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81-56934
The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

CONSIDERATION OF OTHER RELEVANT QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE SECOND SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS THEREON, INCLUDING THOSE IN RESPECT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION

1. Mr. Mennies (Canada) requested the Secretariat to provide information on other United Nations or international meetings scheduled to be held in May, June or July 1982. Although the second special session on disarmament must have priority, its dates could be subject to review in the light of plans for other meetings. It might be convened on Monday 17 May 1982 for a period of three to four weeks. Bearing in mind provision for representation at the "highest possible level", the Preparatory Committee should consider the matters of precedence and the organizational problems involved if world religious leaders were to be invited to attend. The Secretariat might also provide information on the proper channels and form for issuing invitations to participate in General Assembly sessions.

2. In connexion with public information activities, he expressed the hope that the expanded fact sheet on the second special session would become available as soon as possible for study over the winter. At the invitation of the Department of External Affairs of Canada, a booklet on the second special session had been prepared which was intended to serve as a guide in Canada and copies of which could be obtained from the Canadian delegation. With a view to encouraging maximum public interest in the second special session the time allocated to non-governmental organizations should be the same as at the first special session, i.e. approximately one day.

3. Mr. Djokic (Yugoslavia), after quoting operative paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 35/47 setting out the terms of reference of the Preparatory Committee, pointed out that the Committee had clearly been requested to submit recommendations on the technical preparations for the second special session and on the implementation of the decisions of the first special session on disarmament to comply with its terms of reference, the Committee should therefore not confine itself to matters of organization but should contribute to the substantive preparations for the second session. For that reason, it must discuss and determine what type of substantive preparations were needed. In view of the general agreement as to the inclusion of three substantive items in the agenda of the second special session, namely the review of implementation, the consideration and adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, and the strengthening of the role of the United Nations, the Preparatory Committee might begin work on those items without delay in order to provide the second special session with some common ground and a basis for discussion. That was not to say that the Preparatory Committee should actually draft the documents of the second special session but that it should lay the foundations for a positive outcome, either at the current session or at subsequent sessions in 1982. It was thus a question of determining what constructive and substantive work could be carried out to ensure the success of the second special session.

/...
4. Mr. MAUNA (Indonesia) observed that there were grounds for satisfaction in the fact that there had been no substantive disagreement during the preceding three days of discussions on the provisional agenda. It had to be acknowledged however that no substantive or meaningful progress in the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first session had been made with regard to the chief issues. The situation could best be described as a stalemate. There were only a few months left before the second session and the Preparatory Committee should therefore proceed immediately to examine the implementation of the provisions of the Final Document, particularly the implementation of decisions, since the success of the second session would depend both on that implementation and on a measure of prior agreement having been reached. To revert to the question of the draft provisional agenda, it was advisable to retain the annotations for item 8, in view of the paramount importance of the assessment of the international situation. The item concerning the adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament must also be retained.

5. Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil) agreed with the views expressed earlier by the representatives of Nigeria and Yugoslavia, who had said they believed that organizational matters such as the date and duration, participation and representation at the second special session would be easily settled on the basis of precedent and past experience. The Chairman might wish to make specific suggestions in that connexion. It was in fact the second part of the item under discussion which was vital to the success of the second special session inasmuch as it covered the substantive examination of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session. Given the need for the second special session to provide an opportunity for the international community to strengthen its commitments to disarmament, it was incumbent on the Preparatory Committee to make substantive preparations to that effect. It was a question of determining how to proceed. If the Preparatory Committee ultimately proved incapable of dealing with the modalities for the assessment of the status of disarmament negotiations by the second special session, the fears expressed on the previous day would prove well founded. The Preparatory Committee must play its proper role in connexion with the substantive issues at stake, or else the second special session would become an exercise in futility.

6. Mr. AHMAD (Pakistan), elaborating on the point raised by the representative of Brazil regarding the two-fold nature of the item under discussion, observed that it covered both technical or procedural details and substantive issues. Further discussion and consultation were called for on the substantive aspects of the work of the Preparatory Committee. The Preparatory Committee might identify areas or themes on which to focus its attention before determining the modalities for discussion. A fourth theme might be added to the three already identified by the representative of Yugoslavia, namely the relationship between the arms race and international security. It was imperative to tackle those issues while maintaining a flexible attitude to the question of how to approach the work.
7. Mr. OKAWA (Japan) observed that although a review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session was important in terms of reviving interest in disarmament, such substantive issues should be left to the special session itself. The Preparatory Committee must confine its work to organizational and procedural matters, the most important of which was the drafting of the agenda. Discussion should be centred on the opening date and duration of the second special session to be recommended to the General Assembly. An opening date in early June, or late May at the earliest, would seem appropriate. The Preparatory Committee might also discuss the level of representation and the modalities for the participation of world religious leaders or parliamentary groups.

