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The meeting was called to order at 4:50 p.m.

REPORT OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS SPECIAL SESSION (A/AC.230/1988/CRP.1)

1. Mr. NUNEZ-MOSQUERA (Cuba), Rapporteur, introducing the Preparatory Committee's draft report (A/AC.230/1988/CRP.1), said it was gratifying that the Committee, reflecting the current atmosphere of confidence attending disarmament questions, had made progress in the implementation of General Assembly resolution 42/40.

2. The CHAIRMAN said that according to paragraph 4 of the draft report, the informal paper which he had prepared and which had been discussed earlier in the week in informal consultations would be transmitted to the third special session, without prejudice to the position of any delegation.

3. Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America) said that it was necessary to reflect the facts more fully. Accordingly, he proposed that the phrase "but the discussion revealed divergent views on a number of items in the paper and the proposals advanced" should be inserted at the end of the third sentence of paragraph 4. He also proposed that the draft report should state that the Chairman's paper was annexed without prejudice to the views or the positions of any delegation regarding its contents.

4. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia) stressed the need to underscore the positive side of the work carried out by the Committee. His delegation preferred the current wording of the third sentence of paragraph 4. If the United States proposal was adopted, the draft report should also state that there had been a wide divergence of views on other matters.

5. Mr. FAHMY (Egypt) and Mr. DUMEVI (Ghana) said that they, too, preferred the current wording of the third sentence of paragraph 4.

6. Mr. BENYAMINA (Algeria) said that he supported the statement made by the representative of Indonesia concerning the third sentence of paragraph 4. Furthermore, the current wording of the fourth sentence of that paragraph should be maintained, because it would show that the decision had been taken by the Committee.

7. The CHAIRMAN said that the Bureau had considered the question of documentation at its latest meeting, and had reached agreement on the recommendations contained in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the draft report.

8. Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America) said that the reproduction of the documents referred to in paragraph 10 was unnecessary and would involve considerable expense. The information in question could be found in existing United Nations documents, and there was no need to reproduce what was already available.

/...
9. Mr. EDIS (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was surprised to see the recommendations contained in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the draft report. It would be extremely expensive to reproduce the documents in question. Furthermore, it was not clear on what basis the summary of developments in the field of arms limitation and disarmament since 1982 would be prepared.

10. Mr. PRANDLER (Secretary of the Committee) said that if the Committee agreed to recommend that the two reports referred to in paragraph 11 of the draft report should be issued in time for the third special session, there would be no further financial implications, since the General Assembly had already taken a decision in that regard. The two reports referred to in paragraph 10 would be prepared in accordance with the relevant guidelines laid down by the Fifth Committee. The summary of developments in the field of arms limitation and disarmament since 1982 would be concise and based on available public documents and statements. Similar summaries had been prepared in the past and had been found useful.

11. Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America) said that his delegation did not accept the view that simply because the money was there, it should be spent. The information referred to in subparagraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 10 was already available in United Nations documents and need not be reproduced. His delegation could not support the request for documentation in paragraph 10 of the draft report.

12. Mr. NANNA (Nigeria) said that, since the reports referred to in paragraphs 10 (b) and 11 were to be submitted in any event to the General Assembly at its forty-third session, there would be no additional cost if the Committee recommended that they should be issued in time for the third special session. The only new document was the summary of developments in the field of arms limitation and disarmament, referred to in paragraph 10 (a). Since the Secretariat would be largely responsible for the preparation of that report, the cost would be low. Accordingly, he called upon the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom to reconsider their position and join the consensus in support of the report referred to in paragraph 10 (a).

13. Mr. HELLER (Mexico) expressed his delegation's support for the Bureau's proposal concerning documentation for the third special session, as it was a coherent and rational proposal. The question was not really one of funds, but one of principle. On the one hand, a summary of developments in the field of arms limitation and disarmament since 1982, including the status of negotiations in bilateral and various multilateral forums, was being requested and on the other, a frame of reference was being provided for dealing with various agenda items.

14. Moreover, various General Assembly resolutions had requested reports on bilateral negotiations, so as to give Member States access to information and provide a basis for multilateral negotiations. Such documentation would be the absolute minimum for the delegations participating in the third special session.

15. Mr. MOLANDER (Sweden) agreed that the documentation referred to in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the draft report was the bare minimum for the session. His delegation could not, therefore, approve the draft report without those key
provisions. It also regretted the decision not to call a fourth session of the Preparatory Committee. Citing General Assembly resolution 42/40, adopted by consensus, he urged delegations to further that consensus by supporting the request for the reports referred to in paragraphs 10 and 11.

16. Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America) said that his delegation had no quarrel with paragraph 11 of the draft report (A/AC.230/1988/CRP.1). It endorsed what the representative of Nigeria had said. The reports for the forty-third session could be brought forward and submitted to the Assembly at the special session, thereby economizing on documentation. His delegation could agree to paragraph 10 (b), on condition that only one report was produced.

