter would be dealt with when a decision had been taken concerning the non-governmental organizations. He asked whether the Committee approved the procedures for representation of the non-governmental organizations proposed by the Bureau.
24. It was so decided.

25. Mr. OGISO (Japan) said that his delegation and Government were grateful for the consideration and sympathy shown to the Japanese non-governmental organizations and the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by including them in the list of speakers. It was well known that the Japanese people had been the first victims of a nuclear explosion, and it was therefore reasonable that Japanese representatives should speak.
26. Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom), recalling that his delegation had originally made the proposal that a day should be set aside for the non-governmental organizations, expressed deep satisfaction at the decision. He appreciated the difficulty of drawing up an acceptable list of speakers, since many organizations were eager for the honour of speaking to the Committee of the Whole, and hoped that a list which was both geographically and politically balanced could be produced.
27. The CHAIRMAN said that a decision must be made by the Preparatory Committee on the proposal made by the representative of Nigeria to invite the Director-General of UNESCO to state that agency's views and describe its work on disarmament topics. If such an invitation was to be issued, the level of participation must also be decided. The only precedent relating to a specialized agency had been a previous invitation issued to the Executive Director of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The problem was that a number of specialized agencies might wish to participate.
28. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that he had been deeply impressed by the statement made by the representative of UNESCO at the preceding meeting. While he favoured inviting the Director-General of UNESCO to speak at the special session, the other specialized agencies would then have an equal claim for inclusion, since all their work was concerned with peace and co-operation. However, UNESCO's programme of action was in line with the work done in the Preparatory Committee, and he therefore favoured representation from that agency.
29. Mr. BARTON (Canada) suggested that the Bureau could be empowered to take any interim action required in relation to the specialized agencies, informing them of the forthcoming special session and inviting them to speak if they wished.
30. Mr. PALMA (Peru) said that the Nigerian proposal had great merit. The General Conference of UNESCO had adopted an important resolution on disarmament, and the views of that agency would be of great interest to the General Assembly at its special session. Furthermore, the Nigerian proposal implicitly raised the question of the arrangements to be made concerning participation by organizations in the United Nations system, a question on which further consultations were required.
31. Mr. FOKINE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) asked whether any other United Nations bodies had expressed a desire to make a statement during the special session devoted to disarmament.
32. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat had received an informal request from the Administrator of UNDP, who had expressed interest in stating that body's views on disarmament.

33. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) agreed with earlier speakers that it would be wise to hold further consultations on the question of participation by organizations of the United Nations system. His suggestion with regard to UNESCO had been made because that organization had a programme of action on disarmament, and consequently its views would be extremely pertinent to the work of the General Assembly at the special session. At the same time, there were other United Nations organizations whose views would be relevant. Furthermore, the contributions to be made by research institutes such as SIPRI should not be overlooked.
34. The CHAIRMAN said it was clear from the discussion that some members wished to defer a decision until the following meeting.
35. He informed the Committee that the Permanent Observers of the Holy See and Switzerland had expressed interest in participating in the general debate which would be held at the special session. As they were in a position to make valuable contributions, he suggested that the Preparatory Committee might wish to invite them to make statements on the last day of the general debate.
36. Mr. BARTON (Canada) said that to invite the Permanent Observers of the Holy See and Switzerland might give rise to a flood of requests from other permanent observers.
37. Mr. FISHER (United States of America) suggested that a decision should be deferred pending consultations.
38. Mr. VINCI (Italy) said that Switzerland, by virtue of its vocation for peace, wisdom and centuries of military experience, and the Holy See, by virtue of its moral influence, could make significant contributions to the work of the special session. As to the possibility of requests from other observers, he believed that the Preparatory Committee should take a pragmatic approach and deal with such requests as they were received.
39. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that Switzerland was the host country of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and many other international organizations. He believed that that consideration and the pertinent comments made by the representative of Italy should be taken into account in reaching a decision. However, since some delegations required time for consultations, a decision would be deferred until a subsequent meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

41st meeting

Thursday, 20 April 1978, at 3.50 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.41

FINAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE TO THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY (Conference Room Paper No. 18 and Add.1) (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to Conference Room Paper No. 18/Add.1, which contained changes and additions to be made to the draft final report in Conference Room Paper No. 18.
2. He said that he had requested the opinion of the Office of Legal Affairs with regard to the proposal made at the previous meeting by the representative of Nigeria to recommend that the General Assembly should invite the Director-General of UNESCO to participate in the special session devoted to disarmament. According to the opinion furnished by that Office, there was only one precedent for the participation in the General Assembly's debates in plenary meetings of the executive head or director-general of a specialized agency or other body related to the United Nations - that of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Under the Agreement governing the relationship between the United Nations and IAEA, the Director General of IAEA could participate in plenary meetings of the United Nations General Assembly, and had in fact done so in order to present the annual report of IAEA. The Office of Legal Affairs added that only on one other occasion, at a formal ceremony, the Director-General of ILO had spoken at a plenary meeting of the General Assembly during consideration of the item entitled "Fiftieth anniversary of the International Labour Organisation". As to the possible participation of the Director-General of UNESCO in the special session of the General Assembly, the Office of Legal Affairs indicated that article 3, paragraph 3, of the Agreement between UNESCO and the United Nations did not contain a specific provision concerning that question, except in regard to consultations of an exclusively educational, scientific or cultural nature.
3. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that the past practice outlined in the opinion given by the Office of Legal Affairs not only did not preclude following the procedure proposed by the delegation of Nigeria, but even included two cases in which a similar procedure had been followed. He wished to know whether there were any precedents for rejecting requests of that nature for substantive or legal reasons. Otherwise, he would strongly support the proposal to recommend that an invitation should be extended to the Director-General of UNESCO, which, as part of the United Nations system, should be treated differently from organizations outside the system.
4. The CHAIRMAN replied that the opinion given by the Office of Legal Affairs mentioned no precedent for rejecting a request of a nature similar to that being considered. The General Assembly had sovereign competence to lay down its own procedures and could, if it so desired, invite the Director-General of UNESCO to participate in its debates, given the interest shown in that organization's contribution to the subject of disarmament. The Preparatory Committee, for its part, could recommend that the General Assembly take a decision to that end.

5. Miss FAROUK (Tunisia) said that, particularly in the light of the information given by the Chairman, she supported the proposal to recommend that the Director-General of UNESCO should be invited.

6. Mr. HARRY (Australia) requested a clarification concerning the scope of the proposal by the Nigerian delegation. If it involved an invitation to the Director-General of UNESCO to participate in the general debate of the General Assembly, he could not support the proposal, since he felt that participation in those debates should be confined to States Members of the United Nations. There were other occasions when the General Assembly might feel the need to receive information from other persons, or to hear distinguished leaders and, where appropriate, to pay them a tribute for reasons of courtesy. In a sense, the case of the Director-General of UNESCO could belong to the two categories indicated, and it might be appropriate to invite him to participate in the work of the General Assembly at its special session in order to furnish information on UNESCO programmes relating to disarmament, but without that implying a right to participate in the general debate.

7. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) said that his proposal covered the two hypothetical cases mentioned by the representative of Australia. With regard to the participation of the Director-General of UNESCO in the work of the special session in general, it appeared that the Preparatory Committee had already taken a favourable position. The fact was that of all the bodies which the Preparatory Committee had invited to participate in its work, as indicated in paragraph 10 of Conference Room Paper No. 18, only UNESCO and IAEA had shown interest and had attended the meetings.

8. As to the participation of the Director-General of UNESCO in plenary meetings of the General Assembly, he recalled that the First Committee had recommended that the General Assembly, at its thirty-second session, should decide that the Director General of IAEA be invited to make a statement to the Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament (A/32/381, para. 14). He therefore suggested that the Preparatory Committee should make a similar recommendation to the General Assembly in respect of the Director-General of UNESCO. In that way, the Director-General could outline the work of UNESCO to the Assembly, and the UNESCO staff could participate in the work of the Main Committees.

