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CONSIDERATION OF SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES RELATED TO THE SPECIAL SESSION, INCLUDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

PRINCIPAL DOCUMENT(S) TO BE ADOPTED AT THE SPECIAL SESSION (continued)

1. Mr. SORENSEN-MOSQUERA (Venezuela) said that his delegation had contributed actively to the efforts of the Preparatory Committee in the hope that the second special session devoted to disarmament would adopt concrete measures in favour of general and complete disarmament. It was thus essential that the measures provided for in the Final Document of the first special session be implemented. It was also essential that new disarmament initiatives be taken in order to enhance understanding among States, thereby contributing effectively to the maintenance of international peace. The deliberations of the Preparatory Committee must contribute to a dialogue and negotiation, and also reinforce the measures agreed on at the first special session.

2. With regard to agenda items 4 and 5, his delegation attached particular importance to the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament (CPD) as the appropriate framework for substantive disarmament negotiations aimed at the early implementation of a series of specific disarmament measures. Such measures must be reciprocal and implemented gradually in order to guarantee the security of all States. His delegation hoped that the CPD would be binding and that the measures it envisaged would be based on the following priorities: immediate cessation of the nuclear-arms race, the elimination of the threat of nuclear war and nuclear disarmament. The Programme should also provide a time-frame for its implementation.

3. His delegation also attached great importance to the mobilization of international public opinion in favour of disarmament. If the international public was fully aware of the implications of the arms race, it might prove an essential factor in promoting disarmament and reversing the arms race. Unfortunately, growing opposition to the arms race in Europe, the United States and the Soviet Union had so far failed to influence policy makers in those countries.

4. His delegation also attached importance to the relationship between disarmament and development and agreed that measures must be adopted to divert the resources spent on the arms race to the economic and social development of all peoples, particularly those of the third world.

5. His delegation had always supported the multilateral approach to disarmament negotiations as an essential tool for holding substantive negotiations on the subject. It therefore paid tribute to the work being done by the United Nations in that connexion and, in particular, supported the activities of the Centre for Disarmament and believed that the Centre's disarmament training programmes should be expanded.
6. His delegation was sure that States would show the necessary political will at the second special session and finally initiate the irreversible disarmament process so urgently demanded by the peoples of the world.

ANY REMAINING ORGANIZATIONAL AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS RELATED TO THE SPECIAL SESSION

7. The CHAIRMAN said that since the previous meeting, he had held consultations with the Bureau regarding the item under consideration. In view of the widespread feeling in the Committee that a working group should be established to review the implementation of the decisions and recommendations of the first special session, the Bureau had recommended the formal establishment of such a group and the appointment of Ambassador Venkatswaran of India as its Chairman.

8. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee decided to adopt that recommendation.

9. It was so decided.

10. With regard to the procedure for dealing with the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, the Bureau had recommended that an open-ended informal working group should be established to help prepare for the discussion of the CPD at the second special session and to try to resolve outstanding issues in the Programme. Whatever the outcome of the working group's efforts the intention was not to produce a counter-document but to see whether the Committee could make a positive contribution to the work of one by the Committee on Disarmament. If the working group achieved positive results, those could be reflected in the Committee's report. If the Committee adopted the Bureau's recommendation, the Bureau also wished to recommend that Ambassador Hepburn of the Bahamas should preside over the group. It had also been suggested that the Secretariat should circulate to the Committee and the working group, for information, the statement made by Ambassador Garcia Robles of Mexico, in his capacity as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, in submitting the Ad Hoc Working Group's report to the Committee. Ambassador Garcia Robles had agreed to assist the open-ended working group by explaining the position with regard to the CPD and answering any questions.

11. If he heard no objections, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the recommendations regarding the establishment and chairmanship of the open-ended, informal working group.

12. It was so decided.

13. The CHAIRMAN announced that the two working groups just established by the Committee would meet alternately, starting 3 May 1982.

14. Mr. DIACONU (Romania) said that he had supported the Bureau's recommendations on the understanding that outstanding issues which were not referred to the two working groups and which would not form part of the review document or the CPD would have to be considered in some other way. In other words, the organization of
work just adopted was without prejudice to the position of delegations on other issues and documents to be dealt with in the Committee and at the second special session. The outstanding issues to which he was referring were not those covered by agenda items 5 and 6 but rather substantive questions such as disarmament machinery or the World Disarmament Campaign.