17. Furthermore, regarding paragraph 10 (a), he pointed out that the United Nations already produced many yearbooks and fact-sheets concerning developments on arms limitation and disarmament, thus dispensing with the need for a summary of developments since 1982. Regarding the forums mentioned, he said that the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission were already covered, and he asked how reports could be made on the status of negotiations in other forums, when they did not even report to the United Nations. As for bilateral negotiations, reports would be duly submitted, as in the past.

18. Mr. PRANDLER (Secretary of the Committee) said that only two reports were envisaged under paragraph 10 (b): one giving an overview of disarmament activities since the second special session, at which the World Disarmament Campaign had been established and launched, and another covering only activities in 1988. That had been the Secretariat's understanding of the wishes of the delegations which had requested the reports. Of course, it was up to the Committee to decide if that approach was acceptable.

19. Mr. ALATAS (Indonesia) said that the reports envisaged in paragraph 10 (b) would be concise and succinct, giving an overview of previous documents such as those on the peaceful uses of outer space. Such reports would dispense readers from having to consult numerous publications. As well as an invaluable reference source, they would be an excellent preparatory basis for the special session. As for the financial argument, the reports would represent money well spent, and if the funds were available, he saw no reason why they should not be used.

20. Mr. DJIEVA (Cameroon) said that his delegation had no objections to paragraphs 10 and 11. It did not understand the objections to paragraph 10 (a), which merely called for a summary.

21. Mr. FISCHER (Uruguay) added that a summary was not a commentary. He therefore asked for the objections to be withdrawn.

22. Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America) said that there had not been sufficient developments since the forty-second session to warrant a further report. His delegation was particularly reluctant to approve paragraph 10 (a) at such short notice. It therefore wished to register a very strong reservation on paragraph 10.
23. The CHAIRMAN, turning to the question of non-governmental organizations, said that a number of proposals had been made concerning their participation at the special session. The Bureau was of the opinion that some of the requests submitted by them could be accommodated within the terms of the recommendations which the Preparatory Committee had agreed to make at its second session and which had been subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly. The Bureau had reached certain conclusions with regard to other requests, such as those concerning access, written statements and oral statements.

24. As to access, the Bureau was of the opinion that, at the third special session, non-governmental organizations should be entitled to have access only to the open meetings of the bodies concerned.

25. As to written statements, it had been decided that only States Members of the United Nations could ask for documents to be circulated. On the other hand, communications from non-governmental organizations which were officially received would be listed in an information document to be issued by the Secretariat.

26. As to oral statements, although there was no procedural obstacle to complying with that request, the matter would have to be addressed at a later stage in the light of the organization of work of the Committee of the Whole.

27. Regarding the allocation of the items on the provisional agenda for the third special session, the Committee might wish to recommend that items 1 to 9 and item 16 should be allocated to the plenary Assembly, and items 10 to 15 to the Committee of the Whole.

28. It was so decided.

29. Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America) said that his delegation, in the spirit of co-operation, would not be submitting any amendments to the second part of paragraph 4. It requested, however, an amendment to paragraph 8: the words "decided to include" should be replaced by "included". The decision in question had, in fact, been taken by the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs, and his delegation had not taken part in the decision; it had not, however, opposed it.

30. His delegation could not endorse paragraph 16, as his country was not a member of UNESCO and did not always support its approach. He therefore suggested that the paragraph should be deleted.

31. Subparagraph (e) (ii) of paragraph 19 should be placed in square brackets.

32. The CHAIRMAN invited the Preparatory Committee to adopt the draft report.

Paragraphs 1 to 7

33. Paragraphs 1 to 7 were adopted.
Paragraph 8

34. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of the amendment proposed by the United States.

35. Paragraph 8, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 9

36. Paragraph 9 was adopted.

Paragraph 10

37. The CHAIRMAN said that the objection raised by the representative of the United States of America might be accommodated by the incorporation in paragraph 10 of a sentence indicating that one delegation had strongly objected to the preparation of the report under paragraph 10 (a).

38. Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America) said that it was still not clear to his delegation whether the report referred to in paragraph 10 (b) would supplant the regular report on the World Disarmament Campaign, or whether there would be two separate reports.

39. Mr. PRANDLER (Secretary of the Committee) reiterated that there would be two reports on the Campaign, one dealing with the Campaign since its initiation, and the other detailing activities in 1988.

40. Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America) said that his delegation would then wish to see the Chairman's proposed amendment cover both subparagraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 10.

41. Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia) said that the reports referred to in paragraphs 10 (a) and 11 would be of assistance to many delegations. Apparently, they were of less concern to the United States of America, which had more resources at its disposal. With regard to the United States proposal to place subparagraph (e) (ii) of paragraph 19 in square brackets, his delegation could acquiesce, on the understanding that not all delegations were fully satisfied with that approach.

42. The CHAIRMAN said that the reservations expressed by the United States representative could be accommodated by being reflected in the summary record of the meeting. They could also be accommodated through the proposed amendment to paragraph 10.

43. Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America) said that his delegation would like to see paragraph 10 amended as proposed. Delegations should note that the United States had not, in fact, raised any objection to paragraph 11. With respect to paragraph 19, it would be acceptable if asterisks were inserted following subparagraphs (e) (ii) and (e) (iii), with footnotes referring back to subparagraphs (a) and (b) of paragraph 10.

/...
44. Ms. TAYLOR (United Kingdom) said that her delegation also had reservations concerning paragraph 10.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that, so as to accommodate those reservations, his proposed amendment to paragraph 10 should be changed to indicate that two delegations had strongly objected to the preparation of the report under paragraph 10 (a).

46. Paragraph 10, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs 11 to 13

47. Paragraphs 11 to 13 were adopted.

Paragraph 14

48. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of the proposal to insert the following words at the end of paragraph 14: "including the establishment of subsidiary bodies as necessary".

49. Paragraph 14, as amended, was adopted.

Paragraph 15

50. Paragraph 15 was adopted.

Paragraphs 16 and 17

51. Mr. ZAPOTOCKY (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation did not see why the United States objected to the retention of paragraph 16, or why that paragraph stated that the Director-General of UNESCO "should be invited" to address the General Assembly.

52. Mr. PRANDLER (Secretary of the Committee) said that paragraph 16 had been so worded in accordance with the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. So far, requests to address the General Assembly had been received only from UNESCO and IAEA.

53. Mr. DJOKIC (Yugoslavia) said that there was no reason to delete paragraph 16. UNESCO had useful programmes in the area of disarmament, and the Director-General of UNESCO had addressed the General Assembly at the two previous special sessions devoted to disarmament.

54. Mr. AKALOVSKY (United States of America) said that the United States was not a member of UNESCO; neither did it support the programmes to which the representative of Yugoslavia had referred. Furthermore, his delegation had voted against General Assembly resolution 41/59 D, which dealt with the role of the specialized agencies in the field of disarmament. He consequently found paragraph 16 unacceptable.
55. **Mr. DJOKIC** (Yugoslavia) said that he understood the reasons underlying the position taken by the representative of the United States of America. Nevertheless, many delegations supported the UNESCO programmes on disarmament, and he believed that the view of the majority should be respected in the present instance. Perhaps paragraph 16 could be followed by an asterisk to indicate that a certain number of delegations had strongly objected to it.

56. The **CHAIRMAN** drew attention to paragraph 103 of the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament, which urged UNESCO to help facilitate research and publications on disarmament.

57. **Mr. HEPBURN** (Bahamas) said that deleting paragraph 16 without deleting paragraph 17 would pose a problem. Since only two specialized agencies had asked to address the Assembly at the special session, it hardly seemed appropriate for the Committee's report to refer to only one of them.

58. **Mr. BENYAMINA** (Algeria) said that, while the work of UNESCO related more to peace in a general sense than to disarmament per se it was fitting that the Director-General should address the Assembly at the special session. Paragraph 16 should therefore be retained. Furthermore, it would be somewhat discourteous not to invite the Director-General of UNESCO, while inviting the Director-General of IAEA, particularly as the former had only recently been elected to office.

59. **Mr. VASILYEV** (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that paragraph 16 should be retained for the reasons cited by previous speakers.

60. **Mr. MAJENGGO** (United Republic of Tanzania) asked why paragraphs 16 and 17 had not been incorporated into a single paragraph covering all the specialized agencies. UNESCO had participated in previous special sessions of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and should therefore participate in the third special session as well. Moreover, UNESCO did much to disseminate information to developing countries, its participation in the session was particularly vital.

61. The **CHAIRMAN** said that UNESCO and IAEA had been dealt with in separate paragraphs of the report because their status was not the same. He suggested that paragraph 16 might be retained if the formula adopted in the case of paragraph 10 was used.

62. **Mr. AKALOVSKY** (United States of America) said that that solution was unacceptable to his delegation.

63. **Mr. FAHMY** (Egypt) proposed that the question of which executive heads of organizations should address the Assembly should be left for the Assembly itself to decide at the special session.
64. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to delete section F (paras. 16 and 17) of its draft report and refer the question of invitations to executive heads of United Nations organizations to the General Assembly for action at the third special session.

65. It was so decided.

66. Mr. DUMEVI (Ghana) expressed concern that the decision to postpone the issue would not give the executive heads sufficient time to prepare for the special session. Moreover, a decision to invite heads of some, but not other, agencies might appear discriminatory.

Paragraph 18

67. Paragraph 18 was adopted.

Paragraph 19

68. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee of the United States proposal regarding asterisks in paragraph 19, and accompanying footnotes.

69. Paragraph 19, as amended, was adopted.

70. The draft report as a whole, as amended, was adopted.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

71. The CHAIRMAN declared the third session of the Preparatory Committee for the Third Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament closed.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.