9. Mr. ERNEMANN (Belgium) said it was necessary to proceed very prudently in the matter before the Committee and to abide by the principle that participation in the plenary meetings of the General Assembly should be reserved for States Members of the United Nations. The legal opinion before the Committee was an inadequate basis for a decision or a recommendation the case of IAEA was different, since the Director General came every year to present to the General Assembly the report of that agency, relating to a subject that concerned him directly. It was relevant to draw the distinction, as the Australian representative had done, between several possibilities: the Director-General of UNESCO might attend the special session of the General Assembly as an observer, address the Assembly in the general debate or participate in the work of the Plenary Committee

or other working groups. No more could be done in the case of the Director-General of UNESCO than in the case of two States not Members of the United Nations whose possible participation in the special session was being considered, namely, the Holy See and Switzerland. The solution to that problem rested with the General Assembly, and the Preparatory Committee could do no more than recommend its inclusion, together with a written legal opinion, among the issues to be settled by the General Assembly upon the opening of the special session.

10. The CHAIRMAN said that the opinion given by the Office of Legal Affairs referred to two precedents in which States not Members of the United Nations had been invited to participate in the general debate: at the thirtieth session, on the recommendation of the General Committee, it had been decided to invite the Permanent Observers of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and of the Republic of South Viet-Nam to participate in the general debate, and both had made statements at the 2354th meeting, held on 19 September 1975; and at the thirty-first session, a similar invitation had been extended to the Permanent Observer of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, who had made a statement at the plenary meeting held on 26 November 1976.

11. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that acceptance of the proposal by the Nigerian delegation could only be beneficial and that, in any case, it would be for the General Assembly to decide the matter, since the Preparatory Committee could only make recommendations. Even had there been no precedents - and there was a precedent at least in the case of IAEA - that would not stand in the way of issuing an invitation as proposed, since the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament would be the first devoted to that item (although it would be the tenth special session of the General Assembly), and it was understandable that there were no precedents. It would be enough to consider the interest shown by the agency in the questions considered by the Assembly and both the participation of UNESCO in the work of the Preparatory Committee, as mentioned in paragraph 10 of Conference Room Paper No. 18, and the recent activities of that organization in connexion with disarmament and its short-term programme on that subject, as outlined by its representative at the 39th meeting of the Preparatory Committee, fully indicated that interest. He therefore supported the Nigerian proposal.

12. The CHAIRMAN noted a divergency between the Nigerian proposal, supported by various delegations, to recommend that the Director-General of UNESCO should be invited to participate in the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and the position of Belgium, which proposed that the General Assembly should decide the matter without the Committee making any recommendation. Since the Committee had hitherto taken all its decisions by consensus, it would be appropriate to hold consultations among interested delegations in order to prepare a decision based on consensus. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt that approach.

13. It was so decided.

14. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that consultations were continuing with regard to the possibility of recommending that the Holy See and Switzerland should be invited to make statements before the General Assembly at its special session, and announced that the Committee would continue its discussions as a Working Group.

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.



Friday, 21 April 1978, at 11.25 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina)

