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The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

PREPARATION OF A DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE SECOND SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, in the course of informal consultations since the previous meeting, there had been agreement on certain amendments to item 8 of the draft provisional agenda of the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. The text of item 8, so amended, would read:

"General debate, including:

Review and appraisal of the present international situation in the light of the pressing need to eliminate the danger of war, in particular nuclear war, to halt and reverse the arms race, and to achieve substantial progress in the field of disarmament, especially in its nuclear aspects, taking into account the close interrelation between disarmament and international peace and security as well as between disarmament and economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries."

2. He said that if he heard no objections, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee wished to adopt the amended text of item 8.

3. It was so decided.

4. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objections, he would further take it that the Preparatory Committee wished to adopt the entire provisional agenda as just amended and as drafted in the informal paper dated 15 October 1981, which had been circulated.

5. It was so decided.

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 ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

FUTURE WORK OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE (continued)

Dates for the next session of the Preparatory Committee and for the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament

6. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the Bureau had recommended that the Preparatory Committee should hold another session from 26 April to 14 May 1982, and that the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament itself should be held from 7 June to 9 July 1982. He trusted that, after the useful exchange of views at the previous meeting, the Committee could now reach a consensus on those dates.

7. Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden) said that although it was not his delegation's intention to hinder a consensus on the dates mentioned, it was still not convinced of the wisdom of the Bureau's recommendations. It believed that two weeks were entirely
sufficient for the work of the Preparatory Committee, which might otherwise lose its momentum. Although the Preparatory Committee could not take a final decision on the schedule it had suggested for the Disarmament Commission, his delegation felt that too much time had been allotted to its meetings, and that could result only in devaluing the work of that body. According to the calendar set up by the Bureau, one or the other of the disarmament bodies would be in constant session, in either Geneva or New York, from January to September 1982, and such a schedule militated against efficiency. For those reasons, his delegation could accept the decision to adopt the Bureau's recommendations, only with regret.

8. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Soviet delegation approved of the dates recommended by the Bureau and was further of the view that holding the session of the Preparatory Committee and the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament should not have any effect on the amount of time to be devoted to the work of the various disarmament bodies in 1982, especially the Committee on Disarmament, nor on the effectiveness of their work.

9. The CHAIRMAN said that if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee accepted the recommendations of the Bureau regarding the dates for the next session of the Preparatory Committee (26 April–14 May 1982) and for the second special session devoted to disarmament (7 June–9 July 1982).

10. It was so decided.

**Public information activities in connexion with the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (A/AC.206/18)**

11. Mr. MARTENSEN (Assistant Secretary-General, Centre for Disarmament) introduced working paper A/AC.206/18 on public information activities in connexion with the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. He recapitulated the activities that would be undertaken by the Centre for Disarmament, set out in part A of the working paper. The Centre planned to work closely with the Department of Public Information, and would use all means available to it in the media to highlight the importance of the forthcoming special session.

12. Mr. MASHA (Chief, Planning, Programming and Evaluation Unit, Department of Public Information) said, regarding the activities planned by the Department of Public Information in connexion with the second special session (A/AC.206/18, part B) that his department had found it very rewarding to work in close and constant collaboration with the Centre for Disarmament.

13. Regarding the journalists' encounter mentioned in A/AC.206/18, part B, paragraph 9, of the working paper that was to be organized at Headquarters just prior to the special session, it was planned to subsidize the travel of a few journalists from developing countries who would otherwise not be able to attend the special session and to seek to interest journalists from all parts of the world in all aspects of the special session.

/...
31. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the wording "to continue consideration" was more appropriate.

32. Mr. MENZIES (Canada) said that he did not wish to press the issue. He therefore withdrew his first proposal but wished to press the second one.

33. Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic) said that the draft report followed the precedent of the earlier report with one exception. Paragraph 18 of the report of the Preparatory Committee for the first special session included a recommendation that the General Assembly should request several specified bodies to submit reports to that session. The Preparatory Committee should consider whether a similar recommendation might not be added to the present report regarding the submission of reports by the Committee on Disarmament, the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the Ad Hoc Committee on the World Disarmament Conference and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean.

34. The CHAIRMAN said it was his understanding that the Rapporteur considered that, as the proposed agenda was more detailed than that for the first special session and referred specifically to various bodies, there was no need for the Preparatory Committee to include a recommendation similar to that contained in paragraph 18 of the earlier report.

35. Mr. KRUTZSCH (German Democratic Republic) said that there was no reference in the proposed agenda to the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. He would not press the point but he trusted that it would be borne in mind.

36. The CHAIRMAN invited the Preparatory Committee to vote on the draft report (A/AC.206/L.1), with the changes read out by the Rapporteur, paragraph by paragraph.

37. Paragraphs 1 to 18 were adopted.

38. Paragraph 19, with the inclusion of the provisional agenda, was adopted.

39. Paragraphs 20 to 26 were adopted.

40. Mr. VENKATESWARAN (India), referring to paragraph 27, said it was his understanding that a consensus had been reached that representation at the special session should be at the highest political level.

41. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the word "political" should be added before the word "level" in paragraph 27.

42. Paragraph 27, as thus amended, was adopted.

43. Mr. OKAWA (Japan) proposed that, in paragraph 28, reference should be made to the budget of the Centre for Disarmament.

44. Paragraph 28 was adopted with the addition of the words "and of the Centre for Disarmament" after the words "Department of Public Information".