15. The CHAIRMAN observed that the question of disarmament machinery would in fact be within the scope of the two working groups since both the review document and the CPD would include chapters on such machinery. As for the World Disarmament Campaign, although the campaign was to be a very important issue at the second special session, he believed that, for the time being, the Committee could not go beyond the action taken by the General Assembly in that connexion at its thirty-sixth session. The final week of the current session would, however, be devoted to discussing issues which had not been dealt with or had been only partially dealt with by the working groups.

16. With regard to the question of participation in the special session by non-governmental organizations, the Bureau had recommended that three meetings of the Committee of the Whole should be set aside during the special session for non-governmental organizations and one meeting for peace and disarmament research institutions. The list of such organizations, prepared by the Ad Hoc Liaison Group of the two NGO Disarmament Committees, had been circulated in document A/AC.26/CRP.7. The Committee must take a decision on both the number of meetings to be allocated to non-governmental organizations and the list itself.

17. Mr. ADAMSON (United States of America) recalled that, at its previous session, the Committee had decided to recommend that non-governmental organizations and peace and disarmament research institutes should be given the same facilities for participation in the second special session as at the first special session, namely two meetings for non-governmental organizations and one for research institutions. His delegation had agreed to that recommendation and did not believe that a further meeting was needed to allow more non-governmental organizations to participate. If each additional application to speak led to the allocation of more of the session's time, there would be no limit on the number of organizations which might apply to speak. Increased participation could only create problems by reducing the time available for plenary meetings. United States officials preparing for the second special session had met with representatives of non-governmental and inter-governmental organizations: they valued the latter's views and would maintain a dialogue with them throughout the session. His delegation hoped that other countries would do likewise, for that was the best way of communicating the concerns and interests of such organizations. His delegation was not opposed to participation by non-governmental organizations but believed that it would not be a useful precedent to increase the number of meetings allocated to them.

18. His delegation hoped that its views would be taken into account but since it did not wish to delay the discussion of substantive issues, would endorse the Bureau's recommendations on the understanding that the procedures governing participation by non-governmental organizations and research institutions would be the same as those applied at the first special session, and that participation by the IPU and the Palme Commission would also be governed by those procedures and would not involve any further allocation of meeting time.
19. **Mr. Skinner** (Canada) suggested that the list circulated in document A/AC.206/CRP.7 should adopt a uniform approach to the designation of organizations in the different categories. When the document had been reissued for technical reasons, the indication of the countries in which category II organizations were based had been omitted, while such indications remained for categories I and III. If the list was to be circulated as a formal document, that omission must be rectified.

20. **Mr. Diaconu** (Romania) said that two Romanian non-governmental organizations had recently asked his Mission to announce their intention of addressing the second special session. While he appreciated that such notification was extremely late, he wished to request that the organizations in question be included in the list. The organizations in question would be submitting written applications to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

21. **Mr. Wegener** (Federal Republic of Germany) said that he had asked that the Secretariat ensure that the Federal Republic of Germany was named in full in part II of document A/AC.206/CRP.7. The interests of Berlin (West) in the United Nations were represented by the Federal Republic of Germany and an official communication to that effect had been sent to the Secretary-General; that position had been accepted by the Soviet Union in the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. The Federal Republic of Germany should therefore be listed in accordance with the standard practice of the United Nations.

22. The **Chairman** said that, when the agreed list of non-governmental organizations and peace and disarmament research institutions was distributed formally at the special session, it would contain no references to the names of cities or of countries after the names of the institutions. Only the names of the institutions themselves would appear.

23. **Mr. Issraelyan** (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had no objection of the adoption of the list as it appeared in document A/AC.206/CRP.7. If, however, another list were going to be prepared, his delegation would wish to see it.

24. The **Chairman** said that what was important was the name of the organization. In his view, the Preparatory Committee should follow the same practice which had been followed during the first special session. Thus, in part II, "Project Ploughshares" and "Russian Orthodox Church" would appear as such. The real issue was that the Preparatory Committee should agree on the particular organizations which should participate.