A/AC.187/SR.42

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to Conference Room Paper No. 20, entitled "Draft final document", which had been circulated in all the working languages, and to Conference Room Paper No. 18/Add.2, which was available at present only in English and contained the changes made by the Working Group in the draft final report.
2. He recalled that the previous day the Working Group had considered the Nigerian proposal to invite the Director-General of UNESCO to participate in the special session. The Working Group had asked the Nigerian delegation to consult with those delegations which wished to state their views in the matter, particularly with the Belgian delegation, in order to prepare a text that the Committee could adopt by consensus.
3. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) read out the proposal that had emerged from the consultations with the Belgian delegation: "Bearing in mind the special programme which UNESCO has launched on issues relating to disarmament, the Preparatory Committee recommends that the Director-General of UNESCO be invited to make a statement to the Assembly at its special session devoted to disarmament." The proposal, which was based on a similar invitation from the First Committee to the Director-General of IAEA, did not state that the Director-General of UNESCO would participate in the general debate.
4. Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) said that Belgium had expressed reservations concerning the initial text because it had referred to participation by a United Nations specialized agency in the general debate. Since it had now been specified that the agency would merely make a statement, there was no longer any reason for those reservations.
5. The recommendation proposed by Nigeria was adopted.
6. The CHAIRMAN recalled that he had recently informed the Committee that the Permanent Observers of the Holy See and Switzerland wished to state their views at the special session, as a result of which a brief debate had arisen; he had learned in informal consultations that the two Permanent Observers had decided to reconsider the situation in the light of the brief discussion which had taken place in the Committee. He wished to express his personal thanks to UNESCO and its Director-General and to the Permanent Observers of the Holy See and Switzerland for their contribution to the cause of disarmament and for the interest with which they had followed the Committee's work since its inception.
7. He recalled that he had been asked to prepare a draft introduction for the final document. He wished to state, for the benefit of the delegations which were not members of the Committee, that he had carried out that task; the draft text (Conference Room Paper No. 19), which he had tried to keep as objective as possible, had been examined at informal meetings. Some delegations had supported the document, and he was grateful to them; however, in view of the reservations expressed

by the others, he had decided to withdraw it formally. Accordingly, the General Assembly would have to prepare an introduction acceptable to the 149 States Members of the United Nations.

8. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that he appreciated the Chairman's work on the draft introduction and regretted the fact that the document had not met with unanimous approval in the Committee.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that he had wished to make sure that the text did not give rise to any controversy; however, any delegation which felt that the draft introduction had some merit was completely free to make use of it.

10. Mr. HARRY (Australia) said that in his view the draft introduction prepared by the Chairman would make a very important contribution to the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

11. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) again expressed his gratitude to the Chairman for his draft introduction, which, he felt, could win general approval. To be sure, summary records had been prepared for the open meetings and for the closed meetings of the Committee as a working group, and document A/AC.187/SR.W9 related solely to the draft introduction prepared by the Chairman. However, his delegation did not want the 100 or so Member States not represented in the Committee, which were unaware of that text, to think that the Chairman had not prepared his draft introduction as requested. He was still convinced of the value of the draft and considered it a praiseworthy effort to describe the situation objectively and concisely and to state the reasons which had motivated the convening of a special session devoted to disarmament. In order not to place at a disadvantage the States which had not read it, his delegation, supported by the Swedish delegation, requested that the Chairman's draft introduction should be reintroduced and suggested that the full text should be issued in square brackets, which would make it possible to complete the draft final document. Any specific proposals that might be made by some delegations concerning that document would be considered at the special session.

12. Mr. HEPBURN (Bahamas) fully endorsed the views of the Indian, Australian and Mexican delegations.

13. Mr. BERG (Sweden) felt that the Chairman's draft introduction was excellent both in substance and in form. For that reason, he had joined the representative of Mexico in requesting that the document should be reintroduced and included - between square brackets if necessary - in the draft final document which would be submitted to the special session.

14. Mr. MISTRAL (France) also endorsed the draft introduction prepared by the Chairman and supported the proposal by the representative of Mexico to retain the text, while reserving the right to revise all or part of it at the special session.

15. Mr. MESHARRAFA (Egypt) and Mr. HACHEME (Benin) expressed their admiration for the way the Chairman had carried out his task and their regret that he had decided to withdraw his draft introduction.

16. The CHAIRMAN said that his draft introduction would be reintroduced by the Mexican and Swedish delegations and issued between square brackets.

17. He recalled that the closed meetings held by the Committee as a Working Group had been recorded in summary records with restricted distribution. However, if it appeared useful to include those summary records among the annexes to the final report, the Committee should decide to give them general distribution.

18. Mr. HARRY (Australia), supported by the Indian delegation, said that according to established usage, closed meetings were not recorded in summary records and that it had been agreed that summary records A/AC.187/SR.W19 would be issued with restricted distribution. He therefore hoped that delegations would not press for having the summary records of the Committee's closed meetings issued with general distribution.