/...
45. Paragraph 29, as supplemented by the Rapporteur and amended by the Soviet Union, was adopted.

46. The CHAIRMAN invited the Preparatory Committee to vote on paragraph 30 as amended by the second Canadian proposal, namely, to add the words "and any remaining organizational and procedural matter" at the end of the paragraph.

47. Paragraph 30, as thus amended, was adopted.

48. The CHAIRMAN said that, as the Preparatory Committee had adopted the paragraphs individually, he presumed that it wished to adopt the draft report (A/AC.206/L.1), as amended, as a whole.

49. It was so decided.

50. Mr. BLOMBERG (Finland), referring to item 13 of the provisional agenda in the second special session said that it was appropriate for the second special session on disarmament to consider questions of machinery. One of the most important decisions on that subject adopted at the first special session had been that the membership of the Committee on Disarmament would be reviewed at regular intervals (paragraph 120 of the Final Document). To give effect to that decision, the General Assembly, at its thirty-third session, had requested the Committee on Disarmament to conduct such a review, and at its thirty-fifth session had recommended that the first review should be completed, following appropriate consultations among Member States, at the special session on disarmament. Those decisions were not adequately reflected in the wording of agenda item 13, however.

51. His Government shared the concern for enhancing the effectiveness of the Committee on Disarmament, as was shown by its active participation in the Committee's work as a non-member. It had joined in the consensus on the provisional agenda in order to assist the Committee in completing its task, but on the understanding that item 13, rather than restricting the manner in which the machinery would be considered, meant that a review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament would be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Final Document of the first special session and the subsequent General Assembly resolutions.

52. His delegation looked forward to the forthcoming session of the Preparatory Committee and to further consideration of the substantive issues related to the special session. He referred in that connexion to the working paper which his delegation had submitted (A/AC.206/12) with a view to facilitating that consideration.

53. Mr. BAYTOK (Turkey) recalled that in paragraph 12 of the Final Document of the first special session on disarmament, the General Assembly had welcomed the agreement that the membership of the Committee on Disarmament would be reviewed at regular intervals, and had taken the decisions mentioned by the Finnish representative by an overwhelming majority. Item 12 of the provisional agenda dealt with the question of machinery in the field of disarmament from the point of view to enhancing its effectiveness, and when the provisional draft agenda had been under discussion, it had been stated by one delegation, and subsequently confirmed by the Chairman, that the compromise formulation it reflected could not be considered in

/...
any way as limiting the scope and substance of the discussions on international machinery in the field of disarmament to be conducted during the second special session. The agenda had obviously been adopted on that understanding. His delegation was convinced that the review of the membership of the Committee on Disarmament which would be undertaken at the second special session would enhance that Committee's credibility and effectiveness and enable it to speed up its work so as to achieve the positive results so long expected by the international community.

54. Mr. de SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil) said that his delegation had never seen any point in holding a special session on disarmament without adequate preparation of the substantive questions with which it would have to deal, and that the disinclination of some delegations to give them serious consideration with a view to achieving genuine progress had justified his delegation's apprehensions in that connexion. The Preparatory Committee had wasted valuable time in endless wrangling over irrelevant details relating to the agenda of the special session, reflecting the deplorable tendency for sterile confrontation between the major Powers even on matters that should pose no difficulties. A striking example was the fruitless debate on whether or not the question of new initiatives should be spelt out in the formulation of a specific agenda item. The agenda of the first special session contained no reference to new initiatives, but that had in no way prevented delegations from taking them. The suggestion that the item on initiatives and proposals should be included in the agenda was as relevant as the objections to it.

55. It was rather the results of the agreements reached at the first special session that the second special session must assess. Most of the views expressed in the Committee had correctly envisaged the adoption of a comprehensive programme of disarmament as a major prerequisite for the success of the second special session. It must also be kept in mind, however, that the first special session had adopted the Programme of Action by consensus, and assessment of its implementation in accordance with the priorities which had also been adopted by consensus was in itself an essential task of the second special session. The comprehensive programme of disarmament must be adopted within the broader context of a critical appraisal of the results and implementation of the Programme of Action. Otherwise it was likely to remain nothing more than a statement of pious intentions that had little chance of being implemented.

56. His delegation was therefore convinced that the forthcoming session must be devoted essentially to making substantive preparations for such an assessment. The preparatory work of the Preparatory Committee's final session would be based on the agenda the Committee had just adopted. His delegation therefore considered that the procedural skirmishes over minor aspects of the agenda had diverted the Preparatory Committee from the important tasks which still confronted it. The major Powers and some of their allies had ignored the aspirations and preoccupations of most of the delegations, which regarded the substantive aspects of the operation of disarmament machinery to be of overriding urgency. Even more troubling was the fact that some delegations had more than once raised objections to language already agreed upon by consensus, as in the case of the passages quoted from the Final Document. It was very disturbing that commitments entered into only four years previously were already being disavowed.
57. In conclusion, he re-emphasized the need to reach speedy agreement on such purely procedural points as were still outstanding and to give serious consideration to how the Preparatory Committee was to discharge the substantive responsibilities entrusted to it by the General Assembly. Unless all delegations were prepared to discuss the substantive aspects seriously, the special session would have so little hope of success that there might be no point in holding it at all.

58. Mr. AYEWAH (Nigeria) said that he whole-heartedly endorsed the views expressed by the previous speaker and he expressed the hope that delegations would be prepared to engage in meaningful substantive discussions at the forthcoming session.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.