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The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

EXPRESSION OF CONDOLENCES ON THE DEATH OF MOHAMED ANWAR EL SADAT

1. Mr. ESPECHT GIL (Argentina), Mr. HUNZIES (Canada), Mr. LIE (Norway), Mr. RODRIGO (Sri Lanka), Mr. THEOLIN (Sweden), Mr. FIELDS (United States of America) and Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia) expressed their condolences to the delegation of Egypt on the tragic death of Mohamed Anwar El Sadat, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

PREPARATION OF A DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE SECOND SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued) (A/AC.206/CRP.6, A/AC.206/13)

2. Mr. RACZ (Hungary) said that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should give new impetus to disarmament efforts, encourage the preparation of new, realistic disarmament proposals and thus contribute to the strengthening of mutual confidence and the improvement of the international climate. To achieve that goal, the session should deal with substantive issues and avoid unfruitful debates on controversial questions or issues of secondary importance. The Chairman's summary of discussions on possible elements of a draft of the provisional agenda was a good basis for the preparation of the agenda. The working paper submitted by the delegation of Mexico also merited the attention of the Committee. In that regard, he recalled the proposals on the agenda, which had been made at the 14th meeting of the Committee by the delegation of the German Democratic Republic on behalf of the socialist States.

3. The agenda should be general enough to ensure flexibility and concrete enough to be action-oriented. The best procedure was to reach agreement on the main items of the agenda and then, if necessary, undertake a detailed elaboration of the subitems. On behalf of the socialist members of the Committee, his delegation proposed that the following main substantive items should be included into the agenda: item 8 - General debate; item 9 - Review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session devoted to disarmament; item 10 - Consideration of initiatives and proposals of Member States; item 11 - Consideration and adoption of instruments on the basis of drafts submitted by the Committee on Disarmament; item 12 - Consideration and adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament; item 13 - Measures to mobilize world public opinion designated to prevent nuclear war and to limit the arms race; item 14 - Adoption of the principal document (or documents) of the special session. With regard to item 14, his delegation favoured a principal or final document of the session, the name of which could be decided upon at a later date. The proposed formulation of the heading would also make it possible to attach other documents to the principal document since any instrument adopted during the second special session would no longer constitute part of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament.
4. Mr. BLOMBERG (Finland) said that with regard to item 6 of the Chairman's summary his delegation preferred alternative 1 since delegations should have an opportunity to address all issues and questions relevant to the special session. If agreement could be reached on questions to which special emphasis should be given, those questions should be reflected as separate subitems. He supported the Chairman's formulation of item 9 because appropriate time should be devoted to studies undertaken and completed, as they were an integral part of the review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session. Item 14 should be formulated in such a way as to make it possible to conduct a thorough review of the functioning and membership of relevant bodies of the United Nations disarmament machinery. In general, the Chairman's summary was an excellent basis for reaching agreement on a draft agenda to be submitted to the General Assembly.

5. Mr. MAREI (Egypt) said that with regard to the Chairman's summary, his delegation favoured alternative 1 of item 8 since that would not impose a series of topics that delegations would have to address themselves to and would avoid unfruitful debates on controversial questions. Item 9 represented the groundwork for the deliberations of the Committee and was in keeping with General Assembly resolution 35/141. With regard to the subitems under that heading, his delegation supported the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Community, that the contents of item 12 should be subsumed under item 9. His delegation was flexible with regard to the inclusion of the subitem concerning the consideration of recommendations of and follow-up to studies initiated by the General Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament and subsequent sessions. Since the conclusions of those studies would be considered under the relevant substantive issues, his delegation, in a spirit of co-operation, would not insist that that subitem should be included. Items 10 and 11 were acceptable as they were. He suggested that the heading of item 14 should read "Review of the functioning of the United Nations in the field of disarmament with a view to increasing its effectiveness". It would perhaps be preferable not to include any subitems under that heading. Lastly, he proposed that the heading of item 15 should read "Conclusion of agreements reached at the special session", which would be flexible enough to include any possible document or documents of the special session.

