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The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF VIEWS CONCERNING THE AGENDA OF THE SECOND SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued) (A/AC.206/2 and Add.1 and 2; A/AC.206/CRP.1 and 2)

CONSIDERATION OF VIEWS ON OTHER RELEVANT QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE SECOND SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT, INCLUDING THE ORGANIZATION OF WORK OF THE SESSION (continued) (A/AC.206/2 and Add.1 and 2; A/AC.206/CRP.1 and 2)

1. Mr. FLOUVERRET (United States of America) said that his delegation wished to lodge a complaint concerning press release No. US/1022, dated 8 May 1961 and headlined "The Preparatory Committee for the 1962 Disarmament Assembly begins its session". The reporting in the press release was grossly unbalanced, since it reflected only one reply out of all those received from 34 Member States, without any indication that other views existed.

2. The CHAIRMAN said that he would look into the matter and report to the Committee if necessary.

3. Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic) said his delegation agreed with others that the items included in the agenda of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should be broad in nature and flexible enough to cover all the issues involved.

4. The first item should deal with procedural matters, namely, the opening of the session, the approval of credentials and the election of officers.

5. The second item should cover the organization of the session, including consideration of the Preparatory Committee's report and adoption of the agenda.

6. The third item should be a general debate. If it was desired to specify the main themes of the debate, the following item could be added, either separately or as part of the same item: "Review and appraisal of the situation in the field of arms limitation and disarmament". That would serve to concentrate the discussion on the main concern of the special session.

7. The fourth item might be a review of the implementation of the decisions and resolutions contained in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament. In that connexion, his delegation would prefer the report on the session to be called a "final document" rather than a "programme of action", since the former term could cover a number of special topics not appearing on the agenda as separate items.

8. The most important items of substance could be subsumed under one main heading, "Consideration of new proposals and initiatives", with subitems (a) Draft
multilateral agreements or treaties, (b) The Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, and (c) Other proposals or initiatives.

9. A further item should relate to measures to mobilize world public opinion in favour of the prevention of nuclear war and the limitation of the arms race. It should be worded in a general way, so as to cover a wide range of associated ideas.

10. The last item would be the drafting of a final document or documents.

11. The Committee should not attempt to finalize the agenda in a hurry, but it should be in a position to reach a decision at its next session.

12. Mr. MIHAJLOVIĆ (Yugoslavia) said that, while there appeared to be some agreement concerning a number of items to be included, there was still some difference of opinion on the basic approach to the agenda. Consequently, the Committee should be given more time in which to reach a consensus, and he endorsed the Chairman's suggestion of producing a paper outlining the basic elements proposed.

13. The concept of "general debate" required clarification. Some delegations had proposed, in addition, an item on the review and appraisal of the implementation of the 1978 Programme of Action. His own delegation had also proposed an item taken from the 1978 special session: "Review and appraisal of the current international situation in the light of the urgent need to achieve substantive progress in the field of disarmament, in halting the arms race and in establishing a close link between disarmament, international peace and security and economic development"; that title, being more specific, should be preferred to the term "general debate".

14. An item concerning the role of the United Nations was desirable but should be carefully worded - for example, in terms of strengthening the role of the United Nations in the general field of disarmament, with subheadings for specific items.

15. Consideration of proposals and initiatives should constitute another item; however, in view of the continuing work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament, a decision on that question should be deferred until later.

16. Mr. NOLAN (Australia) said that there was an urgent need to reach a firm decision, since there were only two preparatory meetings remaining.

17. The contents of the agenda should be succinct but full enough to cover all the issues involved. A first item on the organization of the work of the session should be followed by a general debate, which should not be limited to specific topics, since the whole question of the advancement of arms control and disarmament had to be reviewed.
18. An item on a review of developments since the 1978 special session should be included but it should concentrate on reaffirming the contents of that session's Final Document and on an appraisal of the progress made on the priority items put forward in the Committee on Disarmament.

19. The Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should be a separate item, since it deserved prominence and demanded realistic progress which would be worthy of the support of all States.

20. Another item should be a review of institutional arrangements, including consideration of the work of the Institute for Disarmament Research, the Disarmament Commission and the Committee on Disarmament. Furthermore, there should be an evaluation of the conclusions of the disarmament studies from the point of view of the follow-up which they required.

21. The last item would be the adoption of a report on the session, together with other documents. It was essential to avoid duplication of documents, and the adoption of a realistic document on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament would be very important in that context.

22. Mr. LEHME (Austria) said that although a high degree of consensus had been reached, there were a number of questions still to be decided.

23. Following a first item on procedural matters, there should be a general debate included in the agenda. Since brevity was required, that item should not be annotated; at the present stage it was not necessary to specify its contents.

24. His delegation had an open mind on the question of a review of the implementation of the Programme of Action contained in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament. The general debate would offer an opportunity to consider the disarmament situation since 1978, but the focal point would naturally be the failure thus far to effect any abatement of the arms race.