25. The representative of Romania had asked for the addition to the list of two Romanian non-governmental organizations. That request should of course have gone to the Ad Hoc Liaison Group. He asked for the views of delegations on the Romanian request.

26. **Mr. Summerhayes** (United Kingdom) said that the listing of such institutions was the responsibility of the Ad Hoc Liaison Group and not of the Preparatory Committee. The request should not have been addressed to the Preparatory Committee which should not therefore take a decision on the issue.
27. **Mr. Lidgard** (Sweden) said that he sympathized with the request of the representative of Romania. A similar case had arisen in connexion with a request from a Swedish organization. On that occasion his delegation had been told that the list could not be changed but that the organization would be included in a standby list in case a vacancy should occur.

28. **Mr. Diaconu** ( Romania) said that he asked only that the Preparatory Committee should not declare the list closed. It would then be possible for his delegation to approach the **Ad Hoc** Liaison Group with a view to having the two organizations included.

29. **Mr. Okawa** (Japan) said that he too sympathized with the representative of Romania. In the case of Japan, however, a considerable number of non-governmental organizations had clamoured for inclusion in the list. If the list was reopened, it would lead to ever-increasing demands from other organizations, including Japanese. To admit that additional organizations could be added would set a dangerous precedent.

30. **Mr. De La Gorce** (France) said that, in the view of his delegation, the Preparatory Committee should not confine itself to rubber-stamping the recommendations of the **Ad Hoc** Liaison Group. He accordingly sympathized with the delegation of Romania. The Preparatory Committee should reserve its competence on the closing of the list.

31. The **Ad Hoc** Liaison Group had considered that it was not in a position to define criteria for the selection of peace and disarmament research institutions since the structure and methods of work of the latter were in most cases different from those of non-governmental organizations. It had therefore confined itself to transmitting a list of institutions which had applied to make an oral statement. In that connexion, he would like to keep open the possibility that an additional French institution might be included. Such a decision was within the competence of the Preparatory Committee. The final responsibility lay with the Preparatory Committee and what was proposed by the **Ad Hoc** Liaison Group was not the last word.

32. The **Chairman** considered that the Preparatory Committee should limit itself to taking note of the list as submitted by the **Ad Hoc** Liaison Group and, if delegations wished additional requests to be considered, such requests should be passed to the **Ad Hoc** Liaison Group for possible inclusion in a standby list.

33. On the issue of research institutions, it would be advantageous to have as few as possible. Otherwise the time available to each would be reduced.

34. The representative of the United States had suggested that the proposed allocation of one additional meeting for non-governmental organizations might affect the length of the presentations of such organizations and had questioned whether the provision of an additional meeting was the best way of ensuring that such presentations were effective. In fact, it was the non-governmental organizations themselves which had made the request for an additional meeting. It had seemed a reasonable request which involved a modest increase in the number of meetings; it should be approved. On the question of the length of presentations, the non-governmental organizations themselves were supposed to set a 10-minute time-limit. An additional meeting would therefore permit additional participation.
35. The Bureau had also considered the status of IPU and of the Palme Commission. Strictly speaking, these were not non-governmental organizations. Each might however be given 20 minutes in which to make a submission to the Special Session. He assured the representative of the United States that IPU and the Palme Commission would speak only before the Committee of the Whole.

36. Mr. LIDGARD (Sweden) said it was his understanding that there were already 70 organizations on the so-called standby list.

37. The CHAIRMAN said that the representative of the United States had indicated his willingness to go along with the consensus. If there were no objections, he would take it that the Preparatory Committee had adopted, by consensus, the speaker's list of representatives of non-governmental organizations and peace and disarmament research institutions prepared by the Ad Hoc Liaison Group (A/AC.206/CRP.7).

38. It was so decided.

39. Mr. ISSRAELYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed satisfaction that consensus had been reached, particularly on the non-governmental organizations, and welcomed the contribution which such organizations could make to the work of the second special session.

40. He had noted with regret that, according to a foot-note to document A/AC.206/CRP.7, two of the members of the Ad Hoc Liaison Group had not been given visas in time to attend. Such difficulties should not be allowed to impede the participation of representatives in such activities.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that the Secretariat was taking up the issue with the appropriate authorities.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.