6. Mr. MENGIES (Canada) said that the Preparatory Committee should give priority to reaching agreement on a draft agenda for the second special session devoted to disarmament. In general, Canada favoured a briefly worded agenda with a minimum of topics. In that way, the participants in the special session would not have to limit their views to a detailed annotation of the agenda. With regard to the Chairman's summary, his delegation supported alternative 1 of item 8. Under item 9, he supported the review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session devoted to disarmament. That review, however, should be based on specific United Nations reports, where relevant. His delegation generally agreed with the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Community, that the contents of item 12 should be subsumed under item 9. He suggested, however, that the Report of the Committee on Disarmament should be listed first
among the four subitems. Item 13 should follow the review items. With regard to
item 14, his delegation did not favour the inclusion of the final subitems
concerning the possible convening of a World Disarmament Conference. If certain
delugations wished to make such a proposal at the special session, they could do so
under the broad heading of item 14. That proposal as such, however, should not be
given special mention. With regard to item 15, Canada favoured the heading
"Adoption of the resolutions and the decisions of the special session", because
that wording was the most flexible.

7. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus) said that the second special session of the General
Assembly devoted to disarmament should be the starting point for making the
General Assembly and the Security Council more effective in the field of
disarmament. With regard to the Chairman's summary, he favoured alternative 1 of
item 8. The general debate should, inter alia, focus on a review of the
implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session.
In that regard, it was necessary to determine why the provisions of the Final
Document had not been implemented in order to avoid making the same mistakes in
the future. Furthermore, it was necessary to find out why the Committee on
Disarmament had remained ineffective. He stressed that there could be no
agreements on the reduction of armaments while the arms race continued. The
Committee on Disarmament must determine why the arms race had not been stopped
and must seek measures to halt it. Primarily, the arms race was caused by the
reliance of nations on weapons in order to achieve security through a balance of
power. Paragraph 13 of the Declaration of the Final Document of the tenth special
session of the General Assembly clearly stated that genuine and lasting peace
could only be created through the effective implementation of the security system
provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and the speedy and substantial
reduction of arms and armed forces. It was, therefore, necessary to undertake
concurrent efforts towards disarmament and international security. Those two
goals were inseparable. The Committee on Disarmament must deal with both
disarmament and the need for a system of international security. The special
session should, therefore, consider the reasons for the ineffectiveness of the
Committee on Disarmament and seek ways for making the General Assembly and the
Security Council more effective in the field of disarmament.

3. Mr. KAMANDA VA KAMANDA (Zaire) said that with respect to the Chairman's
summary, the general debate should focus on the current international situation,
paticularly the question of disarmament, the maintenance of international peace
and security, development and the promotion of international co-operation. Such
a debate would permit a review and appraisal of the measures to be taken to deal
with that situation. Furthermore, the general debate should be separated from the
review and appraisal of the international situation and urgent measures leading
to general and complete disarmament. The subitems listed under alternative 2
of item 8 should constitute separate agenda items. Furthermore, his delegation
attached great importance to the question of the studies initiated by the General
Assembly which were mentioned under item 9. The consideration of the conclusions
or recommendations formulated in the studies on disarmament and related questions
should be a separate agenda item. The review of the implementation of decisions
and recommendations of the first special session should also be made a separate agenda item. Including that topic under the heading "Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament" would lessen the importance of implementing the recommendations of the first special session. For those reasons, his delegation could not support the proposal contained in paragraph 9 of the working paper submitted by Mexico in document A/AC.206/13. The adoption of a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament should also be considered as a separate agenda item, but should not include a review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session. The other elements of Mexico's working paper should be carefully considered and could be incorporated in the Chairman's summary in order to avoid an overloaded agenda. The item entitled "Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament" should contain all appropriate measures for achieving general and complete disarmament under effective international control in order to consolidate international peace and security and promote the new international economic order. That item should consist only of those measures agreed upon after a thorough consideration of the problem under the various agenda items and should not include a review of the implementation of the decisions. Lastly, his delegation supported the proposals contained in items 9 to 15 of the Chairman's summary. With regard to item 15, his delegation favoured the wording "Adoption of the Final Act of the special session", but would be flexible in that regard.

9. **Mr. Fields** (United States of America) agreed with the representative of Mexico that the provisional agenda of the second special session should be as concise and flexible as possible, but believed that document A/AC.206/CRP.6 should be the model for that agenda. He wished to endorse the approach proposed by the United Kingdom at the previous meeting (A/AC.206/SR.20), for simplicity was essential to an effective special session. He welcomed the support expressed for that proposal, as well as delegations' growing enthusiasm for document A/AC.206/CRP.6 and increasing readiness to move ahead to adopt a provisional agenda. Finally, his delegation favoured the first alternative proposed for item 8 in the belief that the focus of the general debate should not be limited.

10. **Mr. Liang Yifu** (China) endorsed the proposal to use document A/AC.206/CRP.6 as a basis for the Committee's work while also referring to document A/AC.206/13.