8. Mr. RAHMAN (Bangladesh) said that his delegation agreed that procedural matters must be considered, but the Committee should also express its views on the substantive aspects of preparing for the second special session. The current world situation was not encouraging. Very little progress had been made in concerting efforts between developed and developing countries to solve the grave social, economic and development problems facing mankind. The world was witnessing the use of force and the threat of use of force against small and defenceless countries, the relentless acceleration of the arms race and the accentuation of super-Power rivalries. The objectives of the First United Nations Disarmament Decade proclaimed in 1969 had not been achieved. Peace and security could not be maintained without a more harmonious and accelerated economic and social development of States and the solution of such economic problems as recession, inflation and unemployment. The success of the second special session to a large degree depended on the international climate prevailing at the time. One way to create a climate conducive to the ultimate success of the special session would be to conclude the negotiations which were currently under way in the Committee on Disarmament on important disarmament issues such as chemical weapons, radiological weapons and negative security guarantees. He noted with satisfaction the recent high-level exchange of views between the two super-Powers and urged both of them to start negotiations in good earnest. The second special session must undertake a review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations contained in the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, a review of the current international situation and consideration and adoption of the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament. Lastly, he stressed that it was vital to ensure that the achievements of the first special session were not diluted further and that the second special session did not become an exercise in futility.

9. Mr. HOUNGAVOU (Benin) stressed the crucial importance of agenda item 5 for ensuring the success of the second special session. The Committee should conduct a frank discussion of the questions related to the preparation of the second special session among the various groups of opinion. In that regard, it was necessary to consider the reasons why the measures contained in the Final Document of the first special session had not been implemented and why little progress had been made in the field of disarmament. His delegation felt profound concern at the enormous sums of money spent in the arms race and
the grave economic and social problems facing the world. Agenda item 5 should deal with the relationship between the arms race and the problem of development. Clear and realistic recommendations acceptable to all groups should be formulated. In short, the success of the discussions and negotiations to be conducted at the second special session depended upon the consideration of agenda item 5 and the recommendations to be made in that regard.

10. **Mr. Kamanda Wa Kamanda** (Zaire) stressed the importance of dealing with questions of substance in preparing for the second special session. With regard to organizational matters, the Committee must decide on the most appropriate dates for holding the session, the methods and organization of work, and the documents other than the report of the Preparatory Committee to be submitted to the second special session. In that regard, it would be useful to recall the experience of the Preparatory Committee for the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

11. The political aspects of preparing for the special session concerned the Member States themselves. They must demonstrate the necessary political will to participate constructively in the work of the session and seek means to bring about general and complete disarmament. They should avoid unnecessary documentation, confrontation and propaganda in order to make genuine progress towards disarmament.

12. States could achieve their legitimate political, economic, social and cultural goals within engaging in the arms race and military competition. The accumulation of arms of mass destruction could never stabilize international relations or guarantee peace and security throughout the world. The Committee should consider submitting to the special session basic documents on how to ensure the implementation of decisions and recommendations for bringing about general and complete disarmament in the interest of mankind. That should be done by means of a painstaking study of the causes which impeded the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session devoted to disarmament.

13. **Mr. Nambiar** (India) said that his delegation agreed with the previous speakers who had stated that agenda item 5 should deal with both the procedural aspects of preparing for the second special session and the substantive issues. His delegation supported the statement made by the representative of Yugoslavia regarding the need to concentrate on a review of the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session, the Comprehensive Programme of Development, and the question of strengthening United Nations machinery in the field of disarmament. There were, of course, other issues to be considered, such as a review of the international situation in view of the pressing need to halt and reverse the arms race, and of the relationship between disarmament and development. The Committee would have to discuss all such issues before the convening of the second special session. He suggested that after an exchange of views working papers could be submitted in an attempt to arrive at a synthesis. At its current session, the Committee should complete /...
(Mr. Nambiar, India)

the task of drawing up the draft provisional agenda and then synthesize the substantive views of delegations on agenda item 5. If that procedure was adopted, the Committee could devote the following week to a substantive exchange of views on that agenda item.

14. Mr. KHERARDI (Secretary of the Committee) said in reply to questions raised by the representative of Canada that, with regard to the date and duration of the second special session, the Committee at its spring session had made a preliminary decision requesting the Secretariat to reserve the period from 10 May to 9 July 1982 in the calendar of conferences and meetings of the United Nations for the purpose of holding the special session. It had also been agreed that the special session would last no longer than five weeks. After that preliminary decision of the Committee, the Secretariat had reserved the period in question. In taking a final decision on the date and duration of the special session, however, the Committee should also take into account the fact that during the initial months of 1982 there were meetings and sessions of other disarmament bodies, such as the Committee on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission as well as the next session of the Preparatory Committee itself.

15. He requested additional time to look into the matter of the attendance of religious leaders at the special session and report back to the Committee at a later date. With regard to the fact sheet or leaflet on information activities, he recalled that the Committee had taken a decision at its seventeenth meeting regarding public information activities. The Secretariat had distributed a committee room paper on that matter, which was contained in document A/AC.206/CRP.5. The Bureau had recommended that the Committee should take note of the various proposals on Secretariat activities and that after the Committee had taken further decisions in October with regard to the agenda and other matters, it might recommend further activities to be undertaken by the Secretariat, including the possible preparation and circulation of a handbook. The Secretariat was currently looking into that matter and would submit the necessary information at a suitable time. Lastly, with regard to the participation of non-governmental organizations and research institutes in the second special session, he recalled that for the first special session in 1978 the Preparatory Committee had decided to recommend that the Committee of the Whole, which was to be set up at the special session, should set aside two meetings to hear the statements of the non-governmental organizations and research institutes dealing with disarmament. The Preparatory Committee had also decided to recommend that the question of the list of speakers from the non-governmental organizations and research institutes should be decided upon by the Committee of the Whole at its first meeting in order to give the speakers sufficient time to prepare their statements.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.