19. The CHAIRMAN said that his mention of general distribution had not been, properly speaking, a proposal; the question of restricted or general distribution was, of course, for the Committee to decide. Since the formula he had suggested seemed to give rise to reservations on the part of some delegations, he proposed that the document should be kept in the "restricted distribution" category and therefore should not be issued in the annexes to the final report.

20. It was so decided.

#### FINAL REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE TO THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

21. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to proceed to the second reading of the draft report (Conference Room Paper No. 18). Some changes, issued as Conference Room Paper No. 18/Add.2, had been made in order to ensure general approval of the text.

22. He asked the Committee to state its views on the various sections of the draft report, bearing in mind the aforementioned changes. The first two sections, entitled "Introduction" and "Organization of the Committee's Work in 1977", had not given rise to any objections. In section V, with regard to the proposed change in paragraph 33, the secretariat had informed him that the exact date of the Committee's 17th meeting would be stated in the final report.

23. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) asked whether the rest of the first sentence of paragraph 33 after the word "consensus" would be changed.

24. The CHAIRMAN replied that it would not.

25. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) observed that in section VIII the list of documents in paragraph 41 did not include the draft introduction prepared by the Chairman. He believed, therefore, that the following subparagraph should be added: "Working paper entitled 'Draft introduction to the final document' submitted by Mexico and Sweden". The text itself would appear between square brackets in the draft final document, as had been agreed.

26. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft introduction should indeed be added to the list in paragraph 41. In addition, in section X, paragraph 53 would probably contain the recommendation relating to UNESCO which the Committee had approved at the beginning of the meeting, and the present paragraph 53 would become paragraph 54.
27. Mr. ELLIOTT (Belgium) said that, to judge by the reactions which it had elicited, the proposal made by the Belgian delegation the preceding day concerning paragraph 48 of the Committee's report had not been introduced with sufficient clarity and its interpretation had given rise to some confusion. His delegation had by no means intended to propose that the Committee should impose the rule of consensus on the General Assembly, whose rules of procedure could not be amended in that way.
28. Like a number of other delegations, the Belgian delegation had supported the idea of preparing a single document because it had believed that, by using that device, it would be possible to unite the four sections within one and the same conceptual framework; however, it had assumed that the Committee would reach a consensus on the text as a whole. It would be a pity if some countries, because they were unable to approve or accept some of the provisions in the final document at the special session, subsequently felt bound to reject the text as a whole on account of the Committee's decision to submit a single final document.
29. In connexion with his delegation's viewpoint, it had been argued that the Committee could not revert to a decision which it had taken at its meeting on 10 April; his delegation therefore wished the summary record of the current meeting to indicate that a number of delegations had accepted the recommendation concerning a single final document contained in paragraph 48 only because they had taken it for granted that the work would continue to advance on the basis of consensus and that the adoption of the final document would not constitute an exception.
30. Mr. MISTRAL (France) said that his delegation's interpretation was consonant in every way with the interpretation just given by the Belgian delegation.
31. The CHAIRMAN observed that processing of the draft final document had already begun when the Mexican delegation had proposed, at the meeting held in the afternoon of the previous day, that in the final version, the title of the draft final document should be amended as indicated in paragraph 53 of Conference Room Paper No. 18/Add.2, namely: "Draft resolution embodying a draft final document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament."
32. As the drafting groups and subdrafting groups had had plenty of time to discuss the contents of that document, and bearing in mind its size, he doubted whether there was anything to be gained by reconsidering it paragraph by paragraph and suggested that the Committee should discuss it as a whole.

33. Mr. ASHE (United Kingdom) observed that the foot-note on page 12 of Conference Room Paper No. 20, under the heading "CTB", erroneously indicated that the full text of the Treaty would be inserted when available, whereas the intention was to insert the official title of the Treaty.

34. The CHAIRMAN said that the remark of the representative of the United Kingdom was quite pertinent.

35. Mr. BENSMAIL (Algeria),\* Rapporteur, speaking as Chairman of the Drafting Group, said that the draft final document prepared by the two subdrafting groups had been circulated, in Conference Room Paper No. 20, dated 20 April 1978, to all the delegations which were members of the Committee.