11. With regard to item 8 of the provisional agenda as proposed in document A/AC.206/CRP.6, his delegation agreed with deliberations such as Nigeria that the item should be annotated. It therefore supported alternative 3, which would make it possible to concentrate on issues closely related to disarmament and find out why there had been no progress in disarmament since the first special session, yet would not limit the scope of the general debate.

12. With regard to item 13, his delegation agreed with the representative of Mexico that the adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament was a key item of great importance to many delegations. He hoped that further progress might be made by focusing more attention on that item, for instance, by bringing it forward to item 9 or 10.

/...
13. If the second special session was to be successful, the provisional agenda must be brief and give proper emphasis to certain issues. If there were too many items or subitems, it would be difficult to give due attention to the most important ones. Finally, his delegation believed that item 9 should remain as it was, but it would welcome other delegations' views as to what to include in the review under that item.

14. **Mr. HOUNGAVOU** (Benin) said that document A/AC.206/CRP.6 provided a fairly faithful summary of the work of the Committee's previous session and of the main items proposed for the provisional agenda. Document A/AC.206/13 prepared by Mexico was also valuable, and he therefore agreed that the Chairman's summary should be used as a basis for the Committee's work but that delegations should also refer to the Mexican paper in order to produce a balanced document which reflected all the different views prevailing in the Committee.

15. With regard to item 8, his delegation believed that the procedure followed at the first special session should be repeated. He therefore supported alternative 1, which would allow a very general review of the disarmament situation. The other alternatives might lead to a lengthy debate and divert time and attention from subsequent items which in fact covered in detail the substance of the annotations proposed to item 8. With regard to the remaining items, he believed that the Committee should endeavour to arrive at concrete proposals wherever that was feasible so that the agenda was as concise as possible.

16. **Mr. SHELDOR** (Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) reiterated that his delegation attached great importance to the agenda of the second special session. At the Committee's previous session, it had expressed its views on the principles which should guide the preparation of such an agenda, and it continued to believe that a fairly concise agenda was needed if the second special session was to be successful. Documents A/AC.206/13 and A/AC.206/CRP.6 were useful and his delegation also endorsed the suggestions made by Hungary at the current meeting to give the agenda its own internal logic and a very clear thrust. His delegation believed that it was preferable to formulate the items of the agenda without subitems and to leave agreement on the subitems to a later stage. The Committee must achieve concrete results and he was therefore in favour of discussing the agenda item by item.

17. With regard to item 9, he wished to endorse the comments made by various speakers in favour of alternative 1. That alternative would enable delegations to express their views on whatever aspects of disarmament they regarded as most important and it would be inappropriate to formulate or structure the general debate in detail, especially when it was clearly impossible to produce an exhaustive list of relevant disarmament aspects.

18. **Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA** (Brazil) agreed that document A/AC.206/CRP.6 provided a very good basis for the Committee's work. His delegation was also open to any other suggestions that might be made with regard to the preparation of the provisional agenda. Items 9 and 13 were, in his view, crucial to the success of
the second special session for it was through them that the international community would be able to enhance its commitment to multilateral action in favour of disarmament. The general debate (item 8) should therefore focus on specific aspects of disarmament, without however preventing delegations from dealing with any issue which they regarded as important.

19. The agenda should enable the second special session to discuss the substance of the disarmament problem and to reaffirm the resolve expressed in the Final Document of the first special session to enter into firm commitments to advance the disarmament process. His delegation would help to prepare an agenda which furthered the goals set out in the Final Document, for otherwise he feared that there would be no point in holding a second special session. Such a session would be meaningful only if it reinforced and made more explicit the decisions of the first special session aimed at progress in multilateral disarmament. The momentum of the first special session would be lost irretrievably if proper use was not made of the second special session.

20. Mr. Lehne (Austria) said that document A/AC.206/CRP.6 provided an excellent basis for the Committee's work, and expressed his conviction that the Committee would finalize a provisional agenda at the current session. Such an agenda should be short, concise and flexible and he therefore supported in principle the first alternative suggested for item 8. Since, however, he realized that some delegations wished to illustrate the main aspects of disarmament by means of annotations, although that might slow down the Committee's work, he could support alternative 3 which reproduced the formulation and major elements of the corresponding item at the first special session.

21. With regard to the suggestion made by Mexico that all the substantive work of the session should be covered by the item on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, he believed instead that the debate at the second special session should be clearly structured by establishing specific items, as indicated in document A/AC.206/CRP.6.