25. The adoption of draft decisions submitted by the Committee on Disarmament was another desirable item and should be extended to include consideration of the disarmament studies and the follow-up which should be given to them, together with other items that were sure to emerge during the debate, all of which should be regarded in terms of their relationship to the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. There should also be an evaluation of new United Nations information activities in the field of disarmament.

26. His delegation had no preference with regard to the title of the final document, but it should be designed to avoid confusion with the Final Document of the 1978 special session.

27. Mr. HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia) said his delegation shared the view expressed by others that, following the first few conventional items, the agenda should include the organization of the work of the session, a general debate, examination
of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the 1978 special session, the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, and the adoption by consensus of a final document or documents. The general-debate item should be broken down into constituent points, but in such a way as not to exclude the possibility of new initiatives.

28. A number of important questions remained outstanding, including the consideration of new proposals and initiatives and of institutional measures. It should also be decided which issues were to be full items and which should be subitems. All the items should be clearly linked to the fundamental orientation of the session, which should be towards proposing new practical measures. The agenda should be decided at the autumn session; it was not possible or necessary to finalize it at the current session.

29. Lastly, it was desirable to include an item on "Prospects for convening a World Disarmament Conference".

30. Mr. ERDENEBILJUU (Mongolia), welcoming the broad agreement achieved on a number of items, agreed that the agenda should be brief and general in nature. It had been generally accepted that the first item should relate to organizational matters and that the second should be a general debate. However, the latter item should not be annotated, for in order to be more specific, it would have to include a large number of issues, leading to lengthy and fruitless discussion. In order to keep the agenda short, and also to respect the right of all delegations to raise any items which interested them, the item should appear simply as "general debate". The introduction of a subitem consisting of a review and appraisal of the international situation would distract from the main focus of the debate, which should be the limitation of the arms race and the pursuit of disarmament, and in any case, delegations would naturally refer to the international situation in connexion with disarmament.

31. A review of the implementation of the decisions and resolutions contained in the 1978 Final Document should be included in the agenda, as should the German Democratic Republic's suggestion of a consideration of new proposals and initiatives, which could include the various proposals made by delegations at the current session of the Preparatory Committee, possibly under three subheadings: (a) Draft multilateral agreements or treaties, (b) Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, and (c) Other proposals.

32. Mr. KRISHNAM (India) said that a number of points must be clarified if the orientation of the agenda of the 1982 session was to represent the real concerns of the vast majority of States, which had a vital stake in disarmament and in world peace and security.

33. Firstly, with regard to the inclusion of a specific "general debate" item in the agenda of the 1982 special session he believed that, while the major content of such a debate would be a review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the 1978 special session and of the serious implications of the continuing arms race for international security, its prime emphasis must be on
(Mr. Krishnan, India)

ways and means of preventing the outbreak of a nuclear war. He was referring not to the purely technological factors which might trigger such a war but to the larger political factors that were aggravating the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, and had already made decision-makers in nuclear-weapon States more ready to take steps which, if uncorrected, would inevitably precipitate a nuclear war.

34. His delegation had already referred to the staggering effects of the qualitative arms race and its adverse impact on the security and economic development of States. Whether the agenda ultimately included a separate item reflecting those concerns, as suggested by Yugoslavia, (A/AC.206/2, p. 58) or, as the Chairman had suggested, they were reflected in annotations to the "General debate" item, the following elements would have to be included under the relevant item: (a) a review, in the light of the principles and priorities identified at the 1978 special session, of the decisions and recommendations contained in the Programme of Action of the Final Document of that session; (b) consideration of urgent measures to halt and reverse the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, in the context of the deteriorating international situation, and of the imperative need to spell out ways and means of averting the threat of a nuclear war; and (c) consideration of the close link between disarmament, international peace and security, and economic development.

35. His delegation would be in favour of an agenda which, as far as possible, was formulated in general terms but at the same time represented a logical outcome of the principles, priorities and measures already established in the 1978 Final Document. It was in that context that his delegation saw the consideration and adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament as the linchpin of the 1982 special session's work. As the Chairman of the ad hoc working group on that Programme had indicated, the Programme should be self-contained, and in fact any final documents emanating from the 1982 special session would have to be built around the Programme and any other document or documents presented to the session. The nature of such final documents would become clear once the draft Programme was presented to the General Assembly, and his delegation hoped that a general outline of the Programme would be available in time for the thirty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

36. The agenda of the 1982 special session should also include a separate item on the role of the United Nations as the primary body for the consideration and negotiation of basic disarmament issues. Such an item might be entitled "Strengthening of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament and of the existing multilateral machinery for negotiations on disarmament".

37. His delegation was in broad agreement with the suggestions made by several delegations concerning the mobilization of public opinion.

38. With regard to the finalization of the agenda, he agreed that the broad elements of such an agenda could be considered only tentatively at the present stage. After the current session, items on which there was general agreement could be compiled and considered by Governments before the agenda was actually finalized.
39. In the light of the expectations placed in the Preparatory Committee, it might be advisable to arrange for the Committee to hold an additional short session in 1982 immediately before the special session of the General Assembly, since real substantive progress would not begin until early 1982. His delegation hoped that in the meantime the ad hoc working groups of the Committee on Disarmament would continue to expedite their work, so that the Preparatory Committee could review their texts before submitting them to the special session.