36. He associated himself with the Chairman's observations concerning the first page of that document, whose final version should reflect the comments and proposals made by the representative of Mexico, and he thanked the representative of the United Kingdom for drawing the Committee's attention to the foot-note concerning the title of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

37. In describing the work of the subdrafting group on the declaration and machinery, he said that the group had made definite progress in drawing up the draft resolution and the declaration, under the dynamic chairmanship of Mr. Vuković (Yugoslavia). As all the delegations would have noted, there were no square brackets in the draft resolution, on which agreement had been reached. The number of square brackets in the draft declaration had been considerably reduced. Only a few parts of the wording in the part entitled "Review and appraisal" had yet to be agreed. The paragraph concerning the role of the United Nations was still in dispute. The part entitled "Goals and priorities" contained a consolidated text, although some of the wording had not yet been agreed. Some progress had been made in connexion with the part entitled "Principles", but there were still fundamental differences, some of which were connected with related questions dealt with in the programme of action, including nuclear-weapon-free zones, zones of peace and the unharpered transfer of nuclear technology.

38. The part relating to machinery for negotiating disarmament measures had been partially consolidated. The subdrafting group had succeeded in drawing up some paragraphs, but a number of questions had not been settled and would have to be negotiated at the special session itself. Those questions included, inter alia, the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, the establishment of a deliberative organ in the field of disarmament, the restructuring of CCD and the strengthening of its links with the General Assembly, and the World Disarmament Conference.

---

\* This statement has been given full coverage in the summary record in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee during the meeting.

39. The subdrafting group on the programme of action had also recorded some progress. Commendable efforts had been made to consolidate texts which at the outset had merely stated the positions of the different delegations or of groups of delegations. In addition, the negotiations had helped to clarify positions and to identify the difficulties and problems. Progress had been made in drafting the part entitled "Other weapons of mass destruction", in which the number of square brackets had been considerably reduced. The same was true of the parts relating to conventional weapons, reduction of military budgets and armed forces, and other measures to strengthen international security and to build confidence, although a number of square brackets remained. Furthermore, appreciable progress had been made in drafting the parts entitled "Disarmament and development" and "Information".
40. The draft programme of action contained, in square brackets, a new part D entitled "Implementation of disarmament agreements". That part consisted chiefly of the new proposals submitted by France and the Netherlands concerning the establishment of an international observation satellite agency and an international disarmament organization. The proposals had not been thoroughly discussed in the subdrafting group and therefore remained in square brackets.
41. No significant progress had been possible on some basic questions, including nuclear disarmament, non-use of nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapon-free zones, zones of peace and non-proliferation, in spite of the laudable efforts made by delegations. Those complex and difficult problems should certainly be thoroughly discussed and receive special attention from all delegations prior to the special session.
42. The last two parts of the programme of action, namely, parts H and I, respectively entitled "Comprehensive programme for disarmament" and "Guidelines for implementation", had been fully reproduced in square brackets in the same form as in Conference Room Paper No. 15. The subdrafting group had decided not to consider them at the present juncture owing to their clearly direct connexion with the question of machinery, which had not yet been settled. The square brackets concerned simply indicated that the contents of the two parts had not been negotiated. With respect to the declaration, the titles "Review and appraisal", "Goals and priorities" and "Principles" should be in square brackets; all were agreed that the titles should not appear in the final document and that their purpose was to simplify reference and negotiation.
43. He had dwelt on some aspects of the work of the two subdrafting groups because it seemed necessary to highlight the progress made in carrying out the mandate which the Committee had received from the General Assembly and to indicate the many basic questions on which agreement had not been possible. The scope and complexity of the task which remained to be accomplished at the special session could not be minimized, but he was convinced that the task was not impossible if the spirit of compromise and dialogue which had so far characterized the Committee's proceedings prevailed during the final stage.
44. He expressed his deep appreciation for the valuable assistance and wise counsel which the Chairman had unstintingly given him in carrying out his mission. He was grateful to all the members who had participated in the negotiations for their

co-operation throughout the Committee's deliberations. He also thanked all the officials in the United Nations Centre for Disarmament and the Secretariat, who had spared no effort in facilitating his task, often under very difficult circumstances.