22. His delegation attached great importance to the second subitem of item 9 and to the explicit reference to United Nations institutional arrangements in item 14 and believed that those elements should be retained. With regard to item 15, he agreed that that item should not prejudge the outcome of the second special session and he therefore supported alternative 4.

23. Mr. Mambiar (India) agreed that document A/AC.206/CRP.6 provided a very good basis for the Committee's work and for the preparation of a provisional agenda. The document prepared by Mexico also represented an important input. The representative of Mexico had stressed that the special nature of the second special session meant that it should concentrate on the main rather than secondary issues. Items 9 and 13 must therefore be a central concern and, as a result, item 8 might need to focus on a number of especially important aspects of disarmament without, however, limiting the scope of the general debate. That could be done by condensing or slightly amending alternative 2 in order to

/...
provide a focal point but also allow flexibility. His delegation would in fact prefer such an approach.

24. Item 9 was very important and should also be annotated in order to reflect the priorities of the Programme of Action adopted at the first special session. With regard to item 13, the adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament must be central to the work of the session. He supported the existing formulation of article 14 and agreed with regard to article 15 that it was difficult to prejudge the outcome of the session. None the less, the second special session was a special session, not a regular session of the General Assembly, and a special nomenclature would be required for its final documents.

25. Mr. KORHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation fully endorsed the proposal made by Hungary, for the preparation and work of the second special session should be geared towards practical, action-oriented measures to end the arms race and decisions calling for such measures. The agenda must therefore be geared to specific ways of ending the arms race and permit a business-like approach. It should also be short and, if the second special session was to be successful, must be adopted by consensus and therefore steer clear of over-detailed, controversial formulations.

26. His delegation favoured the first alternative proposed for item 8. With regard to item 9, he reiterated that there was no reason to include the consideration of disarmament studies as a separate item or subitem. Such studies were often contradictory and would detract from the substance of the main issues before the session and from the adoption of practical disarmament measures. Besides, if the reference to such studies was deleted, that would not prevent them from being considered when related items were discussed. Similarly, the agenda should not go into detail regarding negotiating machinery and the substance of the subitems of item 14 should be considered under item 9 or under a separate item entitled "Measures to mobilize world public opinion designed to prevent a nuclear war and to limit the arms race", along the lines of item 13 proposed by Hungary. He wished to reiterate that the Committee should agree on the main items of the agenda and not go into detail at the current stage.

27. Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan) said that the main purposes of the second special session were to: secure the implementation of and progress towards concrete disarmament measures; increase States' political commitment to disarmament measures; and, reinforce the institutional machinery needed to implement those measures. Document A/AC.206/CRP.6 provided a very good basis for the Committee's work and the annotation of items was important and necessary in order to organize, focus and structure the debate at the special session. Such annotations did not, however, need to be exhaustive. His delegation therefore believed that alternative 2 of item 8 was preferable if the feeling of pessimism regarding disarmament possibilities and the problem of increasing tension and use of force around the world were to be addressed directly.

/...
28. His delegation was fairly flexible regarding the other items of the agenda but believed that the studies mentioned in item 9 provided important and useful information which could help to mobilize world public opinion. They were especially useful to the developing countries, which did not have the financial resources to carry out independent disarmament studies. He trusted therefore that the second special session would place emphasis on expanding such study programmes on specific disarmament efforts. With regard to item 15, his delegation agreed fully that the outcome of the second special session should not be prejudged. However, the various alternatives proposed were not mutually exclusive. A declaration of some kind was called for, since the session was a special session, and that declaration could focus on the political and security measures needed to improve the international climate in order to advance the cause of disarmament.

29. Mr. LIE (Norway) expressed preference for a flexible and simple agenda and therefore favoured alternative 1 for item 8 of the Chairman's summary of discussions (A/AC.206/CRP.6). In order for item 9 to be comprehensive and to cover all aspects of the final document, item 12 should be incorporated in item 9. As to item 15, the fourth alternative, i.e. the adoption by the special session of "resolutions and decisions" would be preferable although it might be wise not to pre-determine the title of the principal documents adopted by the special session.

30. Mr. ESPECHE-GIL (Argentina), having observed that the position of his country had been expressed in a written note and in various statements made at the session held by the Preparatory Committee in May, said that a general consensus seemed to be emerging on the items relating to the general debate, the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, the strengthening of the role of the United Nations and the adoption of the principal documents of the second special session. It would be a mistake however to decide on too general a formulation which would preclude detailed consideration of the principles and priorities of disarmament in the context of the United Nations. The emphasis placed in the Final Document of 1978 on nuclear disarmament must therefore be reflected in the agenda, if necessary by means of annotations if such was the wish of the majority. The titles of the items might be reformulated to reflect that concern. The need for an evaluation of the duties of the Committee on Disarmament must also be reflected in the agenda.