40. **Mr. DE LAIGLESIA** (Spain) observed that, since the 1982 special session would draw extensively on material submitted to it by the Committee on Disarmament, over and above such substantive documents as the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, a draft comprehensive test-ban treaty, and draft conventions on the prohibition of chemical and radiological weapons, any agenda item on developments since the 1978 special session should include a full discussion of the work done since 1978 by the Committee on Disarmament, as the only negotiating body in the disarmament field. His delegation therefore favoured including in the agenda an item which provided for a review of the implementation of the 1978 Programme of Action and included the possibility of reviewing all action taken by the Committee on Disarmament since 1978. The review would cover not only those aspects of the Committee's work on which it had taken decisions but also questions which were still in the process of negotiation. Alternatively, such a review might be conducted under an item on the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

41. **Mr. Riaz M. KHAN** (Pakistan) welcomed the fact that there appeared to be consensus on the main substantive items to be included in the agenda of the 1982 special session. Among those items were: consideration of urgent political and security measures to halt the arms race, in the context of the deteriorating international situation; a separate item on strengthening the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament; and a review of the mandate and effectiveness of the various institutional arrangements within the United Nations, in particular the Committee on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission and the possibility of strengthening those arrangements and establishing new ones. The session should also consider the recommendations contained in studies produced pursuant to the decisions of the 1978 special session and, where necessary, take decisions thereon. That might be done under an item which related to the implementation of the decisions of the 1978 special session and which also covered institutional questions or under a separate item. There should also be an item on the review and adoption of the disarmament treaties and agreements currently being negotiated in the ad hoc groups of the Committee on Disarmament. Those included the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, a comprehensive test-ban treaty, draft conventions on the prohibition of chemical and radiological weapons and security guarantees for non-nuclear States. His delegation hoped that the Committee on Disarmament would complete its work on those treaties and agreements, so that they could be adopted at the 1982 special session.

42. **Mr. FL氧化剂** (United States of America) observed that the Committee appeared to be close to agreement on a number of agenda items. The agenda for the 1978 special session had comprised 12 items, the first eight of which remained valid for the agenda of the coming special session. The remaining four items had been /...
appropriate to the situation in 1978 and would obviously have to be replaced by items appropriate to the situation in 1982. While he did not believe that the two agendas should be totally parallel, the Committee could learn something from the nature of the agenda for the earlier special session. For instance, the 1978 agenda had allowed the session considerable latitude in adopting specific measures. It had made no mention of the introduction of new proposals or initiatives, but in the end so many such proposals or initiatives had been introduced that there had not been time to consider all of them. He therefore wished to reiterate that the agenda should be general and neutrally worded and not focus on the particular viewpoints or initiatives of one country or group of countries.

43. Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objections in principle to the vast majority of the points and proposals made during the current discussion. He wished, however, to emphasize that, while the Preparatory Committee should draw on the experience of the 1978 special session and refer to its documentation, including its agenda, and borrow anything that might be useful to the work of the 1982 session, it must remember that the 1982 special session was not being convened simply as a replica of the 1978 special session.

44. All delegations, he was sure, agreed that the Final Document of the 1978 special session could be regarded as a charter for disarmament. The 1982 special session, on the other hand, ran the risk of spending an excessive amount of time on every subitem relating to international politics or on a mass of contrary recommendations emanating from different studies. He hoped that that would not happen. Alternatively, the coming special session might go down in history as having adopted new binding documents and forward-looking proposals in the field of disarmament. It would clearly be an overwhelming success if it could adopt a signed agreement on the prohibition of nuclear weapons or nuclear tests, or on the limitation of the nuclear arms race. His delegation was not so naive as to expect such an outcome, but the main focus of the 1982 special session should nevertheless be to consider or adopt proposals or initiatives which might achieve some progress in that direction.

45. Any binding multilateral disarmament treaty or agreement would be a major achievement, more valuable than any recommendation or study, and the agenda must provide for such a possibility. The Committee on Disarmament was preparing documents on the prohibition of chemical and radiological weapons and conducting intensive negotiations on security guarantees for non-nuclear-weapon States. There was thus a possibility of achieving substantial results on those issues and on a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. Why, then, should other proposals put forward by countries, groups of countries or international bodies be excluded? Many such proposals had indeed been put forward at the 1978 special session, and, while there had not been time to consider all of them, some had been considered subsequently in other bodies. The experience of the 1978 special session could not
be used to justify the exclusion of such proposals in 1982. In view of the deteriorating international situation, it might perhaps be appropriate to discard existing proposals and consider new ones which were more likely to remove the imminent threat of nuclear war. His delegation therefore wished to reaffirm its view that, if it was to be remembered for any achievements whatsoever, the 1982 special session must adopt binding agreements and new initiatives to end the arms race.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.