45. The CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the importance of the explanations given by the Rapporteur, his statement should be given full coverage in the summary record of the meeting.

46. It was so decided.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that he wished to make it clear that the draft introduction submitted by Mexico and Sweden would also appear in square brackets in the draft final document, of which it would constitute section I; if he had understood correctly, the representative of Mexico had proposed the previous day that the title and number of the preamble should be deleted, although the paragraphs would be retained, and section I containing the draft introduction would follow immediately.

48. Mr. FISHER (United States of America) observed that there had been an error regarding the alternative proposed by the United States as contained in the foot-note on page 3; his delegation would therefore like the text to be changed. He pointed out that the second paragraph of alternative 2 under the heading "SALT" (p. 11) was in fact a separate alternative. His delegation would also like the square brackets around the words "international relations" and "can be realized" in alternative 1 on page 13 to be deleted, since they served no purpose in the current version of the draft.

49. The CHAIRMAN said he was sure that the Committee would have no difficulty in accepting the amendments requested by the representative of the United States, who should advise the Rapporteur of the exact wording of the foot-note he wished to see inserted on page 3.

50. Mr. VELLODI (India) said he took it that the cover page of the draft final document (Conference Room Paper No. 20) would be amended in line with the suggestion made by the representative of Mexico and that it would take the form indicated in paragraph 53 of the draft final report of the Preparatory Committee (Conference Room Paper No. 18/Add.2). He proposed that the title of section IV of the draft final document - "Machinery for disarmament negotiations" - should revert to the formulation "Machinery" used in Conference Room Paper No. 20, since it was a fact that the machinery envisaged would cover more than negotiations. While recognizing that the proposal of the representative of the United States with regard to alternative 1 at the bottom of page 13 of Conference Room Paper No. 20 was well founded, his delegation believed that the representative of the United States, in collaboration with the Rapporteur, might be able to find a new wording for the first part of the sentence, now in square brackets, reading "Strict implementation of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations".

51. Concerning the presentation of the draft final document, it was his understanding that the text of the introduction would follow the draft resolution

and would form section I. His delegation wished to know whether the text of that introduction would be published partly or wholly in square brackets and to point out that it was not mentioned anywhere that, unlike the other sections of the final document, the text of the introduction had been given only preliminary consideration. That fact should be made clear in the draft final document, so that the square brackets would not give the impression that the text had been contested by a large number of delegations.

52. The CHAIRMAN, in response to the last proposal made by the representative of India, suggested that, with the approval of the representative of Mexico, a foot-note should be added to indicate that the text of the introduction had been briefly considered by the Committee as a working group but had not been debated in the Drafting Group. He did not think there would be any objections to the first two proposals made by the representative of India.

53. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) said that his delegation had no objection to section IV of the draft final document being entitled simply "Machinery" and would be prepared to accept whatever solution the Rapporteur, the representative of India and the Chairman considered appropriate with regard to the square brackets in alternative 1 on page 13 of Conference Room Paper No. 20. With regard to the third point raised by the representative of India, since the Rapporteur had indicated in his statement, which would be reproduced in extenso, that it had not been possible to consider one or two parts of the draft final document, he wondered whether the Rapporteur might not also point out that the Committee had not considered the draft introduction either, since it had been submitted only at the present meeting. That was the solution he would prefer, but if the representative of India pressed his suggestion, Mexico would not object.

54. It was decided to adopt the title "Machinery" for section IV of the draft final document.

55. The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that the members of the Committee wished to leave it to the Rapporteur, in consultation with the delegations of the United States and India, to solve the problem of the square brackets in alternative 1 on page 13 of the draft final document. As to the clarification relating to the consideration given to the introduction to the draft final document, the comment made by the representative of Mexico was pertinent. Furthermore, it would be appropriate to make it clear that the draft introduction had been submitted to the Committee at the last meeting of the session.