31. Mr. THEOLIN (Sweden) considered that the agenda should be broad enough to leave room for new initiatives. Annotations might be helpful in giving direction to the proceedings, but should they be judged too lengthy, alternative 3 might provide a solution for the wording of item 8. The review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session must be given a prominent place, possibly even forming an individual item. As for the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, its adoption would constitute the necessary follow-up to the first special session. The importance of studies on disarmament could not be over-emphasized inasmuch as they were one of the most tangible ways of maintaining the impetus gained so far. The second special session should
therefore pay particular attention to studies conducted under the auspices of the United Nations on related issues, such as, inter alia, disarmament and development, conventional disarmament and reduction in military expenditures. It should also consider further measures to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, review the machinery and institutional framework and analyze other institutional arrangements to secure the support of the United Nations for studies on disarmament.

32. Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia), recalling that the position of his country had been stated in detail at the session held by the Preparatory Committee in May, said that the agenda should be both general and concise. Overloading it with annotations would not facilitate the work of the second special session, although all references to studies should not necessarily be excluded. For the sake of conciseness alternative 1 of item 8 would be preferable, while the Chairman's proposal regarding item 9 would provide a satisfactory solution. The review of the machinery in the field of disarmament might be incorporated in item 9. Item 10, "Consideration of initiatives and proposals of Member States", would allow for a forward-looking approach and should therefore be retained. The adoption of a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament and measures to mobilize world public opinion should also appear on the agenda. As for item 15, the general wording "principal document(s) of the special session" would be preferable.

33. Mr. Rodrigo (Sri Lanka), endorsing the views of the representatives of India, Pakistan, Nigeria and Argentina, said that alternative 2 of item 8 would allow for some broadness of scope while providing the necessary guidance and focus for discussions. Item 9 was the pivotal item in that it would provide the second special session on disarmament with an opportunity to take stock of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session and allow States to strengthen their political commitments to disarmament. Also to be stressed was the importance of item 13 and particularly item 14, since it was essential for the United Nations to remain the focus of disarmament negotiations.

34. Mr. Djokić (Yugoslavia) pointed out that in spite of his country's stated preference for alternative 3 of item 8, it was keeping an open mind on the issue. The differences that had come to light so far were not so wide as to be insuperable, provided they were tackled in a spirit of co-operation. It was important however for the items on the review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session, the consideration and adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament and the strengthening of the role of the United Nations to be kept separate.

35. Mr. Moussaoui (Algeria) considered the most important item to be the review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session. It was essential to make a critical scrutiny of the implementation in order to identify and take stock of weaknesses, although such a review should not detract from the importance of other items, particularly item 14. With regard
to the three alternatives for item 8, alternative 1 might result in too diffuse a debate while alternative 3 might prove too selective and discriminatory. Alternative 2 provided the essential guidance for the proceedings and reflected the need for the second special session on disarmament to go beyond the first special session, although it appeared by general consensus to require some rewording.

36. Mr. RAHHACI (Morocco) said that although his preference went to alternative 2 for item 8, he would be willing to accept a reformulation of alternative 3. There were grounds for satisfaction in the fact that the very important items 9, 12 and 13 had already been placed on the agenda. As for the points subsumed under item 14, several of them did not seem interrelated and it might be preferable for them to be separated. It was essential to include an item on studies for consideration by the second special session. As for item 15, it might be advisable for it to be worded "adoption of the final documents of the special session" and for a footnote to be inserted to the effect that the wording was not intended to prejudge the issue, the final decision on which would be taken by the special session itself.

37. Mr. UGERTER (Federal Republic of Germany) expressed satisfaction that the ten members of the European Community had contributed towards shaping the consensus on the agenda and requested the Secretariat to prepare a synopsis of the views expressed in the course of the discussion.

38. The CHAIRMAN, having taken note of the suggestion made by the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, observed that the views expressed so far reflected differences of nuance rather than of substance, given the overwhelming consensus in favour of finalizing the draft agenda on the basis of his summary (A/AC.206/CRP.6) and the general agreement on the need for the agenda to be long enough to cover the subject but not so long as to lose the necessary focus.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.