56. Mr. ADENIJI (Nigeria) pointed out that paragraph 48 of the draft final report of the Preparatory Committee would have to be amended to bring it into line with the amended title of section IV of the draft final document.

57. The CHAIRMAN said that, personally, he would have tended to prefer the more explicit title "Machinery for disarmament negotiations". In any case, he felt that the wording of paragraph 48 was sufficiently clear not to require amendment.



58. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) agreed with the Chairman and said that it would be sufficient to amend the title of section IV of the draft final document as proposed by the representative of India.

59. The CHAIRMAN stated that the wording of paragraph 48 of the draft report would therefore not be amended.

60. He suggested that the Committee should adopt its draft final report as amended, together with the draft resolution entitled "Draft resolution embodying a draft final document of the special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament", subject to the amendments proposed by the delegations of the United States, India and Mexico.

61. It was so decided.

62. Mr. VELLODI (India) said that, since the Chairman had made it clear that the current meeting of the Committee would be the last of the session, he wondered what action members of the Committee were planning to take during the time remaining before the special session of the General Assembly. The draft final document as it stood was certainly a step forward, but a number of important parts still contained many square brackets. He therefore had some reservations concerning the possibility of a consensus emerging on the draft final document as a whole in the course of the special session. He wondered whether it might not be useful for the members of the Preparatory Committee to meet for informal consultations in order to clear up certain problems and improve the draft document further, prior to the special session, while giving Governments time to study the documents and to evaluate the progress that had been made. It might be possible for the Committee to envisage holding a meeting a week or 10 days before the special session. If members of the Committee were in favour of that suggestion, he thought that the Rapporteur could be entrusted with arranging those consultations.

63. The CHAIRMAN said that that was a valuable initiative and suggested that the representative of India, in collaboration with the Rapporteur, should be responsible for convening those informal meetings of the Committee.

#### CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

64. The CHAIRMAN, before declaring the session closed, said he felt sure that the members of the Committee shared his satisfaction at the work that had been accomplished during the fifth session and at the atmosphere of cordiality and mutual comprehension in which the debates had taken place. He commended the members of the Committee for the flexibility they had shown, which had made it possible to adopt all decisions by consensus. That atmosphere had promoted an exchange of ideas which had been all the more fruitful because the discussions had been devoted solely to the matter under consideration, namely, disarmament and preparations for the special session, despite the well-known unavoidable differences on certain political and other issues.

65. He had, however, hoped that more progress would be achieved with regard to the

preparation of the draft final document. Although he recognized that, given the complexity and difficulty of the issues to be tackled, it had been somewhat unrealistic to hope that the Preparatory Committee would be able to find a solution in every case, nevertheless, with a little more effort and goodwill, the members of the Committee might have been able to agree on more complete texts, inter alia on the programme of action and on machinery. From now on, the responsibility would rest with the special session of the General Assembly, and he hoped that it would succeed where the Committee had failed. However, if the facts were to confirm the pessimism of those who claimed that the United Nations was incapable of successfully promoting a genuine disarmament process, then the special session would disappoint many legitimate hopes and, instead of giving new impetus to the cause of disarmament, would serve only to postpone indefinitely any new initiatives in that field. He expressed the sincere hope that, on the contrary, the special session would represent a milestone in the Organization's efforts on disarmament and that the General Assembly, by adopting the draft final document, would be able to ensure that the special session had the favourable outcome that the whole world was awaiting.

66. On behalf of all the members, he thanked the Committee's officers, who, motivated by a spirit of comprehension and friendship, had submitted proposals which the Committee had been able to adopt by consensus, and to the Rapporteur who, in his capacity as Chairman of the Drafting Group, and despite the problems that had arisen, had amply contributed to the progress achieved in the preparation of the draft final document and the draft report. He also thanked the Secretariat officials, inter alia those from the Centre for Disarmament.

67. The Chairman declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.

---

**كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة**  
يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استلم منها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها  
أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

**如何获取联合国出版物**

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

#### **HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

#### **COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

#### **КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишете по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

#### **COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---